

# SILIUS ITALICUS, CATAPHRACTI, AND THE DATE OF Q. CURTIUS RUFUS

J. RUFUS FEARS

QUINTILIAN does not include Q. Curtius Rufus in his list of historians;<sup>1</sup> and in fact no ancient reference is known to the *Historiae Alexandri Magni Macedonis*<sup>2</sup> or to a Q. Curtius Rufus as the author of such a work.<sup>3</sup> Curtian syntax and vocabulary are consistent with any date between Livy and the fourth century;<sup>4</sup> and, in the extant portions of the work, the single clear reference to the period in which the *Historiae* was composed is the imperial panegyric at 10. 9. 1-7, celebrating an unnamed emperor who had quelled a severe civil disturbance and thereby restored prosperity to the Roman commonwealth. This establishes Augustus as a *terminus ante quem non*, but it offers no indisputable evidence to identify the subject of Curtius' encomium.

In these circumstances it is not surprising that the date of the *Historiae* has been the subject of much debate.<sup>5</sup> Nor has this been an idle exercise. Certainty in this matter could throw considerable light upon various aspects of the transmission of the vulgate tradition and could indicate solutions to such thorny questions as the authenticity of Arrian's letter of

This article was written with the aid of grants from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society and from Indiana University.

1. *Inst.* 10. 1. 85-131. It should be pointed out that Quintilian specifies that he is not giving a complete list (10. 1. 104).

2. *Historiae Alexandri Magni Macedonis* is given in the colophons of codices B and F, *Historiae Alexandri Magni Regis Macedonum* in the colophon of M. The title of M is *De gestis Alexandri Regis Macedonum*, while V has simply *Historiae*.

3. The titles of B<sup>6</sup> and M and the colophons of S, B, F, and M give the author as Q. Curtius Rufus. The *praenomen* is lacking in the title of V. Cic. *QFr.* 3. 2 refers to a Q. Curtius, *bonus et eruditus adulescens* (55 B.C.). Tac. *Ann.* 11. 20 and Pliny *Epp.* 7. 27. 2 mention a Curtius Rufus, proconsul of Africa. The index of Suetonius' *De rhetoribus* lists a Q. Curtius Rufus between M. Porcius Latro and L. Valerius Primanus. This last has frequently been assumed to be the author of the *Historiae*. Cf., most recently, G. Sumner, "Curtius Rufus and the *Historiae Alexandri*," *AUMLA* 15 (1961): 30-39; and R. Milns, "The Date of Curtius Rufus and the *Historiae Alexandri*," *Latomus* 25 (1966): 503-6. However, rather formidable objections can be raised against identifying any of these with our author. See E. McQueen, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Biography* (New York, 1967), pp. 24-26; and my "Parthi in Q. Curtius Rufus," *Hermes* 102 (1974): 623-25.

4. For earlier stylistic and syntactical studies, see M. Schanz-C. Hosius, *Geschichte d. röm. Literatur*, vol. 2<sup>4</sup> (Munich, 1935), p. 600, to which add R. Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," *AJP* 36 (1915): 402-423. More recently, D. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus* (Diss. Cologne, 1959), pp. 80-83; M. González-Haba, *Zur Syntax d. Unterordnung bei Curtius* (Munich, 1959); M. Grzesiowski, "De *Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedoni* libris a Q. Curtio Rufo scriptis," *Meander* 22 (1967): 238-43; H. Koskeniemi, *Der nominale Numerus in der Sprache u. im Stil d. Curtius Rufus* (Turku, 1969); T. Viljamaa, *Nouns Meaning River in Curtius Rufus* (Turku, 1969).

5. For the earlier literature, see A. Dosson, *Étude sur Quinte Curce* (Paris, 1887), p. 18; Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, pp. 4-50; and E. Badian, "Alexander the Great 1948-67," *CW* 65 (1971): 47-48. Add now G. Scheda, "Zur Datierung des Curtius Rufus," *Historia* 18 (1969): 380-83; and my study, "The Solar Monarchy of Nero and the Imperial Panegyric of Q. Curtius Rufus," *Historia* (forthcoming).

Alexander to Darius after Issus.<sup>6</sup> An analysis of Curtius' sources is perhaps the most pressing *desideratum* facing Alexandrine *Quellenforschung*, and the key to such a study is the determination of his date and thus the possibility of his use of Arrian.

Although a variety of dates has been proposed for the composition of Curtius' history, recent scholarship has assumed almost unanimously that the *Historiae* of Curtius is in fact a work of the first century after Christ.<sup>7</sup> In the course of recent discussion important arguments have been advanced by D. Korzeniewski<sup>8</sup> and by R. T. Bruère,<sup>9</sup> which would exclude, once and for all, the possibility that Curtius wrote later than the reign of Hadrian or even later than Silius Italicus. Because the views of Bruère and Korzeniewski on this point have met with considerable acceptance and because they rest upon assumptions which tend to characterize attempts to date Curtius from internal evidence, a re-examination of them is not only desirable but may also offer the occasion to place the entire question of Curtius' date in rather clearer perspective.

