

APPIAN AND CASSIUS' SPEECH BEFORE PHILIPPI (*BELLA CIVILIA* 4.90–100)

ALAIN M. GOWING

IN THE CONCLUSION to his seminal study of Appian, Emilio Gabba judged the *Bella civilia* to be a “fedele riassunto, che si avvicina spesso ad una traduzione, e questa è in alcuni casi volutamente letterale” (*Appiano* 219; cf. 213). Though reaction to Gabba’s central thesis, that Asinius Pollio was Appian’s source for virtually all of the *Bella civilia*, was readily forthcoming and generally skeptical,¹ this appraisal of Appian’s working methods has rarely been challenged.² If, of course, Appian did little more than translate a single source, then any artistry noted in his work must indeed lead back to the question of source, for we will have to concede that the artistry is not likely to be Appian’s. But if it can be shown that Appian does intrude himself into the text in more subtle ways than have been observed before, then Appian’s historiographical technique and authorial integrity will need to be reassessed. To be sure, assertions of some ingenuity on the part of Appian are not wholly lacking. Nevertheless, just as few can agree on the precise identification of Appian’s source or sources, few will readily admit without some proof that Appian was, as he has been described recently, a “skilled literary artist.”³

The texts of Appian followed here are the Teubners of P. Viereck, A. G. Roos, E. Gabba (eds.), *Appiani Historia Romana* I (Leipzig 1962) and L. Mendelssohn and P. Viereck (eds.), *Appiani Historia Romana* II (Leipzig 1905, reprint 1986). Unless otherwise specified, all references to Appian are to the *Bella civilia*. The following secondary sources will be referred to by author’s name alone or with abbreviated title: I. A. Wijnne, *De fide et auctoritate Appiani in bellis Romanorum civilibus enarrandis* (Groningen 1855); E. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili* (Florence 1956); T. J. Luce, Jr., *Appian’s Exposition of the Roman Republican Constitution* (diss., Princeton Univ., 1958); S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, 3 vols. (Bari 1966); B. Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian* (Hildesheim 1988); D. Magnino (ed. and tr.), *Appiani Bellorum civilium liber tertius* (Florence 1984). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1987 meeting of the American Philological Association. I would like to thank the two anonymous readers for *Phoenix* for their many valuable suggestions.

¹See M. Gelzer, *Gnomon* 30 (1958) 216–218 and *Gnomon* 31 (1959) 179–181; E. Badian, “Appian and Asinius Pollio,” *CR* ns 8 (1958) 159–162; A. H. McDonald, *JRS* 52 (1962) 186–187. A. B. Bosworth’s reassessment of Pollio’s politics raised additional doubt (“Asinius Pollio and Augustus,” *Historia* 21 [1972] 441–473).

²See, however, I. Hahn, “Appien et le cercle de Sénèque,” *ActaHung* 12 (1964) 169–206, esp. 204, 206; Mazzarino 3.191–193.

³J. Moles, “The Attacks on L. Cornelius Cinna, Praetor in 44 B.C.,” *RhM* 130 (1987) 124–128, at 127. Particularly relevant to the present argument, however, is

In this paper I attempt to locate such proof in the last speech of the tyrannicide C. Cassius Longinus (4.90–100). Delivered at the Republican encampment on the Gulf of Melas just prior to the final westward push to the plain of Philippi in early September of 42 B.C., this oration offers one particular instance where it can be demonstrated, with as much certainty as is obtainable in cases like this, that Appian has transformed a speech found in his source to suit his own particular purposes. Far from being a virtual translation of the source, Cassius' speech will be seen as Appian's attempt to summarize the conflict that has led to this climactic battle as well as the swan song of a character in whom he was particularly interested. In order to place the discussion of the speech in a broader context, I begin with a brief consideration of some of the traditional views on Appian's sources and methods in light of a few recent analyses as well as an explanation of the premises from which my argument proceeds.

I

Though many have long considered source criticism the only useful exercise as far as Appian is concerned,⁴ and the single source theory has in large measure prevailed with regard to the *Bella civilia*, there is a troubling lack of agreement among those who have studied the question. Gabba revived and expanded the argument that Appian used Asinius Pollio directly. Appian does, after all, in a departure from his usual practice, cite Pollio by name (2.82.346). Those who doubted Gabba's thesis have generally preferred an intermediary source, perhaps Greek, that synthesized several accounts, Asinius Pollio's among them.⁵ For Philippi, though, Messalla Corvinus is also a possibility. Having served under Cassius during the campaign, he subsequently wrote *Commentarii* that began most probably with Philippi. By common consent, Messalla was the source behind much of the material in Book 5 of the *Bella civilia*.⁶ But the numerous correspondences between Appian's account of Philippi and that of Plutarch in the *Brutus*, where

Moles's article "Fate, Apollo, and M. Junius Brutus," *AJP* 104 (1983) 249–256, where he contends that Appian relocated an episode in the life of Brutus to his account of Philippi for dramatic effect.

⁴E.g., E. Schwartz, "Appianus," *RE* 2 (1896) 216–237, at 217: "Was von ihm als Historiker zu halten ist, lässt sich nur entscheiden, wenn die Frage nach seinem Gewährsmann mit leidlicher Sicherheit beantwortet ist . . ."

⁵See H. Homeyer, *Die antiken Berichte über den Tod Ciceros und ihre Quellen*, (Baden-Baden 1964, Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswiss. 18) 26, with n. 56 (reprinted with some minor corrections in *Helikon* 17 [1977] 56–96). So too R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford 1986) 358.

⁶See E. Gabba (ed. and tr.), *Appiani Bellorum civilium liber quintus* (Florence 1970) xv, and on 100.419; and esp. M. Sordi, who has recently proposed that Messalla's *Commentarii* could be Appian's source for the siege of Perugia ("La guerra di Perugia e la fonte del l. V dei *Bella civilia* di Appiano," *Latomus* 44 [1985] 301–316, esp. 316,

Messalla is named as a source on more than one occasion, confirm that he was indeed consulted by Appian—or, alternatively, by Appian's source—for that campaign as well.⁷ Indeed, since he would have been present at the occasion and apparently admired Cassius' military ability (Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.4), he seems a likely source for the speech to be examined here.

He cannot, however, be the only source any more than Asinius Pollio. In fact, the single-source theory has been challenged, most recently by Domenico Magnino in his study of Book 3. Basing his argument in part on those instances where Appian cites variant sources, Magnino concluded that Appian himself, not his source, synthesized several sources.⁸ The account of Philippi clearly constitutes such a synthesis, as shown by the significant number of references to variant sources of the sort Magnino and even Gabba (in a study of the *Syriaca*) took to be indications that Appian could work with more than one source.⁹

There are still further reasons for believing Appian has drawn from and revised a plurality of sources. His inclusion of topographical excursuses, for instance, seems more likely to be for the benefit of Appian's readers than for those of Asinius Pollio or Messalla Corvinus and probably derive from a subsidiary source.¹⁰ And in discussing matters of military strategy, Appian commits some topographical errors that must result from his misunderstanding and manipulation of his sources.¹¹ Confusion of this sort is

though she shows greater hesitancy in "L'assedio di Perugia e l'assedio di Alesia: finzione letteraria o propaganda politica?," *Misc. greca e romana* 36 [1986] 173–183, at 179–180).

⁷E.g., Plutarch cites Messalla as his source for the numbers killed at the first battle at Philippi (*Brutus* 45.1), with an odd detail about Brutus' camp-followers. Identical information appears at App. 4.112.471, though no source is named. For other correspondences see Peter, *HRRel* 2.lxxx–lxxxiii. Momigliano believed Messalla to be the source for Appian's remarks about Cassius at 4.133.561 (*JRS* 31 [1941] 156); cf. E. Kornemann, "Die historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenforschung über Appian und Plutarch," *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Supp. 22 (1896) 555–692, at 653–654.

⁸D. Magnino, "La composizione del terzo libro delle *Guerre civili* di Appiano," in *Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche* (Como 1983, Bibliotheca di Athenaeum 2) 99–132, at 103. Cf. W. Steidle, "Beobachtungen zu Appians *Emphyilia*," *Hermes* 111 (1983) 402–430, esp. 402–405.

⁹4.101.425 (ὡς ἑτέροις δοκεῖ), 112.471 (εἰκάζουσι), 113.473 (τισιν ... δοκεῖ ... ἕτεροι ... οἴονται), 118.498 (δοκεῖ δέ τις), 130.547 (φασιν, *bis*). Gabba concluded the similar expressions in Appian's *Syr.* 56–57 to be proof of "un lavoro di ricerca, o almeno di confronto fra più fonti ... dello stesso Appiano" ("Sul libro siriano di Appiano," *RendLinc* ser. 8 12 [1957] 337–351, at 348; cf. G. Marasco, *Appiano e la storia dei Seleucidi fino all'ascesa al trono di Antioco III* [Florence 1982] 84, 164–165).

¹⁰E.g., 4.102.427–428, 105.439–106.443. Strabo has been adduced as a possible source for the geographical details in App. 4.57–138 (P. Otto, *Strabonis Historikon Hypomnematon fragmenta* [Leipzig 1889, *Leipziger Stud.* 11 Supp.] 268 ff.), but comparison of App. 4.102.426 and Strabo 7, fr. 48 shows that Appian had other information besides.

