

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S CAESAR*

1.1. *Τὴν Κίinna τοῦ μοναρχήσαντος θυγατέρα Κορηλίαν ὡς ἐπεκράτησε Σύλλας οὐτ' ἐλπίσιν οὔτε φόβῳ δυνηθεὶς ἀποπάσαι Καίσαρος, ἐδήμευσε τὴν φερνὴν αὐτῆς.* It has been recognised since Niebuhr that several paragraphs are missing from the beginning of *Caesar*¹). It further seems that the preserved portion of the *Life* begins in mid-sentence. This is inherently likely, if the lacuna arose from a missing leaf in the archetype or before; and, whatever preceded, the presumed asyndeton would seem very harsh. The very similar sentence at *Ti. Gr.* 1.3 begins *διὸ καὶ τὴν Σκιπίωνος τοῦ καταπολεμήσαντος Ἀννίβαν θυγατέρα Κορηλίαν...* Here, too, perhaps only a few words have been lost; perhaps a whole co-ordinate clause (dealing with the *gentiliciae hereditates* of Suet. *Div. Iul.* 1.2?). It is possible that some corruption was needed to make sense of what survived. The present poor balance of this sentence may therefore not be original.

3.1. *Ἐκ δὲ τούτου τῆς Σύλλα δυνάμεως ἤδη μαραινομένης καὶ τῶν οἴκοι καλούντων αὐτόν, ἔπλευσεν εἰς Ῥόδον ἐπὶ σχολὴν πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν τοῦ Μόλωνος...* Translators take the genitive absolute as concessive: 'although Sulla's power was waning and his friends were calling him, he nevertheless sailed to Rhodes'. If so, Plutarch has left his meaning very awkward and unclear. We should at least have expected *οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν, ἀλλ' ἔπλευσεν...*, or *ἔπλευσε πρῶτον εἰς Ῥόδον*: compare, for instance, *Ant.* 26.1. The correct explanation is suggested by *Cic.* 4.4–5. When Cicero heard of Sulla's death, *πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ Ῥώμης φίλων γραφόντων καὶ δεομένων, πολλὰ δ' Ἀντιόχου παρακελευομένου τοῖς κοινοῖς ἐπιβαλεῖν πράγμασιν, αὐτίς ὤσπερ ὄργανον ἐξηρτύετο τὸν ῥητορικὸν λόγον...* Thus Cicero decided to visit Asia and Rhodes. Caesar, like Cicero, was sum-

* These notes started life in my Oxford D. Phil. thesis on *Caesar* (1974); I am grateful to Mr. D. A. Russell, Mr. A. N. Sherwin-White, and Mr. E. L. Bowie for their invaluable help at that time. – Reference to 'Ziegler' are to the 1968 edition of his Teubner text, from which all lemmata are taken.

1) In *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973), 343–4, I try to reconstruct some of the missing material from Zonaras' paraphrase.

moned by his friends to play a part in public life; Caesar, like Cicero, sought to elaborate his rhetorical skill *ὡσπερ ὄργανον*; and so he sailed to Rhodes. . . On rhetoric as a political *ὄργανον*, cf. *Mor.* 801 c–802 e, *Fab.* 1.7, *C. Min.* 4.3, *Cic.* 32.6, *Crass.* 3.3, *Ant.* 27.4, etc.

It is still true that Plutarch has abbreviated his source-material to the point of logical obscurity.

3.2–3. . . . ὡς τὰ δευτερεῖα μὲν ἀδηρίτως ἔχειν, τὸ δὲ πρωτεῖον, ὅπως τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις πρῶτος εἶη μᾶλλον [ἀλλ’] ἀσχοληθεῖς, ἀφείναι, πρὸς ὅπερ ἡ φύσις ὑφηγεῖτο τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δεινότητος, ὑπὸ στρατειῶν καὶ πολιτείας, ἧ κατακτηήσατο τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, οὐκ ἐξικόμενος.