In an extremely valuable essay Bruère has treated the literary models for Silius' portrayal of the separation of Hannibal and his wife and of the proposed sacrifice of Hannibal's own son.<sup>10</sup> Out of fear for her safety, Hannibal in Spain sends Imilce back to Carthage. Later, when Hannibal is at Trasimene, envoys arrive to tell him that his son has been chosen by lot for sacrifice to the gods of Carthage, but that the Carthaginian senate has

6. Arr. *Anab.* 2. 14. Cf. W. Kaiser, *Der Brief Alexanders d. Grossen an Dareios nach d. Schlacht bei Issos* (Diss. Mainz, 1957) and the earlier literature Kaiser cites, p. 29, n. 1; G. Griffith, "The Letter of Darius at Arrian 2. 14," *PCPhS* 14 (1968): 33-48.

7. Some forty titles dealing with the problem of Curtius' date can be gleaned from the surveys of the question by Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, pp. 4-50, and Badian, "Alexander the Great 1948-67," pp. 47-48. Seven authors have argued for a post-first-century date: A. Rüegg, *Beiträge zur Erforschung d. Quellenverhältnisse in d. Alexandergeschichte d. Curtius* (Diss. Basel, 1906), pp. 115-16 (Trajan); R. Pichon, "L'époque probable de Quinte-Curce," *RPh* 32 (1908): 210-14 (Constantine); Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," pp. 422-23 (Severus Alexander); A. von Domaszewski, "Die Phalangen Alexanders und Caesars Legionen," *SHAW* (1925-26), pp. 3-5 (Hadrian); F. Altheim, *Literatur u. Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, vol. 1 (Halle, 1948), pp. 153-64 and *Röm. Religionsgeschichte*, vol. 2 (Baden-Baden, 1953), p. 302 (Septimius Severus); E. Griset, "Per la interpretazione di Curzio Rufo 10, 9, 1-6 e la datazione dell'opera," *RSC* 12 (1964): 160-64 (Severus Alexander); C. Robinson, rev. of Korzeniewski, *AJP* 82 (1961): 316-19. None of these views has met with acceptance, and few have even provoked detailed rebuttal. Typical are Korzeniewski's curt dismissals (*Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, pp. 9-11) of Rüegg, Pichon, Steele, and Domaszewski; and the remarks of Badian, "Alexander the Great 1948-67," p. 48, on Grise and Robinson. For a detailed refutation of Altheim, see K. Büchner, *Lateinische Literatur u. Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937* (Bern, 1951), pp. 156-58; and Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, pp. 38-50. The tendency to accept Curtius as a first-century author is marked in the handbooks: e.g., Schanz-Hosius, 2<sup>4</sup>:600; J. W. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*<sup>3</sup> (London and New York, 1964), p. 82; K. Büchner, *Röm. Literaturgeschichte*<sup>3</sup> (Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 398-401; J. Bayet, *Littérature latine*<sup>6</sup> (Paris, 1965), p. 314; E. Paratore, *Storia della letteratura latina*<sup>2</sup> (Florence, 1951), pp. 549-50; V. Paladini-E. Castorina, *Storia della letteratura latina*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 1 (Bologna, 1969), p. 362. The same tendency is found in treatments of related topics: e.g., G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton, 1972), p. 482; A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* (Amsterdam, 1963), pp. 255-56, 468, n. 77; D. Gagliardi, *Lucano* (Naples, 1968), p. 120; R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 1:563, n. 6.

8. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, p. 48.

9. R. T. Bruère, "Silius Italicus *Punica* 3. 62-162 and 4. 763-822," *CP* 47 (1952): 219-27.

10. Sil. 3. 62-162, 4. 763-822.

decided to let Hannibal decide whether to defy the gods or render them their just due. Bruère argues that both of these episodes were suggested to Silius by a reading of Curtius' account of the siege of Tyre.<sup>11</sup> In Curtius, once they have learned that Carthage can furnish no aid, the men of Tyre agree to send their wives and children to their colony so that they can conduct the siege without fear for the safety of their loved ones. There are some Tyrians, Curtius continues, who propose renewing the long discontinued sacrifice of a freeborn son to Saturn, a rite which the Carthaginians are said to have continued until the destruction of the city. So great is the crisis that only the intercession of the Tyrian elders prevents the enactment of the dreadful rite, which Curtius believes to be displeasing to the gods.