¹¹E.g., the assertion that a marsh extended south from Philippi to the sea (4.105.440, 107.451, 109.460, 121.511): Appian was apparently unaware that a stretch of low-lying

scarcely confined to the Philippi narrative or even to the *Bella civilia*, an additional indication that Appian is responsible. Most probably, Appian routinely compressed or revised his source material, which in this instance is quite detailed and beyond doubt contemporary; it is less likely that his sources consistently erred in matters of topography and strategy.

In other words, Appian would appear to have done what Hahn, after a comprehensive study of how he selected and used his sources, concluded to be his practice on occasion: "... wo Appian mehrere zeitgenössische Quellen vor Augen hatte, er dieselben miteinander verbunden und ihren Inhalt mehr oder weniger kontaminiert hat."¹² Now, Hahn was thinking on a rather grand scale; he still subscribed to the single source theory for large, self-contained sections of Appian's work, and accepted Asinius Pollio as Appian's source for Books 2–5 of the *Bella civilia*. But by failing to address and explain passages like those cited above (note 9), he leaves open the possibility that his theory may apply to still smaller sections—the account of a major campaign, for instance, for which several good, contemporary sources were available. On this view, Appian may well have personally consulted both Messalla and Pollio and other sources besides. There are some indications, discussed below (Section IV), that the speech of Cassius reflects that process.

II

If Appian does draw upon more than one source—even if this must be conceded to be more a possibility than a demonstrable fact—then it seems a fair supposition that in composing his account of Philippi he aimed at something other than the mere translation of another's work. But if the argument that he occasionally reworked his source or sources is to be at all compelling, we must first establish some procedures by which it can be determined where, how and, perhaps most importantly, why Appian might have altered material from his source. Gabba formulated three approaches (*Appiano* 220): 1) isolate those instances that do not reflect a distinctly pro-Republican or anti-Augustan bias; 2) consider their compatibility with Appian's own avowed intent, i.e., to trace the revolutions that led to the establishment of the Principate; and 3) determine whether or not such instances coincide with Appian's moralistic purpose, i.e., to illustrate the prosperity of Antonine Rome through comparison with the darker past.

The final two considerations, if admittedly vague, are viable and I will return to them to show that what they yield is consistent with the functions

mountains separates the sea from the plain (cf. Cass. Dio 47.35.3). See P. Collart, *Philippes: Ville de Macédoine* (Paris 1937) 1.206, with n. 2.

¹²I. Hahn, "Appian und seine Quellen," in G. Wirth (ed.), *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 1982) 251–276, at 276.

fulfilled by Cassius' speech. But the assumption underlying the first stage (which Gabba allowed should be used with caution) poses certain difficulties, particularly when the text in question is a speech, and cannot stand as valid. There is, of course, no question that a historian may concoct a speech in which ideas are propounded that are at odds with his own. Yet because Gabba discerned in Cassius' speech the anti-Augustan and pro-Republican tendency that he sees pervading much of Appian's narrative, a tendency better suited to a source close to the event than to an historian of the Antonine era, and that he believes to be so very contrary to Appian's own monarchism, he disallowed the notion that in this instance Appian might have revised an oration found in his source; in brief, the speech did not fulfil the criterion for the first stage. Rather, Gabba judged the speech to be the concoction of "lo storico."¹³ "Lo storico," needless to say, is not Appian but the source, namely (in Gabba's view), Asinius Pollio.

This seems to me an over-subtle reading. Cassius' speech is nothing more than a defense of his actions and of the Republican cause. We would of course be surprised if the oration were not pro-Republican; that it (or any part of Books 2-5) conceals "intenzioni antiaugustee" is by no means self-evident, and in any case, as Bosworth has shown (above, note 1), it is not certain that Pollio's hostility toward Octavian was as virulent as Gabba contends. To be sure—and on this point Gabba agrees—much of what Cassius says seems oddly superfluous and inapplicable to the specific situation, but this merely confirms that the speech is at least partly a fabrication.

Most important, however, is the fact that Appian conveys genuine respect for Cassius. It has been remarked, most recently by Elizabeth Rawson, that Appian's Cassius is a far more substantial figure than that found in other sources.¹⁴ I shall return to this in greater depth in the final section, but for the moment suffice it to note that the favor shown Cassius cannot simply be a function of Appian's source. Though Cassius was the slayer of Caesar (whom Appian generally admired), Appian's eulogy of the tyrannicides at 4.132-134 and the concluding remark at 4.138.581—which only the most intractable of source critics would deny are his own compositions—in fact indicate that he had formulated an opinion of the tyrannicides based on respect for the men themselves and the cause of *libertas*, yet contempt for what they had perpetrated on the Ides of March.¹⁵ It simply does not

¹³ Appiano 180-182, 209. Gabba believed that the author of the speeches in the *Bella civilia* in general followed the Thucydidean line (Thuc. 1.22.1), though of course that author was not Appian (Appiano 158, n. 3).

¹⁴ E. Rawson, "Cassius and Brutus: The Memory of the Liberators," in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, A. J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives* (Cambridge 1986) 101-119, at 110-112. Cf. Wijnne 111.

¹⁵ Note Appian's reverence for the Athenian struggle for *ἐλευθερία* at *Praef.* 8.30. It cannot be an accident that Pompey begins his speech before Pharsalus with an allusion

seem feasible that Appian was so blind to the nature of his source that he failed to realize that what his source provided him with—in this case the speech of Cassius—was contrary to his purposes, especially when the speech is put into the mouth of one of the most important characters at the most dramatic juncture in the entire *Bella civilia*.¹⁶ “Il n’était . . . pas un imbécile,” to quote one of Appian’s defenders, a judgement perhaps deserving of more consideration than has been accorded it.¹⁷ Thus, to reject the speech merely on the basis of its pro-Republican stance as owing nothing to Appian’s imagination is untenable. This is not at all meant to suggest that Appian was himself a Republican at heart; it merely restores to him a degree of intelligence in the reading of his sources and latitude in his use of them.

Gabba’s criteria aside, there are certainly other ways in which Appian introduces his own ideas and interests into his text. I. Hahn, T. J. Luce, P. J. Cuff, W. Steidle, and now B. Goldmann, working essentially with ideas propounded by Appian in his *Praefatio* and in the preface to the *Bella civilia*, have shown that Appian consistently stresses certain themes throughout the whole of his *History*. Thus Hahn focused on, among other things, Appian’s penchant for military figures;¹⁸ Cuff observed a persistent interest in Roman finance;¹⁹ Luce examined Appian’s preoccupation with the institutions of the Roman Republic; Steidle (above, note 8), and most recently Goldmann, collected and studied an array of themes, ranging from his concept of *θεοβλάβεια* to schematic descriptions of battles. As will become apparent, several of these themes surface in Cassius’ speech.

These studies are valuable because they considerably expand the instances where Appian may be supposed to be embellishing a source (or at least suggest why he should favor one source over another) as well as indicate that Appian was not the “miser compiler” he was once judged to be (Otto, above, note 10, 253). It must be all the more compelling, then, when we discover not only repeated themes but repeated phrases and verbal echoes as well. The repetition of material from one section to the next has in fact been observed to be typical of Appian’s own narrative method. Whenever he returns to a previously treated subject, he will frequently digress to reacquaint us with that subject’s earlier circumstances; and most

to this (2.50.205), repeating *verbatim* a (Greek) *locus communis* from the previous narrative (2.37.147; see Gabba, *Appiano* 123–125). The occasional sympathy shown for the Roman version, in, e.g., passages like those at 3.82.334 or 3.90.372, must also have some foundation in Appian’s own thinking. Cf. Appian on Numantia at *Hisp.* 97.419.

¹⁶This, however, is precisely the conclusion of Gabba (*Appiano* 211; cf. 112).

¹⁷N. I. Barbu, *Les sources et l’originalité d’Appien dans le deuxième livre des Guerres civiles* (Paris 1934) 42.

¹⁸I. Hahn, “Appianus Tacticus,” *ActaHung* 18 (1970) 293–306, esp. 301–305. See now Goldmann 6–23, and esp. 51–56.

¹⁹P. J. Cuff, “Appian’s *Romaica*: A Note,” *Athenaeum* NS 61 (1983) 148–164.

often that digression incorporates verbal echoes.²⁰ The speech of Cassius, as I shall discuss at length below, shows a number of such echoes, though it is essential to recognize that this is not the only speech where such a device is in evidence.²¹ In sum, then, this is yet another criterion by which we may reasonably assume a revision of the source by Appian.²² Given what is known about the practice of ancient historians in this area,²³ speeches would seem the most likely place to look for signs of such revision.

III

Before I examine Cassius' speech itself, a few prefatory remarks about Appian's speeches in general are required. For despite the fact that it is unique in many ways, this oration does show some affinity with other speeches in the *Bella civilia* and in other portions of the *History* as well. These connections will be discussed as they become relevant, but it is important to understand that Appian never seems to have concocted a speech for which he found no precedent in his sources. Hahn came to this conclusion by pointing to the erratic pattern of speeches throughout the *History* (above, note 12, 253–254). It is peculiar, for instance, that Book 1 of the *Bella civilia* contains no speeches in *oratio recta* and only a few in *oratio obliqua*. Beginning with Book 2, however, speeches are liberally included, and this must surely reflect the nature of Appian's source. Yet it should be noted as well that on those few occasions where Appian's speeches may be compared with versions of the same in parallel sources (most often Polybius or Livy), there are no instances where Appian can be shown simply to have translated a speech.²⁴

²⁰An aspect of Appian's art noted long ago by Wijnne (77, 113, with n. 9). Cf. Gabba, *Appiano* 177–178. Consider, e.g., Appian's comments at 4.57.243, 75.316.