Commentators have made very heavy weather of this passage. All have assumed that τὸ πρωτεῖον must be the antecedent of the distant πρὸς ὅπερ; and that certainly gives an obscure, ill-balanced sentence, crying for emendation. For the various conjectures, see Ziegler, *Rh. M.* 87 (1938), 289–90. Garzetti proposed an alternative solution: elaborating a suggestion of Reiske, he argued that τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δεινότητος was to be taken as the object of οὐκ ἐξικόμενος. The relative clause πρὸς ὅπερ ἡ φύσις ὑφηγεῖτο will then qualify only what precedes: Garzetti repunctuated to this effect. This is approved by Flacelière and Chambry, but is surely wrong. Plutarch would now be saying that ‘Caesar did not become eloquent’; but Caesar *was* eloquent, Rome’s nearest rival to Cicero. All he lacked, Plutarch must be saying, was the degree of eloquence he might otherwise have attained. It further seems that Plutarch does not use ἐξικνεῖσθαι in this way, with a simple genitive. We must take the closing words together, as πρὸς ὅπερ ἡ φύσις ὑφηγεῖτο τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δεινότητος . . . [πρὸς τοῦτο] οὐκ ἐξικόμενος. It is easiest to abandon the connexion of πρὸς ὅπερ with τὸ πρωτεῖον and take it absolutely with τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δεινότητος: ‘the degree of eloquence’. Cf. e.g. *Mor.* 976 a, *C. Gr.* 18.2. ‘The second place was his beyond all doubt, but he allowed the first to escape him: he was too busy striving to become pre-eminent in power and in armed conflict, and he did not reach that height of eloquence to which his natural powers would have borne him.’

The codd. give the impossible μᾶλλον ἀλλ’ ἀσχοληθεῖς. The most straightforward cure is the deletion of ἀλλ’ (Stephanus); but μᾶλλον ἀπασχοληθεῖς, suggested to me by Mr. E. L. Bowie, is a plausible alternative.

5.1. . . . ὅτε πρὸς Γάϊον Ποπίλιον ἐρίσας ὑπὲρ χιλιαρχίας

πρότερος ἀνηγορεύθη. All translators take this in the sense 'he stood for the post of military tribune at the same time as C. Popilius, and came out above him on the list' (Warner). This gives a weak sense to ἐρίσας, and makes Plutarch's thought quite incoherent. It should be no great achievement for Caesar, the newly-elected pontifex, to come out above this Popilius, who was perhaps not even a member of the main branch of his gens²). ἐρίσας should mean 'quarrelled' or 'wrangled'. Plutarch's words probably reflect some specific contention of the two during the election campaign: it became a point of honour which won the more support. He has again abbreviated his source-material to the point of obscurity.

5.8. ... λέγεται πρὶν εἰς ἀρχὴν τινα καθίστασθαι χιλίων καὶ τριακοσίων γενέσθαι χρεωφειλέτης ταλάντων. Plutarch can only mean that Caesar owed 1300 T 'before he held any public office' (so all translators): i. e., presumably, before his *quaestura* in 69. The word ἀρχή itself might equally mean 'provincial governorship'³), and that rendering would imply that Caesar owed this sum 'before his first province', Spain in 61. That interpretation would certainly make better historical sense, as we shall see; but no reader would take the sentence in that way. Compare the use of ἀρχή in § 7, just before, and § 9, just after: in both cases it clearly means simply 'magistracy'. And the logical sequence of §§ 8–9 is clear. Caesar already owed a large sum before 69, and spent much more in 65.

Yet all this is very difficult. 1300 T should represent 31,200,000 HS, and is perhaps a rounding of 30,000,000 HS (= 1250 T). Appian, *B. C.* 2.8.26 has a very similar item to this: there Caesar owes 25,000,000 HS in 61, before departing to his Spanish proconsulship. (For his creditors' importunity at that date, cf. *Caes.* 11.1–2.⁴)) But it is hardly credible that Caesar's debts decreased during the decade. Plutarch notes his expenditure in 65, and App. *B. C.* 2.1.3 mentions the vast debts which he incurred

2) Suolahti, *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army* (Helsinki, 1955), 92. On this man, cf. Volkmann, *R-E* xxii.53 nr.5; Syme, *JRS* 34 (1944), 95–6, and *JRS* 53 (1963), 59.

3) Cf. Magie, *de Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in graecum sermonem conversis* (Leipzig, 1905), 59, 78; H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (1974), 26, 110.

4) Crassus there goes surety for only 830 T (19,920,000 HS – certainly a rounding of 20,000,000) – but that is explicitly to placate only τούς μάλιστα χαλεπούς καὶ ἀπαραιτήτους τῶν δανειστών.

'as aedile and praetor'; and it was of course common practice for a candidate to borrow in an election campaign against the hope of a future province. The Spanish proconsulship was Caesar's first opportunity to recoup his outlays. Appian and Plutarch often share the same source-material, and it here seems likely that both reflect a single original item, which one of them has displaced. It is no surprise that the figure has been corrupted or exaggerated. Appian's date is certainly the correct one, for 61 is the natural time for Caesar's debts to reach their zenith. Plutarch reflects, imports, a confusion: he seems again to have misunderstood a source. Did a Greek original similarly refer to ἀρχή – meaning Spain?