Bruère contends that, in contrast with the vagueness of references to several children sacrificed in other sources, Curtius speaks of only one child as the victim and Silius implies the same. Curtius, to continue Bruère's argument, precedes Silius in denouncing the sacrifice as displeasing to the gods, and in both Curtius and Silius a council of elders is instrumental in preventing the sacrifice.

On the basis of these "arresting correspondences," Bruère has suggested that Silius was familiar with Curtius' *Historiae*.<sup>12</sup> If this view is correct, then Silius' death in A.D. 101 becomes a clear *terminus post quem non* for the Alexander history;<sup>13</sup> and in the most detailed recent examination of the date of Curtius, R. Milns has worked from the assumption that Silius drew upon Curtius.<sup>14</sup>

Bruère is not the first to find Curtian influence in the *Punica*. In a Würzburg dissertation K. Meyer argued that Silius' account of the Libyan desert at 3. 654-65 and his description of the shrine of Jupiter Ammon are both derived from Curtius.<sup>15</sup> It is significant that, upon noting these analogies between Curtius and Silius, both Meyer and Bruère immediately assumed that Silius must have borrowed from Curtius. This is typical, for, since most scholars have accepted a Claudian date for the composition of Curtius' history, seeming connections between Curtius and such writers as Lucan, Seneca, and Silius have usually been formulated in terms of the question, Did Lucan, Seneca, or Silius use Curtius?<sup>16</sup> However, since there is no clear proof that Curtius predates any of these writers, the contrary is also a possibility. Indeed, on the surface, at least, it seems far more likely that Curtius would have read these writers than vice versa. Lucan, Seneca, and

11. Curt. 4. 2. 1-4. 21, esp. 4. 3. 20, 23-24.

12. In a review of Korzeniewski (*CP* 55 [1960]: 266-68), Bruère reiterates his view that Silius knew the *Historiae* of Curtius.

13. For the death of Silius, see Pliny *Epp.* 3. 7.

14. Milns, "The Date of Curtius Rufus," p. 490. The use of Curtius by Silius is also accepted by M. von Albrecht, *Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1964), p. 148, n. 12.

15. K. Meyer, *Silius u. Lucan* (Diss. Würzburg, 1924), p. 58, compares Sil. 3. 654-65 with Curt. 7. 4. 27, and Sil. 3. 669-71 with Curt. 4. 7. 22.

16. For the view that Seneca used Curtius, see T. Widemann, "Über das Zeitalter des Geschichtsschreibers Curtius Rufus," *Philologus* 30 (1870): 241-64; and Dosson, *Étude sur Quinte Curce*, p. 31. For a rebuttal, see F. Wilhelm, *Curtius und der jüngere Seneca* (Paderborn, 1928). For Lucan and Curtius, contrast C. Hosius, "Lucan und seine Quellen," *RhM* 48 (1893): 383-92 and R. Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912), pp. 259-61.

Silius were all known, cited, and even imitated in antiquity.<sup>17</sup> By contrast, there is no clear evidence of the influence of Curtius, or even a mention of his work, until well into the medieval period.<sup>18</sup>

More importantly, in statements of fact, Lucan, Seneca, and Silius almost invariably contradict Curtius.<sup>19</sup> If Curtius were read and admired by these writers sufficiently to be the source for both phrases and entire episodes, then it is difficult to understand why his narrative made so little visible impression upon their knowledge of Alexander's career. An analysis of Silius' sole reference to Alexander is instructive:

Hic ille est, tellure vagus qui victor in omni  
 cursu signa tulit, cui pervia Bactra Dahaeque  
 qui Gangen bibit et Pellaeo ponte Niphates  
 astrinxit, cui stant sacro sua moenia Nilo.<sup>20</sup>

Of the four deeds of Alexander mentioned here, two, the march through Bactria and Dahae and the foundation of Alexandria, were common knowledge and to be found in any account of Alexander. The other two deeds have no basis in Curtius, who makes no reference to the Niphates and who specifies quite clearly that Alexander did not reach the Ganges but instead halted at the Hyphasis.<sup>21</sup> The sources of Silius' portrait of Alexander cannot be determined with any certainty. Strabo refers to a no doubt spurious letter of Craterus to his mother, which has Alexander reach the Ganges.<sup>22</sup> This same tradition has left its traces in Diodorus and in Plutarch.<sup>23</sup> It is not, however, found in Curtius, who is very firm in denying that Alexander achieved the Ganges. The fact that Silius' only reference to Alexander is

17. Seneca's posthumous fame in antiquity hardly needs elaboration. For a collection of material, see Schanz-Hosius, 24:714-20. For Lucan, see Tac. *Dial.* 20; Suet. *Vit. Luc.*, p. 333 Hosius; C. Hosius, "Inscriptliches zu Seneca und Lucan," *RhM* 47 (1892): 463. See also C. Hosius, *De imitatione scriptorum Romanorum imprimis Lucani* (Greifswald, 1907), p. 17; and W. Fischli, *Studien zum Forleben d. "Pharsalia"* (The Hague, 1945). Silius is cited at Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 9. 260.