²¹For example: In Pompey's speech at 2.50–51: 2.51.209 \approx 2.86.363; see also above, n. 15. In Pompey's speech at 2.72: 2.72.299 \approx 2.69.286; cf. 2.74.307, 2.69.286, 4.124.520. On the basis of these specific repetitions, Otto judged Appian's speeches to be his own compositions, although he neither noted nor discussed other similar instances (above, n. 10, 266). In Caesar's speech at 2.73–74: 2.74.307 \approx 2.67.278 (see Goldmann 39 with n. 76); 2.74.308 \approx 2.69.286 (reiterated by Brutus at 4.124.520). In Brutus' speech at 2.137–141: 2.138.576 \approx 4.93.389 (inviolability of tribunes). In Antony's speech at 3.33–38: 3.33.129 \approx 4.91.381 (Magnino 150); 3.34.132 \approx 2.127.530 (see *ibid.* on 3.34.132; cf. also 4.94.391); 3.35.138 \approx 2.143.598 ff. (*ibid.* 152); 3.36.143 \approx 2.7.23–27 (*ibid.* on 3.36.143); 3.37.148 \approx 2.25.94–95.

²²In his useful discussion of Arrian's speeches, A. B. Bosworth similarly suggests that the presence in speeches of verbal echoes and material repeated from the previous narrative is an indication of Arrian's hand (*From Arrian to Alexander* [Oxford 1988] 105–109).

²³E.g., (to cite a contemporary of Appian) Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 58. See H. Homeyer (ed. and tr.), *Lukian: Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll* (Munich 1965) *ad loc.*

²⁴Cf., e.g., Hannibal's speech before Antiochus at *Syr.* 14.54–58 with Livy 36.7.2–21. Appian has evidently revised the Polybian version, dividing the emphasis equally between Hannibal's recommendations with regard to Philip (*Syr.* 14.54–55) and his strategy

Appian's account of Scipio Africanus' surprise attack on the camp of Hasdrubal and Syphax in 204 B.C. furnishes one particularly relevant example of how he seems to approach speeches. According to Polybius, Scipio began the night operation toward the end of the third watch (Polyb. 14.4.2; cf. App. *Pun.* 21.86). Polybius reports, in *oratio obliqua*, Scipio's advice to his troops immediately prior to the attack: he urged them ἄνδρας ἀγαθούς γενέσθαι καὶ μηδὲν εἰκῇ πράττειν, σαφῶς εἰδότες ὅτι, καθ' ὅσον ἐμποδίζει καὶ κωλύει τὰ τῆς ὁράσεως τὸ σκότος, κατὰ τοσοῦτον δεῖ συνεκπληροῦν τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ τῇ τόλμῃ τὰς νυκτερινὰς ἐπιβολάς (Polyb. 14.4.3). By contrast, Appian provides a long version in *oratio recta* in which Scipio discloses his plans (*Pun.* 19.76–20.84). As in the Polybian version, Scipio in Appian appeals to τόλμα (19.76, 20.83) and points out the advantages of a night attack (20.79), both items suggesting that either Appian or his source drew upon Polybius.²⁵ But following the standard exhortation (19.76–78), which is merely a rhetorical expansion of what Polybius conveys in one sentence, Scipio launches into a rather detailed description of his strategy (20.79–84). Like Cassius in the corresponding section of his speech (4.99–100), Scipio first indicates in what respects they are superior (τόλμῃ δὲ καὶ εὐτυχίᾳ προύχομεν [*Pun.* 19.78] ≈ ἱππεῦσι δὲ καὶ ναυσὶ πολὺ προύχομεν [4.99.414]). Next, and most interestingly, Scipio predicts precisely what will occur (20.84; cf. 21.86–90, and Frontinus *Str.* 2.5.29), just as Cassius will be seen to do in much more elaborate fashion.

This speech, then, operates similarly to at least part of Cassius' speech. It gathers into one location some essential strategic information, thereby fulfilling a narrative purpose as well as permitting the compression of material. In addition, it both operates as a dramatic device and strengthens our impression of the speaker as a successful general, still other functions observable in Cassius' oration.

It should be remarked, too, that while both Polybius and Livy report the delivery of this exhortation, neither of them quote it. Moreover, Livy is not working solely from Polybius here; actually, his reported speech comes somewhat closer to Appian's than to Polybius' in that Livy, like Appian, does have Scipio explain his strategy at this point (Livy 30.5.5–6). According to Polybius, however, Scipio had done this at a meeting earlier

for the invasion of Italy (14.56–57), whereas Livy accords the former far more attention (Livy 36.7.3–15, 16–20). See J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV–XXXVII* (Oxford 1981) 229–231; P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964) 270. H. Nissen cites this as a speech composed by Appian "dem Geschmack seiner Zeit gemäss" (*Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekaden des Livius* [Berlin 1863] 117).

²⁵ Appian's use of Polybius is a vexed question, but he does cite Polybius as a source at *Pun.* 132.630 and it seems inescapable that Appian had read Polybius' account of this event. Whether or not he used him directly here is uncertain, though if he did not then his source certainly did. See Schwartz (above, n. 4) 218–219; Hahn posits Fabius Pictor as Appian's source (above, n. 12, 269–270).

in the day, though Polybius nowhere gives details (Polyb. 14.3.5; cf. Livy 30.5.1). Since the non-Polybian source Appian shares with Livy was probably annalistic (see note 25) and contained no speeches in *oratio recta*, the most likely conclusion is that Appian has worked up the speech himself.²⁶ The similarities in function between this and corresponding sections of the speech of Cassius appear to support that notion.

Pure battle exhortations of this sort, in *oratio recta*, are actually rather scarce in Appian.²⁷ In his entire extant *History*, there really are only seven (of roughly 65 or so speeches) that could properly be called *parakeleuseis*, that of Scipio just discussed and three paired *parakeleuseis* in the *Bella civilia*, one by Antony and Brutus before the second and final battle at Philippi (4.117–119), and two by Caesar and Pompey at Brundisium and again at Pharsalus (2.50–52; 2.72–74). This circumstance must reflect not only the sources used but Appian's own predilections as well. Deliberative speeches, that is, speeches that presented something of substance to the reader, appear to have held greater interest for him. This is rather surprising in a history devoted largely to Rome's foreign and domestic wars, but perhaps explains why the speech of Cassius is far more complex than a routine battle exhortation, though (as I will suggest) that may have been its original form.

One final indication that Appian's speeches are typically not mechanical reproductions of his source material is their overall uniformity.²⁸ They are of a generally consistent length, usually one or two chapters, and style. The absence of the overblown rhetoric that one might expect from an historian of his era has on occasion led some to believe that they cannot be Appian's creations,²⁹ but Appian is not given to excessively rhetorical composition in narrative sections and there is no good reason to suppose that his practice in speeches should be any different. Rather, his orations tend to be functional rather than ornamental; they form an integral part of the narrative rather than interrupt it, as, for instance, the speeches of Cassius Dio often do.³⁰ As we shall see, Cassius' speech is very much germane to the surrounding narrative.

²⁶See further on this speech Goldmann 8.

²⁷For these he generally prefers *oratio obliqua*. For example, he summarizes the battle exhortations before Zama (Pun. 42.178–179), whereas they are quoted by Polybius (15.10, 11.6–12; cf. Livy 30.32.6–7). See Pédech (above, n. 24) 275, with n. 108.

²⁸Schwartz remarks their uniformity (above, n. 4, 234–235), but takes this as an indication that Appian worked from a single source, a post-Livian annalist, i.e., Appian cannot be responsible. For a contrary view see Luce 22.

²⁹E.g., G. Kennedy, "Antony's Speech at Caesar's Funeral," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54 (1968) 99–106, at 106.

³⁰Cf., e.g., the debate between Cicero and Calenus in Dio (45.18–47, 46.1–28), and that between Cicero and Piso in Appian (3.52–53, 54.222–60.248).

IV

We may now turn to the speech in question. While this oration shows a few noteworthy similarities to other speeches in Appian, it is nevertheless unique in several important respects. One of the most remarkable aspects is its length; this is by far the longest oration in the extant *History* of Appian.³¹ In addition, the speech serves to isolate and magnify a character in a way that few other speeches in Appian may be said to do, a circumstance for which Appian may be partly responsible. Finally, the speech is of a far more complex nature than other comparable speeches. While these distinctive features might argue against Appian authorship, there are compelling reasons to think otherwise.

The speech falls roughly into three sections. In the first (4.90), a brief *exordium*, Cassius reminds the soldiers that they are struggling toward a common goal and that they have cause for optimism. Admitting that they know all too well the reasons for the coming conflict, Cassius nevertheless deems it useful to review those reasons. The second section (4.91–97) consequently constitutes a lengthy *narratio* of the events of the past two and a half years. Having reviewed the past and once again reminded his men of the bond between troops and their leaders (4.98), Cassius terminates his speech only to resume once he perceives the enthusiastic reception (4.99.318). In this third section (4.99–100) the tyrannicide contrasts their current strategic advantages with the enemy's disadvantages and looks forward confidently to the impending battle. The oration therefore serves two functions: 1) to justify the Republican cause through a review of the situation that has led to Philippi, and 2) to convey and explain to the soldiers the strategy of their leaders.