6.5. ... ὡς ἀντι πάντων ἄξιός εἰς ὁ ἀνήρ τῆς Μαρίου συγγενείας.

εἰς ὁ ἀνήρ Ziegler: *εἶη εἰς ἀνήρ* *H* *εἶη ὁ ἀνήρ* *cet.*

The archetype⁵) evidently read *εἶη ὁ ἀνήρ*, with intolerable hiatus. *εἶη εἰς ἀνήρ* (H) is no more than conjecture; but *εἰς*, at least, is plausible, sharpening the point of *ἀντι πάντων ἄξιός*. Plutarch probably intends the reminiscence of the Homeric *ἡ-τρὸς γὰρ ἀνήρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιός ἄλλων* (*Il.* 11.514, partly quoted at *Mor.* 122 c); preferable to Ziegler's reading would be the simple *εἰς ἀνήρ* (D. A. Russell), which gives a construction closer to the Homeric paradigm.

This is one of several literary allusions in this highly-wrought chapter. Note particularly, in this same sentence, *πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ δάκρυα ἐχώρει* (§ 5): surely an echo of Plato, *Phaedo* 117 c, *ἀλλ' ἐμοῦ γε βίᾳ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἀστακτι ἐχώρει τὰ δάκρυα*. Cf. *Mor.* 595 d, and, for other passages where Plutarch is influenced by the last chapters of the *Phaedo*, Helmbold and O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations* 59.

11.4 Ἐγὼ μὲν (μᾶλλον ἂν) ἐβουλόμην παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι [μᾶλλον] πρῶτος ἢ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις δεύτερος.

μᾶλλον huc trp. et ἂν add. Ziegler *μᾶλλον* ante εἶναι hab. C, om. M. *μᾶλλον* (ἂν) εἶναι Castiglioni.

The archetype evidently read *ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβουλόμην παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι μᾶλλον πρῶτος ἢ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις δεύτερος*, with impossible word-order: the position of *μᾶλλον* is especially harsh. Neither Ziegler's nor Castiglioni's transposition of *μᾶλλον* is cogent. Castiglioni follows C, but such transpositions are a feature of the Q-branch of the tradition. Better than either would be the

5) I hope to analyse the textual transmission of *Alexander and Caesar* elsewhere, and argue that a *stemma codicum* can be reconstructed.

crisp ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβουλόμην πρῶτος παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ παρὰ Ῥωμαίους δεύτερος, suggested to me by Mr. Russell. But the simple deletion of μᾶλλον is preferable (though the word's omission by M can only be a mistake or a conjecture). ἢ for μᾶλλον ἢ is especially idiomatic after verbs of wishing (K.G. ii.2.303), and an explanatory gloss μᾶλλον could easily have crept into the text. Most critics, including Ziegler and Castiglioni, have also wanted to supplement <ἄν>, but its omission with the past indicative is quite acceptable: cf. K.G. ii.1.215–6 and examples there cited.

14.1. Οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς Κράσσου καὶ Πομπηίου φιλίας <ὥσπερ> δορυφορούμενος ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπάτειαν προήχθη.

ὥσπερ add. Ziegler e Zon. προήχθη L²Zon.: κατήχθη cet.

The L² reading προήχθη can only be a conjecture, and Zonaras is no authority on such matters⁶). The archetype clearly read κατήχθη, and did not qualify δορυφορούμενος with ὥσπερ. In both cases the archetype readings should be retained.

Plutarch's vigorous language is only semi-metaphorical, building on the practice of escorting candidates to the *comitia* on the morning of the elections; καὶ λαμπρῶς ἀναγορευθεῖς ... immediately relates the sequel. Compare two versions of Appian Claudius Pulcher's *bon mot*, rebuking Aemilius Paulus on Scipio's disreputable supporters: ... ὅτι σοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπὶ τιμητικὴν ἀρχὴν καταβαίνοντα Φιλόνικος ... δορυφορεῖ (*Mor.* 810 b), and ... ὅτι σοῦ τὸν υἱὸν Αἰμίλιος ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ Λικίνιος Φιλόνικος ἐπὶ τιμητείαν κατάγουσιν (*Aem.* 38.5). Cf. *C.Gr.* 8.2, *Cic.* 14.7, *Brut.* 14.4; *C.Mai.* 16.5 is similarly semi-metaphorical. Ziegler's προήχθη would destroy the point of the figure, and <ὥσπερ> is no more necessary – δορυφορεῖν and cognates are favourite figures, and need no apology. Cf. *Pel.* 6.2, *Alex.* 77.7 (with Hamilton's n.), *Mor.* 94 a, 817 b, 830 d; *Pl. Rpb.* 573 ae, 574 d, 587 c; esp. *Isoc.* 10.37; *Luc. Tim.* 28, *Peregr.* 16, *tyr.* 4; and many other post-classical instances, esp. in Philo.