18. E. Klebs, "Eine antike Benutzung des Curtius Rufus," *Philologus* 51 (1892): 152, argues that Hegesippus 5. 19 draws upon Curtius 9. 4. 30-31, while M. Manitius, *Geschichte d. lat. Literatur d. Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1911), p. 734, sees Curtian influence on Einhart's style. The evidence is not conclusive for either of these arguments. In general, for Curtius in the Middle Ages, see A. Eussner, "Jahresberichte: Q. Curtius Rufus," *Philologus* 32 (1873): 162-65; Dosson, *Étude sur Quinte Curce*, p. 360; H. Bardon, "Quinte-Curce," *LEC* 15 (1947): 9-14. The *Alexandreis* of Philippus Gualtherus Castellionaeus, from the end of the twelfth century, not only relies heavily on Curtius, but often simply reproduces him word for word.

19. Contrast Curt. 9. 10. 3, 10. 1. 10 with Sen. *Ben.* 7. 2. 5; Curt. 8. 1. 17 with Sen. *De ira* 3. 17. 2, *Clem.* 1. 25; Curt. 8. 10. 29 with Sen. *Epp.* 59. 12; Curt. 6. 2. 22 with Sen. *Epp.* 84. 4; Curt. 3. 6. 4. with Sen. *De ira* 2. 23. 2. See further Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," pp. 412-14. Contrast Curt. 9. 1. 35-9. 3. 19 with Lucan 9. 33. For the Alexander portrait of Lucan and Seneca, see my "Stoic View of the Career and Character of Alexander the Great," *Philologus* 118 (1974): 113 ff.

20. Sil. 13. 763-66.

21. Curt. 9. 1. 3-9. 3. 19, 9. 4. 17, 9. 4. 20. *Transmittere* at 9. 4. 17 ("Macedones . . . regem increpare coeperent: Gangen amnem et, quae ultra essent, coactum transmitters, non tamen finisse, sed mutasse bellum") has the force of "to pass over" in the sense of "omit" or "resign," as in Stat. *Theb.* 8. 596. In his Budé edition (Paris, 1947) H. Bardon correctly translates the phrase by "obligé de laisser de côté le Gange." So too in the editions of W. J. C. Müttzell (Berlin, 1841) and Th. Vogel (Leipzig, 1885). *Transmittere* = *omittere*.

22. Strabo 15. 702.

23. Diod. 2. 37. 3; Plut. *Alex.* 62. For the problem of the Ganges in the Alexander tradition, see W. W. Tarn, "Alexander and the Ganges," *JHS* 43 (1923): 93-101; E. Meyer, "Alexander und der Ganges," *Klio* 21 (1927): 183-91; and D. Kienast, "Alexander und der Ganges," *Historia* 14 (1965): 180-88.

so at odds with Curtius' account establishes a strong *prima facie* case that the epic poet was not familiar with the *Historiae*.

Silius' apparent ignorance of this major episode in Curtius' narrative would suggest then that any analogies between the historian and the poet are best explained by the assumption that Curtius borrowed from Silius. In truth, however, the correspondences between the passages brought forth by Meyer and Bruère are not close enough to allow the inference that either Curtius or Silius drew upon the other. The story that the Tyrians sent their wives and children to Carthage is common to Diodorus, Justin, and Curtius—and thus almost certainly was found in Cleitarchus.<sup>24</sup> If the siege of Tyre suggested to Silius the theme of the separation of Imilce and her child from Hannibal, then Curtius is no more likely as the source than is Pompeius Trogus or one of the popular histories of Alexander, including the much-read work of Cleitarchus.<sup>25</sup>

The Punic custom of child sacrifice was common knowledge in antiquity.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, there are sufficient differences in detail between Silius' and Curtius' accounts of this rite to show that the one is not based on the other. Curtius seems quite clearly to be drawing upon Cleitarchus:<sup>27</sup>

Sacrum quoque, quod equidem dis minime cordi esse crediderim, multis saeculis intermissum repetendi auctores quidam erant, ut ingenuus puer Saturno immolaretur. . . .

Κλείταρχος δέ φησι τοὺς Φοίνικας, καὶ μάλιστα Καρχηδονίους, τὸν Κρόνον τιμῶντας, ἐπὶ τινος μεγάλου κατατυχεῖν σπεύδωσιν, εὐχεσθαι καθ' ἑνὸς τῶν παίδων, εἰ περιγένοιτο τῶν ἐπιθυμηθέντων, καθαγίειν αὐτὸν τῷ θεῷ.