4.91–97

The first of these purposes receives the most attention, and in the middle section of the speech Appian's hand is the most apparent. Indeed, a comparison of Cassius' review with the historian's previous accounts reveals close links between speech and narrative. The connections are achieved through a series of substantive and verbal echoes whereby Appian brings Cassius' emphases into line with his own. The obvious objection will be that Appian is simply mirroring the interests of his source, but I believe it may be shown that these emphases are to a significant degree Appian's own.

Predictably, Cassius begins with the assassination of Caesar. He recalls the friendship between Caesar and the tyrannicides in order to refute the

³¹The only other speeches of even slightly comparable length are those by Brutus (2.137–141) and Antony (3.33–38). Outside of the *Bella civilia*, the longest speech is that by one of Scipio's supporters at *Pun.* 57.248–61.271.

charge that they murdered him out of enmity (4.90.381; cf. 4.132.553), an issue that seems to hold particular interest for Appian. The notion that private interests must be subordinated to public concerns is of course entirely conventional and was part of the debate over the justifiability of Caesar's murder.³² It constitutes, however, a persistent theme in Appian's account of the assassination and distinguishes it from that of Cassius Dio, who is far more interested in political motivations and consequences (cf., e.g., Cass. Dio 44.1-3). Indeed, the fact that they killed a friend is made the focus of the criticisms levelled at the tyrannicides in Appian's aforementioned eulogy at 4.132 and again at 4.134.562. Significantly, the bonds of friendship and the relationship between one's private affairs and the affairs of the state form the subject of an exchange between Appian and his friend Fronto.³³ In his letter Appian insists, εἰκὸς ἔπεσθαι τοῖς κοινοῖς τὰ ἰδιωτικά (2); and adds, τί γάρ ἐστι φιλίας καὶ τιμῆς βαρύτερον, ὧν οὐδὲ ἴσως γ' ἄρειον οὐδὲν ἐστίν; (3). Appian, then, need not be supposed to mirror unthinkingly the sentiments of his source when he criticizes Cassius and Brutus for betraying a friend. Rather, such a perspective may have made one source more attractive than another, and Appian himself would have been inclined to elaborate the theme.

Cassius then revives the old argument that they were merely following the example of their ancestors who swore long ago to oppose monarchy (4.91.382), a subject that has been broached in two previous speeches.³⁴ Caesar, he asserts, robbed them of their right to self-government and violated the sacredness of the tribunate (4.93.389), all of which we have heard from Appian before.³⁵ To refresh their memories, he recapitulates the procedures on which the Roman democracy was founded and which Caesar subverted (4.92-93), a point to which I shall shortly return. Then, in order to justify the legality of their position and affirm senatorial support for their cause, he reminds the soldiers that the Senate had in fact voted honors to the tyrannicides (4.94.391; cf. 2.127.530) and recalled the democratically-minded Sextus Pompey, a character on whom Appian lavishes particular attention (4.94.394; cf. 4.83).³⁶ A summary of the proscription follows that concurs in almost every detail with Appian's own vivid, extensive account

³²Cf., e.g., Cic. *Fam.* 11.27.8 (SB 348), Plut. *Comp. Dion et Brut.* 3.3. See also App. 2.123.517.

³³C. R. Haines (ed.), *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto* 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1929, Loeb Classical Library) 265 ff.

³⁴At 2.138.576 in the speech of Brutus and again at 3.18.67 in the speech of Antony.

³⁵2.108.453, 111.463, 138.576. The former criticism occurs in Pompey's speech before Pharsalus as well (2.50.206-208), a speech which in tone, intent, and substance parallels certain parts of Cassius' oration.

³⁶Cassius omits a minor detail: although he and Brutus had originally moved for Pompey's recall (2.122.514), in fact Antony had effected it (3.4.11; cf. 3.36.142). Cassius merely says the Senate had recalled him (4.94.394). Cassius' attention to Sextus Pompey

of this event in the first half of Book 4,³⁷ an account conceded even by Gabba to be the most original part of the *Bella civilia*.³⁸

The notion that Appian has purposefully orchestrated these connections is confirmed by the frequent verbal echoes of the historian's narrative and occasionally to other speeches.³⁹ The following are the most striking:

Cassius' Speech

4.91.382: ... οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἤρμωσαν, ὅτε τοὺς βασιλέας ἐκβαλόντες ἐπώμοσαν καὶ ἐπηράσαντο οὐκ ἀνέξεσθαι βασιλέων ἐς τὸ μέλλον ἐτέρων.

4.94.391: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγένετο, αὐτίκα ἡ βουλὴ τὴν κοινὴν γνώμην ἐξέφηνε, σαφῶς μὲν ὅτε καὶ γέρα τυραννοκτονικὰ ἐψηφίζοντο εἶναι.

Narrative or Other Speeches

Praef. 6.20: ... τοὺς βασιλέας ἐκβαλόντες καὶ ἐπομόσαντες οὐκ ἀνέξεσθαι βασιλέων κτλ.

3.18.67: "Ῥωμαῖοι ... [τοὺς βασιλέας] ἐκβαλόντες ἐπώμοσαν μηδ' ἄλλων ἔτι ἀνέξεσθαι ..." (Antony, in conversation with Octavian).

2.127.530: [The senate] τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐκάλουν τυραννοκτόνους καὶ γεραίρειν ἐκέλευον.

3.34.132: "ἡ βουλὴ σὺν ἐκείνοις [the tyrannicides] ἦν, ἥ καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ φανερώτερον, γέρα τε τοῖς ἀνελοῦσιν ὡς τυραννοκτόνους ἐψηφίζετο" (speech of Antony).

seems due to Appian's interest in him (Sextus and the *Bellum Siculum* are the subject of Book 5) and his efforts at foreshadowing; see below, 172 ff.

³⁷E.g., the injuries suffered by ἀδελφοὺς καὶ θεῖους (4.95.399; cf. 4.5.20, ἀδελφοί τε καὶ θεοί); the taxes imposed on women (4.96.405; cf. 4.32.135).

³⁸Appiano 222–226. In light of Appian's remarks at 4.16, Gabba concluded that the account fulfilled his third criterion.

³⁹I. Hahn, the only scholar to my knowledge to have examined the speeches in Appian's *Bella civilia* as a whole, noted only the most obvious of these, 4.95.401 and 4.16.61, and took this as evidence for Appian's hand ("Geschichtsphilosophische Motive in den Reden der *Emphyilia*," in J. Harmatta [ed.], *Studien zur Geschichte und Philosophie des Altertums* [Amsterdam 1968] 197–203, at 200). Goldmann also compares 2.71.299 to 4.95.401 and 4.16.61 (30, with nn. 36–37). I would add, if only to refute, W. Soltau's brief observation on Cassius' speech in Appian ("Appians Bürgerkriege," *Philologus* Supp. 7 [1899] 597–634, at 617). Although he noted in very cursory fashion that Cassius repeats details which occur in the narrative, he concluded that this was simply because Appian here followed two sources, one historical and one rhetorical. He justifies this theory by pointing to what he perceives as Cassius' exaggerations. But Soltau failed 1) to perceive, much less explain, the frequent verbal echoes; 2) to take into account the circumstances of the speech and the nature of such speeches; and 3) to allow that Appian might be capable of reworking his material. One final possibility needs to be acknowledged, that the speech was not informed by Appian's narrative, but just the opposite, that the narrative was informed by the speech. This raises questions about Appian's methods of composition, but the principal objection to the latter possibility is that the speech contains scattered reminiscences to other books and not to any one portion (e.g., the proscriptions); hence it seems more likely that the verbal echoes are from narrative to speech, not vice versa.

4.94.393: ... ἡ βουλή καὶ ἀρχαὶ ἐθνῶν τῶν μεγίστων καὶ ἡγεμονίας ἔδοσαν ἡμῖν ... πότερον ὡς ἐναγεῖς κολάζοντες

4.94.394: ... Πομπήιον τὸν νέον, οὐδὲν μὲν ἐς ταῦτα συνειργασμένον, ὅτι δὲ μόνον Πομπηίου Μάγνου τοῦ πρώτου περὶ τῆς δημοκρατίας ἀγωνισαμένου παῖς καὶ ὅτι μικρὰ τὴν τυραννίδα ἠνώχλει λανθάνων περὶ Ἰβηρίαν ... (cf. 4.96.404).

4.95.396: ... κτείνονται χωρὶς καταδίκης ἐν οἰκίαις, ἐν στενωποῖς, ἐν ἱεροῖς

4.95.397: ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ... ὑπάτων ἄρτι καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ δημάρχων καὶ ἀγορανόμων καὶ ἱππέων κεφαλαὶ πρόκεινται.

4.95.398: τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπανάστασις τίς ἐστι πάντων, ὅσα τέως ἦν ὑπουλα, καὶ ἀνδρολήψια αἰφνίδια

4.95.401: ... οἶα νῦν οὐκ ἰδιώτις πόλις, ἀλλ' ἡγεμονίς ἀδικεῖται πρὸς τῶν αὐτὴν ἀρμόσαι καὶ διορθῶσαι τὰ κοινὰ κεχειροτονημένων.

4.96.403: ... οἶδε εἰσὶν οἱ πλέονες, οὓς ὀρᾶτε, διὰ πλοῦτον ἢ γένος ... προγεγραμμένοι (cf. 4.5.17).