18.1. πρὸς Ἑλβετίους ... καὶ Τιγυρίνους: Plutarch clearly regards the Helvetii and the Tigurini as two distinct tribes; so does App. *Celt.* fr. 15.1, ἔθνη δύο Τιγύρινοι καὶ Ἑλουήτιοι, and this was therefore the version of the source which Plutarch and Appian regularly share (probably Asinius Pollio). Caesar,

⁶ I again hope to defend this view of the manuscript transmission elsewhere.

however, claims the *pagus Tigurinus* to be one of the four Helvetian *pagi* (*B.G.* 1.12.4); and the statistics of *B.G.* 1.29 clearly include the Tigurini among the total of Helvetii. It is usual to accept Caesar's version (see, e.g., Stähelin, *Die Schweiz in röm. Zeit*³ 78.4, and Flacelière's note here); but Strabo 4 p. 193 independently states that there were only three Helvetian *pagi*. It is just as likely that Caesar has simplified his narrative by subsuming the Tigurini to the Helvetii as a fourth *pagus* – or that he has simply made a mistake. The relationship of a subservient tribe to a stronger neighbour can naturally suffer from ambiguity; cf. the case of the Mandubii and the Aedui (Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*² 446–7).

19.1. Δεύτερον δὲ πρὸς Γερμανοὺς ἄντικρος ὑπὲρ Κελτῶν ἐπολέμησε, καίτοι τὸν βασιλέα πρότερον αὐτῶν Ἀριόβιστον ἐν Ῥώμῃ σύμμαχον πεποιημένος.

The senate had certainly recognised Ariovistus as *rex atque amicus populi Romani* during 59 (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 1.35.2, 40.2, 43.4, 44.5; *App. Celt. fr.* 16–17; *Dio* 38.34.3). But the precise force of Plutarch's *πεποιημένος* is elusive: it should mean that Caesar was directly responsible for Ariovistus' recognition. Unless Ariovistus' request was received in February or in April, Caesar presumably presided at the senate-meeting which discussed it (see Taylor and Broughton, *Hist.* 17 [1968], 166–72). This is presumably what lies behind the unclear notice of *App. fr.* 16, Ariovistus recognised *ὑπατεύοντος αὐτοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ψηφισαμένου*. Appian may mean by this that Caesar 'carried this by vote' (cf. e.g. *Plut. Pomp.* 67.1, *Ant.* 60.1); or simply that he supported the proposal (although in fact magistrates possessed no voting right: Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* iii. 944–6). Whatever he meant himself, his ultimate source presumably said something like 'Caesar rem detulit ad patres'. But Plutarch's *πεποιημένος* should imply a more direct responsibility than this. He seems either to assume that Caesar granted the title on his own initiative, or to imply some formal ceremony of admission which he conducted as consul. The same alternative interpretations are afforded by *Dio* 38.34.3, *ἐς τοὺς φίλους τοὺς τε συμμάχους αὐτῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὑπατεύοντος ἐσεγγράφητο*. It need not follow that Plutarch and Dio have anything to go on; both may reflect independent inferences from Caesar's words (*B.G.* 1.35.2), '... tanto suo populi Romani beneficio adfectus, cum in consulatu suo rex atque amicus a senatu appellatus esset ...'. Caesar there explains *tanto ... beneficio* by what follows. Ariovistus owes

gratitude to the whole Roman people, but especially to the man who happened to be consul at the time of his recognition. Plutarch and Dio, not realising the influence of a consul in choosing what matters to bring before the senate, might not think 'happening to be consul at the time' represented much of a *beneficium*; they would naturally seek to invent a more concrete reference.