Thus both Cleitarchus and Curtius specify that one child is offered to the deity Kronos-Saturn. On the other hand, Silius' account is very close to that found in Justin. Neither names Saturn as the recipient of the sacrifice nor indicates clearly that only one child is sacrificed. Silius writes:

Mos fuit in populis, quos condidit advena Dido,  
poscere caede deos veniam ac flagrantibus aris,  
infandum dictu parvos imponere natos.<sup>28</sup>

24. In Curtius the sending of the women and children to Carthage is closely followed by an account of the custom of child sacrifice. Since Curtius' details on the rite of child sacrifice correspond closely to those of Cleitarchus frag. 9 = *FGrH* 137 F 9, and since Diodorus and Curtius relate the same story of the evacuation of women and children, it must be assumed that Cleitarchus is the common source. See also Jacoby's comments, *FGrH*, 2D: 489; and E. Schwartz, s.v. "Curtius 30," *RE* 8 (1901): 1875. Along with Jacoby, s.v. "Kleitarchos 2," *RE* 21 (1921): 622-54, Schwartz's remarks here and s.v. "Diodorus 37," *RE* 9 (1903): 683, remain the classic statement of the thesis of a Cleitarchan vulgate. More recent discussions include T. S. Brown, "Cleitarchus," *AJP* 71 (1950): 134-55; and H. Strasburger, rev. of Tarn, *BO* 9 (1952): 202-211, both largely directed at the attempt of W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1948), 2:132, to reduce the importance of Cleitarchus as a common source. See also A. Gitti, *Alessandro Magno all' oasi di Siwah: Il problema delle fonti* (Bari, 1951); and E. Borza, "Cleitarchus and Diodorus' Account of Alexander," *PACA* 11 (1968): 25-45.

25. Cleitarchus was certainly read in the Roman period. Strabo 15. 1. 69 could simply refer his readers to Cleitarchus for details on birds. Cf. Cic. *Fam.* 2. 10. 3; Quint. *Inst.* 10. 1. 74.

26. Soph. *Andromeda* frag. 122; Plato *Minos* 315C; Theophrastus ap. Schol. *Pind. Pyth.* 2. 3; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1. 38; Ennius *Ann.* 221V "Poeni suos soliti dis sacrificare pueros." Cf. the collection of material by M. Mayer in Roscher, *Lex.*, 2:1501.

27. Curt. 4. 3. 23; Cleitarchus frag. 9 = *FGrH* 137 F 9.

28. Sil. 4. 765-67.

Justin similarly informs his readers:

Quippe homines ut victimas immolabant et impuberes, quae aetas etiam hostium misericordiam provocat, aris admovebant, pacem deorum sanguine eorum exposcentes pro quorum vita dii rogari maxime solent.<sup>29</sup>

It will be noted that, while Curtius explicitly states his belief that the gods find such a sacrifice displeasing, Silius and Justin simply indicate their own distaste for such a rite. Silius does have Imilce wonder if the gods favor such bloodshed in their honor;<sup>30</sup> but he permits Hannibal to state unequivocally: "di patrii, quorum delubra piantur / caedibus atque coli gaudent formidine matrum. . . ."<sup>31</sup>

In short, Curtius' description of the Carthaginian child-sacrifice is taken from Cleitarchus, who may be the ultimate source for Trogus-Justin and Silius Italicus. However, differences in detail show that Silius' account of this rite does not derive directly from either Cleitarchus or Curtius.

In the same way, there is no need to follow Meyer in deriving Silius' description of the Libyan desert from Curtius' portrait of the Bactrian wastelands.<sup>32</sup> The language of Silius and Curtius is not strikingly similar in these passages. Moreover, the ravages of the south wind, whirlwinds heavy with sand raging amidst the level expanses of the desert, and the necessity to steer a course by observation of the stars are all common elements in descriptions of the Libyan desert, elements found in Arrian, Plutarch, and more importantly, in Lucan.<sup>33</sup> While Curtius makes no mention of sandstorms or navigation by the stars in his account of Alexander's trek to Siwah, both Silius and Lucan give this description as part of their narrative of a journey to the shrine of Jupiter Ammon; and it is difficult to justify bypassing Lucan to seek a source for Silius in a quite different desert passage in Curtius. Furthermore, the strange spring at the oracle, the waters of which were cold at noon and boiled at midnight, already appears in Herodotus and was a matter of common knowledge.<sup>34</sup> Again, there is no reason to assume that Silius derived his description from Curtius, and in fact his whole account of the oracle varies markedly from that of the Alexander historian.<sup>35</sup>

Apart from Bruère's attempt to show its influence on Silius Italicus, Curtius' Tyrian passage has frequently entered into the controversy over the date of the *Historiae*. The famous reference to Tyre has, along with the

29. Just. *Epit.* 18. 6. 12.

30. 4. 791-802.