4.99.416: ... οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐπεικῶν ὄνουμένου χωρία ἐπίφθονα.

4.99.416: ... τετρυμένης στάσεσι καὶ ἐσφοραῖς καὶ προγραφαῖς τῆς Ἰταλίας.

4.8.35: "οἱ λοιποὶ [of the senators] δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ μύσει τῷδε τοὺς ἐναγεῖς ἀντὶ κολάσεων ἐπὶ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἡγεμονίας ἐξέπεμψαν ..." (in proscription edict).

4.83.348: νεώτερος ὢν ὅδε τῶν Μάγνου Πομπηίου παίδων ὑπερώφθη μὲν τὰ πρῶτα ὑπὸ Γαΐου Καίσαρος περὶ Ἰβηρίαν, ὡς οὐδὲν μέγα διὰ νεότητα καὶ ἀπειρίαν ἐργασόμενος, καὶ ἤλατο περὶ τὸν ὠκεανὸν ληστεύων σὺν ὀλίγοις καὶ λανθάνων, ὅτι εἶη Πομπήιος.

2.122.514: Σέξστον τε Πομπήιον, τὸν Πομπηίου Μάγνου, τοῦ Καίσαρι περὶ τῆς δημοκρατίας πεπολεμηκότος, καλεῖν ἤξιουν, πολεμούμενον ἔτι πρὸς τῶν Καίσαρος στρατηγῶν ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ

1.95.443: ... διεφθείροντο, ἔνθα συνελαμβάνοντο, ἐν οἰκίαις ἢ στενωποῖς ἢ ἱεροῖς

4.13.52: ... ἀθρόα τότε ἐγίνετο καὶ ἀθέμιστος μεταβολὴ βουλευτῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὑπάτων ἢ στρατηγῶν ἢ δημάρχων

4.13.49: εὐθύς οὖν ἦν ... ἀνδρολήψια αἰφνίδια

4.13.52: ἐπανάστασις γὰρ δὴ πάντων, ὅσα τέως ὑπουλα ἦν ... (cf. 1.2.6).

4.6.23: τῷ γὰρ ἐγνώσθαι μὲν ἀνδρολήψια γίνεσθαι

4.16.61: καὶ τότε ἐγίνετο οὐκ ἐν ἰδιώτιδι πόλει οὐδὲ ἐν ἀσθενεῖ καὶ σμικρῷ βασιλείῳ, ἀλλὰ τὴν δυνατατάτην καὶ τοσοῦτων ἐθνῶν καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἡγεμονίδα διέσειεν ὁ θεὸς

4.8.31: "... οἱ χειροτονηθέντες ἀρμόσαι καὶ διορθῶσαι τὰ κοινὰ ..." (in proscription edict).

4.25.102: Στάτιος δὲ ὁ Σαυνίτης ... διὰ πλοῦτον καὶ γένος ... ἀνακεκλημένος ... διὰ πλοῦτον προγεγραμμένος

4.31.133: ... οὐ πολλὸς ἦν ὁ τὰ χωρία ὠνούμενος

4.5.18: ... μάλιστα τῆς Ἰταλίας πολέμοις τε καὶ ἐσφοραῖς τετρυμένης

It must be stressed that these echoes cannot be the work of Appian's source. Several hark back to passages that are not only unique but beyond doubt represent Appian's own words; that is, to passages where Appian speaks *sua voce*. Thus in Cassius' summary of the proscription a number of key words or phrases recur that are found elsewhere only in Appian's own remarks: Appian, in his programmatic sixteenth chapter (4.16.61), and Cassius at 4.95.401 observe that Rome is a ἡγεμονίς and not merely an ἰδιώτις πόλις; 4.95.398 contains an almost *verbatim* repetition of Appian's words at 4.6.23, 13.49, and 13.52, among them several words and phrases occurring exclusively in these sections (ἐπανάστασις, ἀνδρολήψια, ὕπουλα). At 4.95.396, again in reference to the proscriptions, Cassius employs a series of words plucked from Appian's description of the Sullan proscription at 1.95.443. This is a particularly telling echo, because Appian's source for the earlier event was emphatically not that consulted for Philippi (see Gabba, *Appiano* 89–101, esp. 92–93). Finally, at 4.94.394 and again at 4.96.404 Cassius summarizes Sextus Pompey's activities in much the same terms as Appian has described them.

In this section of the speech, then, Appian composes almost formulaically, creating by means of substantive and even verbal echoes a patchwork summary of events and concerns detailed in the previous two books, much in the same way as he will occasionally do within the narrative proper (see note 20).

Before the final section of the speech is examined, the somewhat unusual nature of Cassius' review should be remarked. In the context of the situation, it seems rather superfluous for Cassius to detail as he does the democratic processes of the Roman Republic (4.92). Of course, for Appian (and presumably for his source) Philippi marked the demise of that form of government (4.138.580). Cassius might therefore be expected to mention those processes, but certainly the soldiers do not need to be schooled in Roman voting procedures or the function of the tribunate. Such details seem more appropriate to a historian concerned with describing Republican institutions for Greek readers than to Asinius Pollio or Messalla.⁴⁰ In fact, the focus of Cassius' remarks, as well as the phraseology, parallel Appian's summary of the Sullan constitution at 1.59. Both passages allude to the προβουλή (1.59.266 ≈ 4.92.385), yet another point echoed in a previous speech,⁴¹ the electoral function of the assemblies (*ibid.*), and the tribunate (1.59.267 ≈ 4.93.389–390); in short, to the sort of institutions Appian perceived to be the cornerstones of the Roman Republic. Moreover, Appian has Cassius describe the election of consuls under the Republic with the same phrase used

⁴⁰ On this as one Appian's foremost concerns see Luce 143–147.

⁴¹ At 2.138.574 in Brutus' speech. Cf. the contrary view of Piso at 3.55.229. See further Hahn (above, n. 39) 201; Luce 108.

in a rare excursus on how consuls were selected under the Empire.⁴² Still other concerns of special interest to Appian are in evidence: the sacred and inviolable nature of the tribunate (4.93.389), an interest in the processes by which money was acquired and how it was used (4.96.405–406, 99.416–417), the relationship between Senate and people (4.91.383, 92.384–387 and *pas-sim*), and the Roman aversion to monarchy (4.91.382–383).⁴³ It would appear, then, that Appian has used this section of the speech to rehearse for his Greek reader the salient characteristics of the Roman democracy, as he understood it, and to replay the final stages of its ruin.⁴⁴

4.99–100

Following the ostensible conclusion at 4.98, Cassius is confronted by a chorus of cheers from the soldiers (4.99.413). This, too, would appear to be one of Appian's favored dramatic devices, used on other occasions in Antony's funeral oration at 2.144–146 (2.145.604), Brutus' speech at 2.137–141 (2.140.581), and Scipio's speech at *Punica* 19.76–20.84 (20.79). In addition, Appian here uses a closing formula found elsewhere, most notably in a speech in *oratio obliqua*, the circumstances of which are quite similar, that of Sulla to his troops before leading them to Rome in 88.⁴⁵

Cassius resumes, and in the last two chapters, which comprise the third and final section (4.99–100), connections between speech and narrative are again observable. Here Cassius looks ahead to the coming battle and, in a manner reminiscent of certain Thucydidean speeches, accurately predicts the course of events, thus confirming (as it turns out) his professed *πρόνοια* and *φροντίς* (4.99.413, 99.417, 100.420).⁴⁶ Cassius reassures his men that they are well positioned: securely covered on all flanks but one, they have

⁴² ὑπάτους ἀποφαίνοντες (1.103.479); cf. Cassius at 4.92.385, “ἀποφαίνοντες ὑπάτους τε καὶ δημάρχους καὶ στρατηγούς.” Appian employs this same phrase to describe how Augustus, by way of subverting the standard democratic procedures of the Republic, made himself ruler—ἐαυτὸν ... ἄρχοντα ἀποφῆναι τῇ ... πατρίδι (1.5.22). On Appian's imperfect grasp of elections under the Republic and his phraseology, see Luce 113–114, 118–121.

⁴³ On Appian's particular interest in the tribunate see Luce 89–92; and in financial matters *ibid.* 27–82, and esp. Cuff (above, n. 19). On the βουλή/δῆμος antithesis see n. 60.

⁴⁴ This resembles what Antony does in his speech at 3.33–38. Appian had Antony early on ominously predict the consequences of opposing Caesar (2.33.131–132).

⁴⁵ πάντων ... εὐθὺς ἄγειν ἀξιούντων, ἡσθεὶς ὁ Κάσσιος ... (4.99.413) ≈ ἐξ Ῥώμην σφᾶς ἄγειν θαρροῦντα ἐκέλευον. ὃ δὲ ἡσθεὶς ... (1.57.252–253). Cf. the reaction to Pompey's speech at 2.52.212 and Caesar's at 2.54.221. According to Appian, in his speech Sulla dwelt on the ὕβρις of their opponents, as Cassius in his (4.93.389; cf. Pompey at 2.51.211).