19.8. ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἤμβλυε τὰ μαντεύματα τῶν ἱερῶν γυναικῶν, αἱ ποταμῶν δίναις προσβλέπουσαι καὶ ῥευμάτων ἕλιγμοῖς καὶ ψόφοις τεκμαιρόμεναι προεθέσιζον ... 'This is a merry sort of divination' (Dacier), and Plutarch's statement is in fact very strange. *Caes. B.G.* 1.50.4, from whom much of Plutarch's account ultimately derives, has merely *sortibus et vaticinationibus*. *Tac. Germ.* 10 discusses German methods of augury, and makes no mention of hydromancy: the most common practice relied on lots made from a tree-branch. It is still possible, if unlikely, that Plutarch here preserves good evidence of a genuine German custom. Hydromancy was certainly practised elsewhere in antiquity (Halliday, *Greek Divination* [1913], 145–62, and esp. Boehm, *R–E* ix. 79–86); and *very occasionally* a type of hydromancy was linked with the use of lots (cf. Paus. 4.3.5, Suet. *Tib.* 14.3, Halliday 148–9). Yet it is difficult to refer Plutarch's words to such a custom. Hydromancy does not seem elsewhere to have exploited the waters of natural rivers; it rather relied on holy springs, or liquids borne in special vessels. And hydromancy seems to have been a technique derived from the Orient and from Egypt. Nothing suggests that it was practised in the north and west (see Boehm, 1.c.). The nearest German parallel seems to be augury from the patterns formed by running *blood* (Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus*³, 200). It is more likely that Plutarch has misunderstood his immediate source, though the misunderstanding is a strange one. If that source was Latin, *vaticinationibus* may have been corrupted to, or misread as, *verticibus*; if it was Greek, there may have been some confusion between κλάδος (reflecting the custom described by Tacitus) and κλύδων.

20.7. οἵπερ εἰς συμμαγεῖς δρυμοὺς κατοκημένοι, γενεὰς δὲ καὶ κτήσεις ἐν τινὶ βυθῷ τῆς ὕλης ἀπωτάτω θέμενοι τῶν πολεμίων ...

This passage is textually very difficult. Ziegler keeps the manuscripts' *συμμαγεῖς*, but this cannot be right. *συμμαγῆς* is close to the Latin *promiscuus*, and should refer to a whole composed from a 'commingling' of different sorts of parts: *συμμαγεῖς δρυμοὺς*

could only be an inapposite comment on the variety of the vegetation. Translators take the word as 'dense', but this meaning is not attested. The two parallels cited by *LSJ* are both false: at *Mor.* 725e the Nile is *συμμιγῆς . . . καὶ θολερός*, but that means that the original stream joined with the *χυμοί* from the banks, and they flowed 'commingled together'; at *Pl. Phdr.* 239c we have *οὐδ' ἐν ἡλίῳ καθαρῷ τεθραμμένον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ συμμιγεί σκιᾷ*, but *συμμιγεί* there clearly contrasts with *καθαρῷ* (cf. de Vries ad loc.) – not in *pure* sunlight, but in a mixture of light and shade. Madvig's *συνεχεῖς* would be the most economical improvement. The Nervii had settled in woods which joined together to make a continuous forest, 'and they left their families and possessions in a corner of this forest as far as possible from the enemy'.

But the expression is still an odd one, and the corruption may well go deeper. The rest of this part of Plutarch's narrative seems to derive ultimately from *Caes. B.G.*, but Caesar has nothing like this. The perfect middle or passive use of *κατοικέω* is fairly frequent in Herodotus (1.96.2, 2.102.2, *al.*) and Thucydides (1.120, *al.*), but it afterwards falls from favour; Plutarch never uses it elsewhere. Once *κατωκημένοι* is suspected, it becomes likely that Plutarch's phrase should reflect the description of *Caes. B.G.* 2.18.2–3. A hill rose from the river, open for the first two hundred yards, but wooded on its upper slopes: *intra eas silvas hostes in occulto sese continebant*. That is, Plutarch will not be referring to the permanent dwelling-place of the Nervii, but to their temporary military disposition: cf. *γενεὰς δὲ καὶ κτήσεις πτλ.* Emendation is difficult, but *κατακείμενοι* is tempting (perhaps with Bryan's *συνηρεφεῖς* rather than *συνεχεῖς*), although that is awkward with *εἰς . . . δρυμοὺς*, and its tense sits uneasily with *θέμενοι*. Other possibilities might be *(κατα-)κρυψάμενοι* or *καλυψάμενοι*, but these are disturbingly far from the *ductus litterarum*.

21.1. Ταῦθ' ἢ σύγκλητος πυθομένη πεντεκαίδεχ' ἡμέρας ἐψηφίσαστο θύειν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ σχολάζειν ἐορτάζοντας, ὅσας ἐπ' οὐδεμιᾷ νίκη πρότερον.

ἡμέρας L² Ziegler: *ἡμέραις* cett.