31. 4. 819-20.

32. Sil. 3. 654-68; Curt. 7. 4. 27.

33. Arr. *Anab.* 3. 3; Plut. *Alex.* 26; Lucan 9. 449-97. M. Wünsch, *Lucan-Interpretationen* (Leipzig, 1930), pp. 50-55, argues that Posidonius was the source for the physical elements in Lucan's sandstorm. See also M. Morford, *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic* (New York, 1967), pp. 49-50.

34. Hdt. 4. 181. 3-4; Lucr. 6. 847-88; Pliny *HN* 2. 103. 228. A description of the fountain is also a standard element in the Alexander tradition. Cf. Diod. 17. 50. 4; Curt. 4. 7. 22; Arr. *Anab.* 3. 4.

35. Sil. 3. 673-712; Curt. 4. 7. 16-29. Silius' account of the foundation legend has no counterpart in Curtius, while the navel-shaped image of the deity and the procession of boats, so prominent in Curtius, are not mentioned by Silius.

imperial panegyric at 10. 9. 3, long been seen as the only temporal reference in the entire work: "multis ergo casibus defuncta et post excidium renata nunc tamen longa pace cuncta refovente sub tutela Romanae mansuetudinis acquiescit."<sup>36</sup> On the basis of this passage Niebuhr placed Curtius in the reign of Septimius Severus, who granted Tyre colonial rights.<sup>37</sup> Recently, this passage has been used to exclude Severus as a possibility on the grounds that, as a colony, Tyre "could no longer be described as *sub tutela Romanae mansuetudinis*."<sup>38</sup> In particular, attempts have been made to relate the phrase *longa pace cuncta refovente* to various periods in the history of Tyre and of the Roman Empire.<sup>39</sup> Thus, for example, a possible Severan date has been rejected on the grounds that the sack of Tyre by Niger in 193 would make the phrase nonsensical if it were applied to the city in the Severan period.<sup>40</sup> So, too, Vespasian has been excluded because Tyre was too near the main theater of the Jewish war.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, Korzeniewski has opted for an Augustan date, arguing that *longa pax* refers to the closing of the gates of Janus in 29 B.C.<sup>42</sup>

It might be suggested that Curtian scholarship has placed too much emphasis on this passage. We should especially not press the words *longa pax*. In post-Augustan writers the *pax Romana* could be invoked in a largely rhetorical sense.<sup>43</sup> Probably the bulk of the *Naturalis historia* was composed by A.D. 77,<sup>44</sup> and thus within very recent memory of the civil wars of 68–69, the revolt of Civilis, and the Judaeian War, and in the midst of frontier warfare in Britain and Germany. Yet Pliny could write of *immensa Romanae pacis maiestas*.<sup>45</sup>

There are further reasons to question the assumption that the remarks on Tyre should be seen as a temporal reference inserted by Curtius. The same theme of the misfortunes of Tyre, the refoundation of the city by

36. Curt. 4. 4. 21.

37. B. G. Niebuhr, *Kleine historische u. philologische Schriften*, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1828), p. 305.

38. McQueen, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," p. 24.

39. Since Müttzell's edition of Curtius (p. xlvii ff.), the mention of *longa pax* at 4. 4. 21 has been generally accepted as a temporal reference, like 10. 9. 3–6, from which conclusions about the author's date might be drawn.

40. McQueen, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," p. 24.

41. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, p. 38.

42. Ibid., p. 85. Robinson, rev. of Korzeniewski, pp. 316–19, counters that Korzeniewski's attempt to date the work between 25 and 23 B.C. is vitiated by the fact that Augustus was on campaign in 26 B.C. and therefore one could not speak of a *longa pax*. See also Syme, *Tacitus*, 1:218, n. 6.

43. Tac. *Agr.* 11. 5; *Hist.* 1. 67. 2, 1. 88. 2, 2. 17. 1, 4. 21. 1, 5. 16. 3; *Ann.* 13. 35. 1; *Juv.* 6. 292.

44. Book 1 contains a dedication to Titus in his sixth consulship (A.D. 77) as well as a table of contents. Since Pliny died in August, 79, it seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the larger part, if not the whole, of the work was completed by 77. See M. Rabenhorst, "Die *indices auctororum* und die wirklichen Quellen der *Naturalis historia* des Plinius," *Philologus* 65 (1906): 567–603; W. Kroll, s.v. "Plinius 5," *RE* 41 (1951): 299. For evidence of revision in the last two years of Pliny's life, and of the posthumous editing of certain books, see K. Urlichs, *Chrestomathia Pliniana* (Berlin, 1857), p. xiv; D. Detlefsen, *Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der "Naturgeschichte"* (Berlin, 1899), p. 18; and A. Klotz, "Die Arbeitsweise des älteren Plinius und die *indices auctororum*," *Hermes* 42 (1907) 324–35. K. Sallmann, *Die Geographie d. älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (Berlin, 1971), gives an excellent treatment of Pliny's method of composition, pp. 121–34, but no discussion of date.