⁴⁶ A general's foresight was a conventional motif (e.g., Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.8; Polyb. 3.105.9; Sall. *Iug.* 49.2; Tac. *Ann.* 2.14.1, *Hist.* 5.17.2). *πρόνοια*, though, is a rare word in Appian, occurring only here at 4.99.413, in reference to Cassius' foresight, and at 2.123.515 in a reported message from the tyrannicides. It is, then, a term which sets Cassius apart (cf. n. 54) and puts him in good company, for according to Thucydides *πρόνοια*

only to contend with the enemy in front (4.99.415), Norbanus Flaccus and Decidius Saxa, whom the Republicans will subsequently defeat (4.102-105). He advises that they have as bulwarks Sextus Pompey in Sicily, and Statius Murcus and Domitius Ahenobarbus in the Adriatic (4.99.415; cf. 4.86.367). Appian will soon narrate in two vivid chapters the destruction of the triumviral fleet by Murcus and Domitius (4.115-116). Cassius stresses the abundance of their provisions (4.99.417), while pointing out that the enemy will be forced to transport supplies overland through the difficult terrain of Thrace and Macedonia (4.100.418). Subsequent events prove him right (4.108.455, 122.512). So too, he correctly foresees, the enemy will be cut off from supply lines from Africa and Italy (4.100.418).⁴⁷ The Republicans have the added prospect of a supply line from the sea (4.100.419), and in fact this is soon established at Thasos (4.107.448). Finally, Cassius proposes a possible strategy: they will overcome their own numerical disadvantage by avoiding battle and wearing the enemy down through hunger (4.100.419). This tactic, of course, nearly cost Antony and Octavian their victory, as Appian frequently emphasizes (4.108.453, 455; 111.464; 122.512).

Such connections cannot of course be accidental, and again Appian seems to be responsible. On the one hand, this is not the only example of this kind of composition, though it is the most extensive. In his speech at 2.73-74, for instance, Caesar accurately predicts the performance of the allies in Pompey's army (2.74.308-309), as confirmed by Appian at 2.75.314-315 and 2.79.333-80.334 (cf. 2.70.289). On the other hand, there are speeches whose contents simply mirror Appian's own narrative. Thus Caesar remarks upon Pompey's sluggishness and lethargy (2.74.307), as Appian does at 2.67.278-279 (see Goldmann 39, note 76). The most striking analog to the speech of Cassius, however, is that of Antony to the tribunes at 3.33-38. In tone self-justificatory, it concurs substantially with Appian's own narrative.⁴⁸ But as remarked above (Section III), what Appian aims at in this final portion of Cassius' speech most closely resembles the concluding section of Scipio's speech at *Punica* 19.76-20: Scipio lays his strategy

was a distinguishing characteristic of Pericles and Themistocles (Thuc. 1.138.3, 2.65.13, 2.62.5). On speeches as predictive of events see Pédech (above, n. 24) 258-259.

⁴⁷Cf. 4.86.366-367, 108.456, 117.494, this last in a speech by Brutus.

⁴⁸3.33.129 ≈ 2.114.478 (why the conspirators spared Antony); 3.34.131 ≈ 2.118.496 (why Antony fled after the murder); 3.34.132-134 ≈ 2.128.534 ff. (how Antony prevented the voting of honors to the tyrannicides); 3.34.135-136 ≈ 2.132.554 ff. (how Antony supported the amnesty vote); 3.35.138-139 ≈ 2.143.598 (Antony's designs and comportment during Caesar's funeral, on which see Magnino on 35.138); 3.35.141 ≈ 2.122.512 (Antony and Dolabella); 3.36.142 ≈ 3.2-4 (Amatius-affair and recall of Sextus Pompey); 3.36.143 ≈ 3.23-27 (why Antony secured Syria for Dolabella); 3.37.147-148 ≈ 3.25 (how Antony used the Getae as a pretext); 3.37.148 ≈ 3.25 (the *Lex Antonia de dictatura in perpetuum tollenda*); 3.37.150 ≈ 3.27 (Antony and D. Brutus). See further Magnino 150-154, and esp. Gabba's excellent discussion in *Appiano* 159-161.

before his men, and the outcome proves in accordance with his predictions. In light of this, and his apparent respect for Cassius' military ability (discussed below), Appian may very well have composed this last section to enhance his characterization of Cassius in much the same way as he did that of Scipio.

Cassius Dio and Plutarch

To judge strictly by internal evidence, this speech is not likely to be Appian's unvarnished translation of his source. The slight external evidence that may be brought to bear lends some additional support.

Cassius Dio furnishes a particularly instructive point of comparison. At 47.42.3–4 Dio summarizes the speeches delivered on the battlefield at Philippi before the first engagement.⁴⁹ The Republicans offered the following:

οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Βρούτου τὴν τε ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν τό τε ἀτυράννευτον καὶ τὸ ἀδέσποτον τοῖς σφετέροις προεβάλλοντο, καὶ τὰ τε ἐν ἰσονομίᾳ χρηστὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν μοναρχίᾳ ἄτοπα, ὅσα ποτὲ αὐτοὶ τε ἐπεπόνθεσαν καὶ περὶ ἐτέρων ἠκηκόεσαν, προέφερον, παραδεικνύντες τε καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον ἑκάτερα καὶ ἱκετεύοντές σφας τῶν μὲν ὀριγνήσασθαι τὰ δὲ ἐκκλίνειν καὶ τῶν μὲν ἔρωτα λαβεῖν τὰ δὲ μὴ παθεῖν φυλάξασθαι . . .⁵⁰

That Dio has given a very precise if somewhat more rhetorical distillation of the second section of Cassius' speech in Appian is readily apparent. In fact, it is possible that both historians are working from the same tradition; contacts between the Philippi accounts of Appian, Dio, and Plutarch have led some to believe that all three ultimately draw either directly or (as is most likely in the case of Dio) indirectly on the account of Asinius Pollio.⁵¹ But there are two items to note: 1) the speech reported in Dio is attributed not to Cassius but to the "officers of Brutus," and 2) in Dio the speech appears as a genuine *parakeleusis*, delivered directly before the first battle, not some weeks before at the Gulf of Melas, and is paired with a speech from the Caesarians (47.42.5). If Dio does accurately reflect the account of Pollio, then Appian, in this instance anyway, has either not followed Pollio or very much revised what he found. The latter strikes me as more

⁴⁹Dio presents the first battle as a set piece (47.42.1), whereas in Appian the battle happens quite unexpectedly (4.109), with little opportunity for the speeches envisioned by Dio.

⁵⁰Note that, in distinction to this generic sort of presentation, Cassius in Appian is made to establish the contrast between monarchy and democracy at a personal level, with Cassius representing the latter and the triumvirs or Caesar the former. The contrast is reinforced syntactically: ἡμᾶς δύο ἄνδρες ἐχθροὶ (4.90.380), ἡμεῖς γὰρ Καίσαρα (4.91.381), ἡμᾶς Γαῖον (4.97.408). Cf. Antony in his speech at 3.62.254, establishing a comparison between Cicero and Caesar: Κικέρωνα . . . Καίσαρα . . . Κικέρωνα . . . Καῖσαρ . . . Κικέρων.

⁵¹See C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives," *JHS* 99 (1979) 73–96, at 84, n. 73; 87, n. 94. Cf. Kornemann (above, n. 7) 583–585.

probable, but comparison with Plutarch suggests that when he composed Cassius' speech Appian had Messalla's *Commentarii* before him as well.

Although his account of Philippi concurs with Appian's in many details, Plutarch nowhere alludes to a speech by Cassius resembling that found in Appian. Nor does he indicate that speeches were delivered before the initial engagement at Philippi. Rather, just prior to the first battle, Plutarch recounts a private dialogue between Brutus and Cassius (*Brutus* 40.3–5) that ostensibly takes place in the space between their armies (*ibid.* 40.3) and the source for which appears to be Messalla (*ibid.* 40.1–2). It seems a curious coincidence that Brutus should here disavow his reliance on ἐλπίδες and παρασκευαί (*ibid.* 40.5), precisely the things to which Cassius immediately appeals in his speech in Appian (4.90.378–379). Still more interesting is an earlier conversation recorded by Plutarch between Cassius and Brutus at their camp on the Hellespont. Cassius discourses on the nature of dreams (*Brutus* 37), and the source may again have been Messalla (*ibid.* 40.1–2). The fact that Cassius' passing reference to the approaching conflict parallels some remarks found in his speech in Appian does not appear to be mere chance.⁵² directly subsequent to Cassius' speeches in both accounts the omen of the two eagles is detailed in similar terms (Plut. *Brutus* 37.4, App. 4.101.425), yet another detail possibly derived from Messalla (see Peter, *HRRel* 2.lxxxii). In short, Appian seems to use Messalla while not following or reproducing his account in its entirety.

More specifically, Appian appears to have made use of several elements from Messalla's narrative, and his speeches and conversations as well, by incorporating them into Cassius' speech and elsewhere. Either Messalla or Pollio, or both, perhaps provided him with a precedent for the speech, but if Dio does preserve the Pollio tradition, then Appian has moved the speech from immediately prior to the battle to a point well before. There is in fact some evidence that this is the case.