Ziegler may have been misled by inaccurate reports of the MSS in referring *ἡμέρας* (so too *Dio* 39.5.1); he is followed by Flacelière. But L² is the only Plutarch MS to offer *ἡμέρας* here; and, as I hope to show elsewhere, L² has no authority in isolation. (It in fact is based on a collation of H and a manuscript of the Q-tradition). The use of the dative for duration of time is well-

attested in later Greek, and need cause no suspicion here: cf. e.g. 2.3 and the examples cited by Schmid, *Der Atticismus* i. 92, 236; ii. 41–2, iii. 55–6; iv. 615–6.

22.6. ... τὸν Ῥῆνον ἐγεφύρου, πλάτος τε πολὺν ὄντα καὶ κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ χρόνου μάλιστα πλημμυροῦντα καὶ τραχὺν καὶ ῥοώδη ...

χρόνου Ziegler: πόρου codd.

πόρου is the reading of all the manuscripts; that would mean 'at that point in its course', cf. *LSJ* s. v. πόρος, I.3. Ziegler, however, probably influenced by the repetition of τοῦ πόρου at § 7, prints his own conjecture κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ χρόνου. Despite the approval of Gossage (*CR* n.s. 22 [1972], 25), Ziegler's case is hardly made out. Plutarch is not particularly sensitive to such iteration: cf. the repetition of περιϊστάναι at 49.5, of ἀνήκεστος at *Mar.* 29.5–8, of ἐκκόπτειν in *Pomp.* 24, and many other examples. And it may be relevant that in 53 Caesar preferred to bridge the Rhine *paulum supra eum locum quo ante exercitum traduxerat* (*B.G.* 6.9.3); was he dissatisfied with his initial choice of crossing-point? – Whether Plutarch wrote χρόνου or πόρου, the item seems to rest on good information. Below Mainz, the Rhine reaches its greatest depth at the approximate region of the crossing, between Bacharach and Linz⁷); and at this point in its course the river flows at its fullest in June, a plausible month for the crossing. (See *Der Rheinstrom und seine wichtigsten Nebenflüsse*, issued in 1889 by the *Centralbureau für Meteorologie und Hydrographie im Grossherzogthum Baden*, tables at pp. 166–71). The item does not derive from Caesar's account, which is the ultimate source of most of Plutarch's narrative; and Plutarch himself was hardly well-informed about the vagaries of the Rhine's flow. The item must come from an intermediate source, who has added this note to his version of Caesar's narrative. The identity of so scrupulous a source is not beyond conjecture: surely Asinius Pollio. And, as it happens, Strabo 4 p. 193 independently attests Pollio's interest in the Rhine's flow.

23.3. νῆσον ἀπιστουμένην ὑπὸ μεγέθους. Not 'an island of incredible magnitude' (Xylander, Stewart and Long, Perrin, Garzetti, Warner): that would require e.g. ἀπιστουμένην τὸ μέγεθος. Plutarch's words rather introduce the theme of ὄνομα καὶ λόγος below; 'an island whose reported size was so great that

7) On the location of the crossing, cf. Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*² 706–10, and Grisart, *LEC* 28 (1960), 171.

men would not believe it existed at all': cf. *LSJ* s. v. *ὑπό* A.II.3. So Amyot and Chambry; the versions of 'Dryden', Langhorne, and Clough are imprecise. Plutarch here seems to be reflecting a comment made by his source: cf. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 25.2, *Britannos ignotos antea*, and esp. App. *Celt. fr.* 1.13, *ἐπέρασε . . . ἐς τὴν Βρετανίδα νήσον, ἠπείρου τε μείζονα οὖσαν μεγίστης καὶ τοῖς τῆδε ἀνθρώποις ἀγνωστον ἔτι*. But there does seem to be some confusion here. Suet. and App. need mean only that 'Romans had hitherto had no *personal* experience of the British or their island', and Plutarch's detailed expansion, *καὶ πολλὴν ἔριν . . . πέπλασται*, seems to be a garbling of the item of Dio 39.50.3 – *καὶ τοῖς μὲν πάνυ πρώτοις καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ῥωμαίων οὐδ' ὅτι ἔστιν ἐγγνώσκето, τοῖς δὲ ἔπειτα εἰς ἀμφισβήτησιν εἴτε ἠπειρος εἴτε καὶ νῆσος εἴη ἀφίκετο*. Very early writers did not realise that Britain existed at all; later writers (never doubted its existence, but) debated whether or not it was an island. (For this controversy, cf. Quint. 7.4.2 and Tac. *Agr.* 10.4, with Ogilvie-Richmond *ad loc.*). Pace Stevens, *Lat.* 12 (1953), 21, it would be very difficult after Pytheas to doubt that Britain existed: after all, Cornish tin appeared regularly in Roman markets. It is much easier to assume that Plutarch has misunderstood his source.