45. Pliny *HN* 27. 1. 1.

Alexander, and its restoration to prosperity is also found in Trogus-Justin.<sup>46</sup> After a description of various disasters which had befallen Tyre, including the destruction by Alexander, Justin notes: "hoc igitur modo Tyrii Alexandri auspiciis conditi parsimonia et labore quaerendi cito convaluerunt."<sup>47</sup> The theme of the contrast between Tyre's long history of woe and its current prosperity is common to both Curtius and Trogus-Justin. In both, the allusion to the resurrection of Tyre concludes a digression on the earlier history of the city. For both, Tyre was a city notable for the colonies which it had founded and the misfortunes which it had suffered. Differences in emphasis and in the details included make it difficult to assume that their accounts of Tyrian history were taken directly from the same source.<sup>48</sup> Nonetheless, the overall similarity in structure does suggest that the somewhat rhetorical reference to the renaissance of Tyre in Curtius and Trogus-Justin does ultimately go back to a common source. Curtius or an intermediate source may have amended the reference by noting that Tyre was *nunc sub tutela Romanae mansuetudinis*, a statement valid any time after Pompey's settlement in 63 B.C. Support for the view that Curtius here refers simply to Pompey's annexation of this area may be found in Ammianus' excursus on the eastern provinces.<sup>49</sup> In his description of Syria and Phoenicia, with their flourishing cities (including Tyre), Ammianus adds the note: "has autem provincias . . . Gnaeus Pompeius superato Tigrae regnis Armeniorum abstractas dicioni Romanae coniunxit."<sup>50</sup>

Ammianus' entire excursus offers a salutary warning against any attempt to deduce Curtius' date from the Tyrian passage and suggests that it may be dubious methodology to assume that Curtius knew anything of the constitutional position of Tyre under the Roman Empire. Ammianus notes that Claudopolis in Cilicia was established as a colony by Claudius,<sup>51</sup> but he gives no evidence that he possessed knowledge of the colonial status of Tyre, Laodicia, or Berytus.<sup>52</sup> It should be emphasized, too, that in describing the favors bestowed upon Laodicia and Tyre by Septimius, Herodian makes no reference to the grant of colonial status.<sup>53</sup> It would seem then that students of Curtius' date have to assume too readily that the constitutional status of cities such as Tyre was a matter of common knowledge.

46. Just. *Epit.* 18. 3. 1-4. 1.

47. 18. 4. 1.

48. For the literary structure of the Tyrian episode in Curtius, see W. Rutz, "Zur Erzählungskunst des Q. Curtius Rufus: Die Belagerung von Tyrus," *Hermes* 93 (1965): 370-82.

49. Amm. Marc. 14. 8. The best treatments of the sources of the geographical excursuses remain V. Gardthausen, "Die geographischen Quellen Ammians," *Neue Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.*, suppl. 6 (1872-73): 509-556; and Th. Mommsen, "Ammians Geographica," *Hermes* 16 (1881): 602-636 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 7 (Berlin, 1909), pp. 393-425. See also P. de Jonge, *Sprachlicher u. historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus* (Groningen, 1939), pp. 54-87; the remarks of E. Galletier, in his Budé edition of Ammianus (Paris, 1968), pp. 28-31; and L. Dillemann, "Ammien Marcellin et les pays de l'Euphrate et du Tigre," *Syria* 38 (1961): 88-89.

50. Amm. Marc. 14. 8. 10.

51. 14. 8. 2.

52. 14. 8. 8-9.

53. Herodian 3. 3. 6.



The same methodological question bears upon D. Korzeniewski's contention that Curtius' treatment of *cataphracti* excludes a post-Hadrianic date for the composition of the *Historiae*.<sup>54</sup> Korzeniewski argues that the detailed description of mailed cavalry at 3. 11. 15 and 4. 9. 3, together with the failure to use the specific term *cataphracti*, indicates that Curtius could not expect a knowledge of these troops from his reading public. This, Korzeniewski continues, shows that he must have written before *cataphracti* were part of the Roman army. Since we have epigraphical proof for *cataphracti* under Hadrian,<sup>55</sup> Korzeniewski concludes that this gives a new *terminus post quem non* for Curtius' history.