Like Appian, Plutarch credits Cassius with the plan to debilitate the enemy through delay (*Brutus* 39.4). While Appian has Cassius propose this stratagem in his speech (4.100.419), Plutarch more plausibly has Cassius formulate the plan *after* arriving at Philippi and taking stock of the situation (*loc. cit.*). Although it is difficult to know how well-informed the Republicans were about the opposition's circumstances when they crossed the Hellespont, Cassius' strategy in Appian seems prematurely conceived. The problem disappears, however, once we grant the possibility that Appian could have moved the speech. For once revised, what had perhaps stood in his source as a stirring but simple battle exhortation delivered in camp on

⁵² "ὡς ἔγωγ' ὃν ἐβουλόμην, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ὄπλοις καὶ ἵπποις καὶ ναυσὶ τοσαύταις, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ἀρωγαῖς ἐπεθαρρῶμεν, δοσιτάτων ἔργων καὶ καλλίστων ἡγεμόνες ὄντες ..." (Plut. *Brutus* 37.3) ≈ "τέλη μὲν ὀπλιτῶν ἴσα αὐτοῖς ἀντεπάγομεν, πολλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χρεῶν ἄλλα πολλαχοῦ καταλιπόντες· ἵππεσι δὲ καὶ ναυσὶ πολὺ προύχομεν κτλ." (App. 4.99.414).

the eve of the first battle, was now something quite different, a situation Appian resolved by relocating the speech to an earlier time and place.

The preceding provides additional indications that Appian has not simply translated a speech found in his source; nowhere in the corresponding sections of Dio and Plutarch do we find anything precisely identical to Cassius' oration. The comparison suggests in addition that Appian has utilized and revised Messalla and perhaps Pollio. In other words, rather than baldly translate a single account, Appian may have gathered material from a variety of sources, perhaps in the form of notes (cf. Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 47–48), and from there worked up his own version of events together with a dramatic speech by one of his most prominent characters.

V

Cassius' speech, then, fulfils a number of the criteria posited at the outset for determining ways in which Appian may have transformed his source. To begin with, the speech clearly marks the climax of the *Bella civilia*; Philippi was in essence the historical point toward which the *Bella civilia* as a whole was headed, the point at which the Republic was irretrievably lost. It meets, therefore, the criterion underlying Gabba's second stage, the compatibility with Appian's intent to trace the revolutions that led to the establishment of the Principate. How the passage fulfils his third criterion, the extent to which it reflects Appian's desire to set Antonine Rome against the Republic, is perhaps less easy to assess. Appian's excursus on the proscriptions, however, was admittedly prompted by such a consideration (cf. 4.16.64), and, as we have seen, the proscriptions figure in this speech to a significant extent. Furthermore, it might have struck his reader as ironic that Cassius should assert that under Republican rule Rome had achieved the height of prosperity—ἄκρα εὐδαιμονία (4.92.387)—a term Appian uses elsewhere almost exclusively of his own era, and once earlier in this same book, at 4.16.64 (as εὐδαιμόνισμα), whose contents he has been shown to echo deliberately.⁵³

Even more compelling, apart from the echoes from the previous narrative that reverberate throughout this speech, is the degree to which it focuses on themes seen to be of particular interest to Appian. The speech seems in part contrived in order to review the institutions that so intrigued him as well as the events that led to the establishment of the Principate. This is consistent with his aim of explaining Republican institutions for his Greek audience (see above, 171, with note 40) and providing material for comparison of the Republic with his own era. Philippi was an entirely appropriate point at which to carry out such a review.

⁵³Cf. *Praef.* 7.24. The term is found elsewhere only twice: in a speech by Syphax at *Pun.* 27.114 and at *BCiv.* 2.14.50, both in reference to personal happiness.

The appropriate spokesperson was C. Cassius Longinus, Appian's interest in whom now needs some additional discussion. On one level, this speech is completely in line with Appian's characterization of him as a military man. As the studies of Hahn and now Goldmann indicate (see above, note 18), a source that stressed this aspect of Cassius' character would apparently have been quite attractive to Appian. Nonetheless, the nature of Appian's portrait, which, as Rawson has shown (above, note 14), stands in contrast to that found in the other surviving sources, implies that he has again imposed his own interpretation on his source. There are, in fact, clear signs that Appian is responsible for the distinct emphasis placed upon Cassius, who, apart from emerging as the dynamic force behind the conspiracy to murder Caesar, is portrayed as a far more capable general than Brutus; it cannot be an accident that Cassius exhibits many of the same qualities as other prominent military figures in Appian.⁵⁴

Proof that the distinction drawn between the two tyrannicides is a conscious effort on Appian's part is found in the eulogy offered toward the end of his account of Philippi (4.132-134), where Cassius' military ability is contrasted with Brutus' penchant for philosophy (4.133.561; cf. 4.123.518). The conclusion seems inescapable that Appian deliberately constructed the Philippi narrative to amplify a previously implicit contrast, now made explicit here. How much Cassius' expertise will be missed, for example, becomes quite apparent following his suicide after the first battle, when Brutus must take full command.⁵⁵ Unlike his partner, Brutus proves ineffective and powerless in the face of the more reckless element among his soldiers. After

⁵⁴ Appian singles out Cassius in several ways. Cassius first enters Appian's narrative at 2.88 in a notorious error, where he is confused with the Lucius Cassius who surrendered to Julius Caesar in the Hellespont after Pharsalus. Appian here describes Cassius as πολεμικώτατος, an adjective used by the historian on only two other occasions, once to describe Caesar (and Alexander) at 2.149.621 and once to describe Pompey's μεγαλουργία (1.4.15). Appian stresses Caesar's remarkable ταχυνεργία (2.34.136, 53.216, 55.227), doubtless a translation of *celeritas*, a quality often remarked in the dictator (e.g., Suet. *Iul.* 57, Cic. *Att.* 7.22.1 (SB 146). But ταχυνεργία is infrequent in Appian. Apart from the passages on Caesar, it is used, with regard to individuals, of Scipio at *Hisp.* 38.155, Hannibal at *BCiv.* 1.112.522—both military paragons in Appian—and twice of Cassius at 4.74.313, 114.476. (Lucius Antonius, speaking with Octavian, describes the assassins collectively as ἄνδρας ταχυνεργεῖς [3.19.69].) Also, like Viriathus, another favorite, Cassius is described as being ἀρχικός (4.123.518; on the meaning see n. 56; cf. *Hisp.* 75.318 with Mazzarino 3.190); and like Viriathus at *Hisp.* 75.319, Cassius commanded the respect of the soldiers (4.123.518, quoted below, 178). Cf. Cato at *Hisp.* 39.160, described like Cassius as αὐστηρός (4.123.518). In short, Appian has chosen his words carefully. It is perhaps purposeful that in his speech Cassius adduces, as an example of a Republican hero, the younger Scipio Africanus, whom Appian clearly admired (4.92.387; cf. *Pun.* 112. See Goldmann 7-8, 18-19).

⁵⁵ Note the various ways of describing Philippi: Josephus conceives it as a war against Antony (τῷ πρὸς Ἀντώνιον πολέμῳ, *BJ* 1.232); to him the death of Cassius was the most significant event of the battle (*BJ* 1.242; cf. *AJ* 13.311, 14.301). But Lactantius writes

making Brutus himself defend his apparent lethargy (βραδυτήτα, 4.118.496), Appian compares the two:

αἵτιον δὲ τούτων ἦν αὐτὸ τὸ Βρούτον ἐπεικὴ καὶ φιλόφρονα ἐς ἅπαντας εἶναι καὶ ἀνόμοιον Κασσίου, αὐστηρῶ καὶ ἀρχικῶ⁵⁶ περὶ πάντα γεγεννημένῳ· ὅθεν ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἐξ ἐπιτάγματος ὑπήκουον, οὐ παραστρατηγούντες οὐδὲ τὰς αἰτίας μανθάνοντες οὐδὲ εὐθύνοντες, ὅτε καὶ μάθοιεν, Βρούτῳ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ συστρατηγεῖν ἤξιον διὰ πρᾶυτητα. (4.123.518)

This emphasis on Brutus' ineffectiveness is heightened by the tyrannicide's own comparison between himself and Pompey the Great, which contains a specific verbal echo: "εἰκόκαμεν ὡς Πομπηῖος Μάγνος πολεμήσειν, οὐ στρατηγούντες ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ στρατηγούμενοι" (4.124.520).⁵⁷ Appian extends the parallels further. Like Pompey, Brutus falls victim to bad advice (4.125.522, 134.566; cf. 2.69, 71.298); and, as in the case of Pompey, Brutus' men (though here not Brutus) are deluded by θεοβλάβεια (4.131.550).⁵⁸ These last few chapters substantiate Appian's belief that Cassius was the more competent general of the two.

For these reasons, Cassius appealed to Appian more than Brutus, and was the more fitting candidate to deliver a speech of this sort.⁵⁹ Yet his

of the *bello civili Brutiano* (Div. Inst. 2.8). So too Plutarch asserts that Brutus was the "only man" who stood in Octavian's way at Philippi (*Brutus* 47.4). These simply confirm the pro-Cassius slant of Appian's version.

⁵⁶H. White, the Loeb translator of Appian, renders ἀρχικός as "imperious," but this strains the sense and puts an unnecessarily negative construction on the word. Similarly, Wijne's contention that in these lines "Cassii mores ab Appiano vituperantur" is too strong (126). ἀρχικός here means simply "fit for command," as the ὅθεν clause makes clear: see LSJ s.v. 2, and the discussion of Appian's use of the word by J. Hering, *Lateinisches bei Appian* (diss., Leipzig 1935) 14.

⁵⁷Cf. 2.69.286, repeated by Caesar in a speech at 2.74.307 (cf. 2.72.299, 3.44.182, with Goldmann 10, with n. 14). Such a comparison was not, however, an original idea: cf. Luc. 9.15–30, where Brutus is viewed as Pompey's successor (see M. L. Clarke, *The Noblest Roman* [London 1981] 82). Plutarch reports a conversation between Cassius and Messalla (identified as the source) in which Cassius compares himself to Pompey (*Brutus* 40.1–2). See Pelling (above, n. 51) 87.

