THE WORK

Although the brilliant career and complex character of Alexander the Great received frequent mention from Latin writers, in particular the rhetoricians and the historians, only one work in Latin devoted exclusively to his life and exploits has come down to us, and that in an incomplete form. The First and Second of its ten books are wholly lost, and there are extensive gaps at the end of Book V (v. 13. 25,a semivivi ho-) and the beginning of Book VI (pugnae discrimen immisit), and in Book X from x. 1. 45 (ne Graecia quidem) to x. 2. 1 (Igitur triginta navibus), as well as some lesser lacunae. Supplements of the two lost books (I and II) and of the lacunae in the existing books were published by J. Freinshem in his editions (Strasburg, 1648 and 1670), who based them upon material furnished by Arrian, Diodorus Siculus, Justin, Plutarch, and others, and gave more or less full references in many instances to his sources of information. A translation of Freinshem's Summaries of Books I and II in a somewhat abbreviated form is given below (pp. 3-59). Freinshem's filling of the lacunae in Books III-X has been repeated by many subsequent editors, either in his original form or with more or less change of wording. Hedicke's

^a See Preface for manner of reference.

versions belong to the latter class. They have been followed in this edition and are printed in italics.

The title of the work is given by Hedicke as *Historiae Alexandri Magni Macedonis*, which appears in the colophons of codices B and F. Other colophons, and the title of Codex V, have simply *Historiae* and Codex S has *Historiae Magni Macedonis Alexandri*. *Magnus* was applied to Alexander as early as the first century B.C. (Nepos, *De Regibus*, 2).

MANUSCRIPTS AND EARLY EDITIONS

The Historiae have been preserved in a considerable number of manuscripts, none of which is earlier than the ninth century. All the surviving codices are descended from a single ancient example, originally incomplete, as stated above. Of these the Bernensis (B), Florentinus (F), Leidensis (L), Parisinus (P), and Vossianus (V) are generally regarded as the best. Because of certain corruptions they are commonly divided into two classes. One consists of Parisinus 5716 (P), in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. was written in Carolingian letters at the beginning of the tenth century, and emended by a corrector. the fourteenth century it was revised in many places by a learned man, who used for the purpose B or a very similar codex; his alterations, additions, and omissions corrupted rather than improved the manuscript. Its last leaves have been torn off and it ends with x. 10. 16, armisque ponendis.

The second class is represented by B, F, L, and V. B, Bernensis 451, is now in the Public Library at Berne. It was written in the ninth century in handsome Carolingian letters, and corrected and annotated

at about the same time by another monk, who used an example of the same codex for the purpose. Afterwards there were others who attempted to emend the work of Curtius by corrections, or erasures, or annotations. F, Florentinus, is in the Laurentian Library at Florence (plut. lxiv, cod. 35). It has lost its first quaternion and begins with iii. 10. 6, vix gladio futurum It was written in Carolingian letters at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, and revised and annotated by a corrector. Later it suffered alterations or erasures from two or three L, Leidensis 137, is in the University Library at Leyden. It has lost its last folio and ends with x. 10. 16, dumtaxat patientem. It was written in the tenth century, for the most part in Carolingian letters, and revised and annotated by a corrector. Unfortunately it was later badly corrupted by alterations, insertions, and omissions by many hands. Vossianus, is now in the University Library at Leyden among the codices Vossiani, Q. 20. It lacks the last folio and ends with the words purgavere corpus. It was written in Carolingian letters of the tenth century, and revised and annotated by a corrector. Afterwards, especially in the fifteenth century, it was further emended or corrupted by very many hands.

Although these codices are not lacking in errors, nor wholly free from interpolation, they are nevertheless without the blemish with which all the other extant manuscripts, designated by "I," are disfigured through the excessive lawlessness of their scribes, which makes it impossible to determine which of their readings are derived from their archetype and which are conjectures of the scribe. Each of the codices B, F, L, P, and V has its own merits

and defects, so that no one of them can be wholly neglected. The agreement of both classes gives the reading of their archetype (A). Where they differ, careful consideration is necessary to determine which should be followed, taking into consideration the sense of the passage, the usage of the Latin language, and that of Curtius himself. If no decision can be reached in that way, Hedicke believes that an editor will perhaps be nearest to the truth in following P; this he regards as an inferior example of a better class, and the archetype of B, F, L, and V (C) as a better example of an inferior class. The latter archetype seems to have suffered some revision, since the four codices which are derived from it have marginal notes correcting or explaining the words of Curtius, such as often occur in manuscripts dating from the fall of the Roman empire. It is unfortunate that we have only one example of the former class, and hence cannot judge how many of its errors are due to its archetype and how many to the carelessness of the scribe.