24.6. *ἀναγαγεῖν δὲ τὸν χάρακα καὶ τὰς πύλας ἀποικοδομεῖν ὡς δεδοικότας ἠνάγκαζε*.

ἀποικοδομεῖν Schweighäuser et Ziegler: *ἀνοικοδομεῖν* codd.

Retain *ἀνοικοδομεῖν*, meaning to 'wall up': Caesar's *portasque obstrui iubet* (*B.G.* 5.50.5). Editors have tried to emend this sense of *ἀνοικοδομεῖν* out of existence; hence, here and at *Cim.* 1.8, Ziegler accepts Schweighäuser's conjecture. (Flacelière oddly reads *ἀπ-* here, but *ἀν-* at *Cim.* 1.8.) *ἀνοικοδομεῖν* is decisively defended by the manuscript readings at *Ar. Pax* 100, *Lycurg.* 128, *Apollodor.* 2.5.1, *D.S.* 11.21.3, and *Polyaenus* 1.40.4 and 2.38.1; cf. *Hdt.* 1.186.2.

25.1. *Τοῦτο τὰς πολλὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν ἐνταῦθα Γαλατῶν κατεστόρεσε, καὶ τοῦ χειμῶνος αὐτὸς ἐπιφοιτῶν τε πανταχόσε καὶ προσέχων ὀξέως τοῖς νεωτερισμοῖς*.

A lacuna should be marked after this sentence. As the text stands, *αὐτὸς ἐπιφοιτῶν τε . . . καὶ προσέχων . . .* must be taken as an afterthought, adding a further subject. 'This (the relief of Cicero's camp) quieted the many revolts of the Gauls in the area – this and Caesar himself, travelling everywhere and attending swiftly to any disturbance.' It is hard to believe that Plutarch could have meant this. The parallel personal and non-personal

subjects are very harsh; the balance of the sentence is poor; and the antithesis is more verbal than real – it would have more point if it had not been ‘Caesar himself’ who had relieved Cicero. Ziegler’s *τοῦτό* (τε) is no great improvement. It is much easier to posit a lacuna after *νεωτερισμοῖς*: the missing words would presumably have conveyed the sense ‘quelled any remaining trouble’. Caesar *αὐτός* can then have a separate main verb to himself, as he deserves; and the whole sentence is much more elegant.

29.5. οἱ δὲ τούτους Πομπηῖω κομίσαντες εἰς μὲν τὸ πλῆθος οὐκ ἐπιεικῆς οὐδὲ χρηστοὺς κατέσπειραν λόγους ὑπὲρ τοῦ Καίσαρος, αὐτὸν δὲ Πομπηῖον ἐλπίσι κεναῖς διέφθειραν . . . Translators usually take *ὑπὲρ τοῦ Καίσαρος* as ‘about Caesar’, and assume that the men who spread these reports were acting innocently: they were simply deceived about the morale of Caesar’s troops, and their reports spread their misconception further. That interpretation certainly fits the parallel version at *Pomp.* 57.7, where Appius Claudius is named as the man who spread such reports. He clearly seems to be misled, and there is nothing sinister or corrupt about his actions. But this is a strained interpretation of the *Caesar* passage; οὐκ ἐπιεικῆς οὐδὲ χρηστοὺς then has to mean ‘neither likely nor true’ (Warner), or something of the like. ἐπιεικῆς = ‘likely to be correct’ is hard to parallel in Plutarch, and the natural run of those words suggests much stronger moral disapproval; North’s ‘ill and seditious’ catches the tone, though hardly the precise sense. In that case, it is more natural to take *ὑπὲρ τοῦ Καίσαρος* as ‘sul conto di Cesare’ (Gazzetti; so also Flacelière-Chambry). Plutarch means that these men were acting on Caesar’s behalf, and consciously spreading false reports. This is inconsistent with *Pompey*, but the very inconsistency illuminates Plutarch’s techniques⁸). His source may well have mentioned both alternatives, for Appian’s version, which clearly shares the same provenance, has these men acting εἰθ’ ὑπ’ ἀγνοίας εἴτε διεφθαρμένοι (*B.C.* 2.30.117). In each *Life* Plutarch selects the version which best suits the run of the narrative. In *Caesar* the context is stressing the ubiquitous efforts of Caesar to gain support: Curio and Paullus have been purchased, the men Caesar has sent home have been handsomely rewarded, Caesar is outwitting Pompey on every front. It is natural to include the hint that οἱ τούτους Πομπηῖω κομίσαντες were also acting in Caesar’s