⁵⁸The characters to whom Appian applies this or a similar expression (e.g., θεοῦ βλάπτοντος) reflect his view that the fall of the Republic was in some way divinely ordained. Aside from this passage, it is used of Sertorius (1.113.526), Labienus (2.62.259), Pompey (2.67.278, 71.298, 81.339, 87.366), Antony (3.72.396), Decimus Brutus (3.73.298, in a paraphrase of his words to Octavian), Sextus Pompey (5.140.583, 143.597) and of Brutus and Cassius themselves (4.134.566). But the use is not limited to the *Bella civilia*: cf. Scipio to Syphax at Pun. 27.113 ("τίς σε δαίμων ἐβλαψε;"), 50.220; Syr. 28.141. A definition is provided at Syr. 28.139: θεοβλάβεια destroys τοὺς λογισμούς, ὅπως ἂν πᾶσι προσόντων ἀνυχμημάτων ἐπὶ γίνεται. On the significance of Appian's use of the expression see G. Kramer, *Theologumena Appiani* (diss., Bratislava 1889) 50 ff.; Hahn (above, n. 18) 293–294; Luce 18; Gabba, *Appiano* 125–140; and now esp. Goldmann 33–44.

⁵⁹Appian does state that Cassius gave the speech because he was older than Brutus (προὔχεν γὰρ ἡλικία, 4.89.376). In a chapter comparing the two (*Brutus* 29.1), Plutarch too notes Cassius' seniority in similar terms ([Κάσσιον] ἡλικία ... προύχοντα).

speech, with its strong emphasis on Cassius' political abilities, suggests that Appian was interested another dimension to his character as well. For instance, although Cassius stresses their common cause (4.90.377-379) and repeatedly addresses the men as "συστρατιῶται" (4.90.377, 98.412, 100.420; cf. 91.381, 98.410, 99.413), he subtly maintains the distinction between soldier and senator (cf. 4.90.378). This is significant, for part of his speech is a carefully contrived attempt to convince the troops that this is indeed a struggle for democracy and hence for their own right to self-government. Thus he also addresses them as "πολίται" (4.92.387, 96.403, 97.407; cf. 92.385, ὁ δῆμος ὑμεῖς) and, in the best tradition of persuasive oratory, attempts to make them see that *they* are the ones who have been wronged, and that he and his fellow senators have struggled and are struggling on their behalf (4.93.390).⁶⁰ But Cassius is quick to remind that in war they must obey the leaders while in peacetime all issues must first be discussed by the Senate before being remanded to the people (4.92.385). This aspect of the speech, the manner in which it establishes Cassius as a political as well as a military figure, distinguishes it from the routine battle exhortation (which, as we have seen, interested Appian little) and elevates its effect.

It is, of course, somewhat ironic that for all of his prowess Cassius will ultimately perish, and all the more so in light of the fact that, as Appian tells

⁶⁰ Cassius interestingly presents the conspiracy as undertaken by the entire Senate (4.93.390; cf. 94.391), a notion repeated by Appian at 4.132. Note too that Cassius takes care to point out that they are struggling to restore τῷ δῆμῳ ... τὴν πολιτείαν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια (4.97.408). To this compare the terms used by L. Antonius in Appian: in addressing the soldiers, he is struggling to restore τὴν πάτριον ... πολιτείαν (5.39.159; cf. Pompey at 2.51.210) and δημοκρατίαν (39.161), but at 5.43.179, speaking privately with Octavian, he avers that he will restore τὴν ἀριστοκρατίαν. Like Cassius, he addresses the soldiers as συστρατιῶται (5.39.159; cf. Pompey at 2.72.299, Antony at 3.38.155) and πολῖται (5.39.166). (The former, συστρατιῶται, translates *commilitones* and was conventional: see Suet. *Iul.* 67, *Aug.* 25, and Livy 2.55.7 with *cives* and *commilitones* together, as in Cassius' speech. See further J. B. Campbell, *The Emperor and the Roman Army* [Oxford 1984] 32-59, esp. 33, with n. 6.) At 2.138.576, in an address to the populace, Brutus uses δημοκρατία, but in passages repeating the same phrases it is omitted (*Praef.* 6.20, 3.18.67, 4.91.382). ἀριστοκρατία is the term *initially* used by Appian to denote the Republic (*Praef.* 6.20) although later we find δημοκρατία (e.g., *Ill.* 30.86; cf. Cass. Dio 53.17.3). See discussion by G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London 1983) 322-323; 614, n. 51. This distinction is more important than may at first be apparent. Appian's condemnation of δημοκρατία at 4.133.560 is well known, but there he describes what the *soldiers* were fighting for (a point missed by Gabba, *Appiano* 184—with serious implications for his reading of the speech—but not by Ste Croix, *ibid.* 614, n. 49). In his speech, Cassius quite properly emerges as a member of the "Senats-Aristokratie," as Hahn observed (above, n. 39, 201). What Cassius is really defending is the Republican government as described by Polyb. 6.11-18, 43-58 and not, as Gabba concluded, "governo popolare" (*Appiano* 209). This βουλή/δῆμος antithesis, adduced by Appian in the opening sentence of the *Bella civilia* (1.1.1), was common to Greek historians (see C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch and Roman Politics," in *Past Perspectives* [above, n. 14] 159-187, at 167-169). I suspect, therefore, that this is additional evidence of Appian's hand in the speech.

it, the Republicans really won the first battle. This should not, however, be regarded as inconsistency but rather as Appian's attempt to present the life of Cassius as proof of the instability of Fortune, much as he had done that of Caesar (cf. 2.88.371–372, 4.134.563). To be sure, Cassius' unnecessary suicide is regarded as divine retribution for the murder of Caesar, but we should not let Appian's opinion of the assassination overshadow what he obviously approved of in Cassius. This is, after all, an historian often noted for his objectivity.⁶¹ In Appian's view, Cassius embodied all that was right—and wrong—with the Roman Republic, and in this speech Cassius and the Republic are indissolubly linked. Cassius here stands at the height of his career as a general and a Republican. The speech should not then be viewed merely as a banal, predictable attempt to render Cassius' death all the more tragic and to demonstrate the instability of Fortune. We must also concede that it accomplishes something more profound than that, the dramatization of the death of not merely an individual but of the Roman Republic as well.

The thesis argued here has implications for the judgment of Appian's worth as a historiographer, particularly in light of the admission by various scholars that Appian's speeches are quite good.⁶² For it now seems that whatever skill and intelligence lies behinds this particular oration cannot be entirely attributed to the source. Appian has in fact used the speech to accomplish the rather sophisticated function that Polybius demanded of orations: they should "sum up events and hold the whole history together," ὁ σχεδὸν ὡς κεφάλαια τῶν πράξεων ἐστὶ καὶ συνέχει τὴν ὅλην ἱστορίαν (12.25a.3). Cassius' speech may well be said to fulfil precisely that function. But the "whole history" it holds together—or at least *brings* together—is not that of Asinius Pollio, Messalla, or an *ignotus*, but the *Bella civilia* of Appian. Admittedly, this was not a speech drawn out of thin air; his source provided him with a precedent or perhaps with simply the gist of the speech. What Appian ultimately included was in fact neither the gist nor a translation of that speech, as he admits to having done on previous occasions.⁶³ Philippi

⁶¹ See Gabba, *Appiano* 165; Magnino 17; Mazzarino 2.400.

⁶² E.g., E. L. Bowie, "Appian," in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 1: *Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1985), 707–709, 888–889, at 709; cf. H. White, tr., *The Roman History of Appian of Alexandria*, Vol. 1: *The Foreign Wars* (London 1899) xix (he terms Cassius' the "best speech" in Appian). Even Photius was impressed: "Whether to arouse by speech the spirits of the dejected soldier, or to calm the fiery one, or to portray emotion, or to express anything else by words, [Appian] stands in the first rank" (tr. White, *op. cit.* x).

⁶³ Cf. his comment following the conversation between Lucius Antonius and Octavian following Perugia: ταῦτα μὲν ἔλεξαν ἀλλήλοις, ὥς ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἦν ἐς τὸ δυνατόν τησθε τῆς φωνῆς μεταβαλεῖν τεκμαιρομένῳ τῆς γνώμης τῶν λελεγμένων (5.45.191). Appian is not, *pace* Gabba ("Appiano traduttore in B.C. V 191," in *Studi di storiografia antica in memoria di Leonardo Ferrero* [Torino 1971] 185–189), saying that he has translated two speeches,

was worthy of something more refined. It presented an opportunity to personalize his account of the fall of the Roman Republic, and Appian, if not a "skilled literary artist," was at least not so dull a historian that he let the opportunity pass.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

but rather that he has worked up speeches in Greek based on the gist (γνώμη) of the things said as gathered from the Latin *commentarii* (ὑπομνήματα)—in my opinion, most probably Augustus', identified as a source shortly before at 4.110.463. The ὑπομνήματα presumably did not provide him with the text of the actual speeches (see Hahn [above, n. 39] 198–199). At 4.12.45, however, Appian does explicitly state that what follows is a translation of the proscription edict: ὁδε μὲν εἶχεν ἡ προγραφὴ τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὅσον ἐς Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ Λατίνης μεταβαλεῖν.