Although these arguments have been labeled unanswerable,<sup>56</sup> in point of fact, both factual and methodological objections can be made to Korzeniewski.<sup>57</sup> In the first place, at 3. 11. 15 the brief description of the Persian mailed cavalry is demanded by the narrative. The passage under discussion occurs in the description of the battle of Issus:

Equi pariter equitesque Persarum, serie lamnarum grave agmen, ob id genus pugnae, quod celeritate maxime constat, aegre moliebantur, quippe in circumagendis equis suis Thessali inulti eos occupaverant.

In order to explain why the Thessalian cavalry was able to outmaneuver the Persians, Curtius must note that Persian rider and horse were weighed down by rows of metal plates extending to their knees.

At 4. 9. 3, Curtius, obviously for his reader's benefit, does give a description of the mailed cavalry without using the technical term *cataphracti*: "equitibus equisque tegumenta erant ex ferreis lamminis serie inter se conexas." However, Curtius' failure to use the word *cataphracti* indicates nothing about his date. The term is already found in Sallust and Sisenna, as well as in Livy and Propertius.<sup>58</sup> In the same way, Curtius' detailed description of *cataphracti* permits no conclusions concerning his date. Long after *cataphracti* had become a valuable part of the army, Ammianus Marcellinus felt constrained to give an even more detailed description of these troops, which by his time were no longer merely auxiliary troops posted on the frontier but instead part of the imperial guard:

. . . sparsique cataphracti equites (quos clibanarios dictitant) personati thoracum muniti tegminibus, et limbis ferreis cincti, ut Praxitelis manu polita crederes simulacra non viros; quos laminarum circuli tenues, apti corporis flexibus ambiebant, per omnia membra diducti, ut quocumque artus necessitas commovisset, vestitus congrueret, iunctura cohaerenter aptata.<sup>59</sup>

54. Korzeniewski, *Die Zeit d. Quintus Curtius Rufus*, pp. 47-48.

55. *CIL* 10. 5632.

56. E. Badian, rev. of Pearson, *Gnomon* 33 (1961): 661. More recently, in "Alexander the Great 1948-67," p. 48, Badian seems less certain, noting that this argument "is not quite conclusive, but very strong . . . against late date."

57. Korzeniewski's attempt to date the *Historiae* to the early Augustan period has met with little acceptance, and his arguments are convincingly refuted by Robinson, rev. of Korzeniewski, p. 356; Görlich, rev. of Korzeniewski, *AAHG* 14 (1961): 107; and Breebaart, rev. of Korzeniewski, *Mnemosyne* 17 (1964): 431-33. His argument against a post-Hadrianic date has not been discussed.

58. Sallust and Sisenna at Non. Marc. 556. 13M; Livy 35. 48. 3, 37. 40. 5; Prop. 3(4). 12. 2.

59. Amm. Marc. 16. 10. 8.

Thus from an examination of references to *cataphracti* in Curtius and Ammianus, it is clear that these passages in Curtius offer no help toward establishing a *terminus post quem non*. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that in this instance it is clearly improper methodologically to assume that Curtius or his reading public knew such a detail as the presence of *cataphracti* in the Roman army. The detailed description of these troops in Ammianus shows that the average Roman reader of the fourth century had no clear picture of *cataphracti*, although they had long been part of the Roman army and were prominently displayed on the great column of Trajan.<sup>60</sup>

I have argued elsewhere that we must reject the commonly held view that A.D. 226/27 is an absolute *terminus post quem non* for the composition of the *Historiae*. Comparison with Ammianus Marcellinus and other writers of the fourth century shows that Curtius' references to *Parthi* do not exclude the possibility that Curtius wrote after the fall of the Parthian monarchy. In the same way neither Curtius' description of *cataphracti* nor alleged correspondences between him and Silius Italicus establish *termini post quem non*. Moreover, no concrete evidence, internal or external, justifies the general tendency to assume that the *Historiae* is a work of the first century after Christ. In this light then, it is clearly time for Alexandrine source criticism to deal firmly and frankly with the proposition that Curtius made use of the *Anabasis* of Arrian.<sup>61</sup>

Indiana University

60. For *cataphracti* on the column of Trajan, see K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Trajanssäule* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1926), pl. xxxvii. See also L. Rossi, *Trajan's Column and the Dacian Wars* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1971), p. 125.

61. To take only a single example, in their otherwise admirable examination of the authenticity of Arrian's letter of Alexander to Darius at 2. 14, neither Kaiser, *Der Brief . . . an Dareios*, pp. 5, 23, nor Griffith, "The Letter of Darius at Arrian 2. 41," pp. 33-48, considers the possibility that Curtius used Arrian in his account of this same letter (4. 1. 10-4). Cf. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 2:111-16. The only serious examination of the question is by R. Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," *AJP* 40 (1919): 37-63, 157-74, a useful but not exhaustive collection of material.