8) I examine similar inconsistencies between parallel versions in *JHS* 100 (1980), 127–40.

service. In *Pompey* Plutarch is treating the other factors which encouraged Pompey's *θράσος καὶ περιφρόνησιν τῆς Καίσαρος δυνάμεως*: in particular, he has just mentioned the enthusiasm with which the towns of Italy celebrated Pompey's recovery from sickness. There was nothing sinister or corrupt about that; and Plutarch naturally continues to treat these reports in a similar vein. Caesar's own activities in securing supporters are delayed until the following chapter, where they are conveniently grouped together.

42.1. ... ὁ μὲν Πομπήϊος αὐθις εἰς τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἀνεκρού-
ετο λογισμὸν τὴν γνώμην, ἔτι καὶ φασμάτων οὐκ αἰσίων
προσγενομένων καὶ καθ' ὕπνον ὄψεως. ἐδόκει γὰρ ἑαυτὸν
ὄραν ἐν τῷ θεατρῷ κροτούμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων. Editors have
noted the inconsequentiality here: the content of the dream should
represent something unpropitious or portentous of defeat (like the
φάσματα οὐκ αἰσία). Hence they have either deleted *ἐδόκει*...
Ῥωμαίων (Solanus, Sintenis), or, more usually, marked a lacuna
after *Ῥωμαίων* (Muret, Amyot, Perrin, Flacelière). The lacuna
would have contained the same material as the parallel account at
Pomp. 68.2, where Pompey also dreams *αὐτὸς δὲ κοσμεῖν ἱερὸν*
Ἀφροδίτης νικηφόρου πολλοῖς λαφύροις. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐθάρρει,
τὰ δ' ὑπέθραττεν αὐτὸν ἢ ὄψις, δεδοικότα μὴ τῷ γένει τοῦ
Καίσαρος εἰς Ἀφροδίτην ἀνήκοντι δόξα καὶ λαμπρότης ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ γένηται⁹⁾. Cf. also App. *B.C.* 2.68.284, from the same
source (Pollio). Finally, Ziegler (followed by Garzetti) defended
the text as it stood, noting that Lucan, Florus, and Obsequens
have only the 'theatre' item, omitting all mention of Venus Vic-
trix: this was therefore the version of Livy. Ziegler's defence is not
decisive. Even if Livy omitted the 'Venus' item, nothing follows
concerning Pollio or the accounts dependent on Pollio. But two
other factors suggest the text may be sound, and that no lacuna
should be marked. (1) Plutarch is severely abbreviating here. Ch.
42 treats events in Pompey's camp, concentrating mainly on the
fierce optimism of most of Pompey's colleagues and men. Pom-
pey himself is mentioned briefly as a foil to these. Ch. 43 will turn
to Caesar's army, and it is there that omens will be treated more
extensively. Comparison with Appian and *Pompey* makes clear
that in *Caesar* Plutarch has delayed two Pompeian omens from
the present context, the *λαμπάς οὐρανίου πυρός* and the *πανικὸς*
τάραχος, preferring to treat them in ch. 43 as 'what Caesar

9) Dacier and Langhorne simply inserted the passage from *Pompey* verbatim into the *Caesar* text.

noticed happening in Pompey's camp'¹⁰). Pompey's own dream could evidently not be delayed by this device, but *φάσματα οὐκ αἰόια* are not Plutarch's interest in ch. 42, and he might naturally pass over them quickly. (2) *Caesar* itself never mentions the paraded descent from Venus, though there were several opportunities: e.g. at 5.2 (cf. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 6.1), or indeed in the account of Caesar's sacrifices on this same day (43.3; cf. App. 2.68.281, from the same source): cf. also App. 2.76.319, 102.424, 104.430, all items omitted by Plutarch. This is a quite different sort of *Life* from *Antony*, which delights in the claimed descent from Heracles (*Ant.* 4.1–3, 36.7, 60.5, 90(3).4). A mention of Aphrodite here would involve Plutarch in a lengthy explanation, and he might well doubt if it was worth the trouble. If the text is sound, an inconsequentiality is undeniable; but (as we have seen) it would not be the only case where careless abbreviation of source-material involves Plutarch in logical obscurity.

University College, Oxford

C.B.R. Pelling

10) There are further differences between the *Pompey* and *Caesar* accounts. I discuss these in *JHS* 100 (1980), 131–5.