It is highly probable that more manuscripts of this class once existed. Besides the Coloniensis, used by Franciscus Modius in his editions (Cologne, 1579 and 1591), which his notes show to have agreed in many places with P, a few fragments have come down to us of manuscripts of the tenth century whose readings agree with P and differ from those of the other class. These are D, Fragmentum Darmstadiense (cod. 3152), of the tenth century, containing iv. 2. 14, territoque rege, to iv. 2. 24, interficiunt; E, Frag. Einsidlense (476, folio 36), of the tenth century, containing vii. 1. 34, -cere homo superbissimus, to vii. 2. 8, Amyntan mea sen-; H, Frag. Herbipolitanum, of the tenth century, vii

containing viii. 1. 3, ignarus, to viii. 1. 7, super, and viii. 1. 10, quae appellatur Bazaira, to viii. 1. 14, repulso et abire. In the same category belongs S, Schedae Vindobonenses, three leaves of a codex now lost, which are preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna, 492 (hist. prof. 622). They were written in the tenth century, and contain x. 8. 22, id inpetratum est, to the end of the work. Hedicke also somewhat hesitatingly includes R, Excerpta Rhenaugiensia, now in the Public Library at Turin (cod. 95, p. 184); these were written in the ninth century, and although, as Hedicke says, they have almost no value for emendation and load the critical notes with a great number of errors, they pass from one class to the other in a remarkable manner, and even show readings which suggest interpolation. They contain vii. 8. 12, igitur unum ex, to vii. 8. 30, considera, and viii. 7. 3, utor inquid beneficio, to viii. 10. 2, ducibus usurus.

All the other codices, designated in the Sigla as "I, codices interpolati," show undoubted indications of interpolation; they often give good readings, but it is impossible to determine whether the readings are due to the skill of an interpolator or to the testi-

mony of a manuscript.

The main difference of opinion has been, whether B, F, L, and V are copies of P, or are from a separate archetype. The latter view is held by Hedicke, who bases his text upon the five codices B, F, L, P, and V, and is now generally accepted. Some help may be gained from certain of the early editions (see the Bibliographical Note). Those of Franciscus Modius, Cologne, 1579 and 1591, contain a rich collection of corrections from Janus Meller Palmer, some of which

seem to have been based upon manuscripts. In the use of Modius's editions great caution is necessary, since, although they are on the whole excellent, they have many doubtful readings, due to an arbitrary treatment of critical problems. In the editions of J. Freinshem, mentioned above, is printed a Variorum lectionum libellus, in a more correct form in the edition of 1670; this was used by Snakenburg (Delft and Leyden, 1724) in his Variantes Lectiones, but with important inaccuracies. In 1250 (Voss, De Poetis Latinis) Bishop Philip Walter (Philippus Gualterus) wrote a poem entitled Alexandreis, of which the greater part of the material was taken from Curtius and a number of his phrases and words were embodied in the poem. Among these are many which in the manuscripts of Curtius show corruptions or variants. In some of these all the manuscripts show common corruptions (e.g. v. 9. 12). In other places Walter seems to have followed readings which belong only, or mainly, to the inferior class of manuscripts (e.g. iv. 10. 27). On the contrary in other places he had before him readings which now are partly in the first class and partly in the majority of manuscripts (e.g. iii. 5. 13). The conclusion seems to be justified that in Walter's time the condition of the text of Curtius did not differ essentially from that which appears in our older and younger codices, and that Zumpt's idea, that the text of the interpolated manuscripts was formed in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, is at least improbable. For other early editions see the Bibliographical Note, pp. xxxii-xxxiv.

THE SOURCES

While Alexander's expedition was in progress two separate accounts of it were being made; one was a record of each day's events, the Ephemerides, or Day Book, under the supervision of Eumenes of Cardia and Diodotus of Erythrae, the other a finished History by Callisthenes of Olynthus. After Alexander's death several of his contemporaries wrote histories of the expedition. The most important of these were Aristobulus and Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who based their accounts on Callisthenes (see Arrian, Preface). All these records, together with a group of histories composed in the next century or two, have been completely lost, except for a few fragments collected by C. Müller in Dübner's Arrian (Paris, 1846). are preserved, wholly or in part, the works of four historians and a biographer, who wrote several centuries after Alexander's death: Arrian, Diodorus Siculus, Justin, Curtius, and Plutarch. Four of these obtained their information from various sources; the fifth and best, Arrian, based his account mainly on the histories of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, hence on Callisthenes and the *Ephemerides*.

Alexander's Itinerary is the name given to a complete list of the places visited by him, collected from the works of the historians and the biographer mentioned above by C. A. Robinson, Jr. (The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition, Providence, Brown University, 1932, pp. 13 ff.). It falls into three divisions. In the first division it is in substantial agreement with the five authorities (they are not equally full, but there are few discrepancies); in the second division there are many discrepancies and general confusion;

END OF SAMPLE TEXT



The Complete Text can be found on our CD:

Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature
which can be purchased on our Website:

www.Brainfly.net

or

by sending \$64.95 in check or money order to:

Brainfly Inc.

5100 Garfield Ave. #46

Sacramento CA 95841-3839

TEACHER'S DISCOUNT:

If you are a **TEACHER** you can take advantage of our teacher's discount. Click on **Teachers Discount** on our website (www.Brainfly.net) or **Send us \$55.95** and we will send you a full copy of **Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature AND our 5000 Classics CD** (a collection of over 5000 classic works of literature in electronic format (.txt)) plus our Wholesale price list.

If you have any suggestions such as books you would like to see added to the collection or if you would like our wholesale prices list please send us an email to:

webcomments@brainfly.net