

sen? Dabei setzt Aristoteles bereits voraus, daß es die Zeit gibt und daß es sich bei ihr um ein Kontinuum mit eindeutiger Richtung handelt, d. h. der Ablauf der Zeit ist für ihn eine Realität, von der er ausgeht.

Dieses Kontinuum ist schwerer in den Griff zu bekommen als das der räumlichen Ausdehnung, aber Aristoteles ist in der Frage nach den Orientierungsmöglichkeiten zu einer klaren und, wie mir scheint, unbestreitbar richtigen Konzeption gelangt. Orientierung heißt für ihn, daß jemand da sein muß, der Markierungen vornimmt. Diese Markierungen, bzw. die durch sie abgegrenzten Zeitstücke, kann man zählen. Das ist die Grundlage des Messens. Weiter können wir in theoretisch befriedigender Weise eigentlich nicht kommen; denn das Messen ist zwar praktisch möglich, aber es bringt theoretische Probleme mit sich, die sich aus der zirkelhaften Beziehung zwischen Zeit und Bewegung ergeben und deswegen letzten Endes nicht lösbar sind. Aristoteles ist auch ihnen nicht aus dem Wege gegangen, aber er konnte dort naturgemäß nicht zu einer so eindeutigen Lösung kommen, wie in unserer Frage. Doch das darzustellen gehört in eine andere Untersuchung.

Frankfurt a. M.

Gustav Adolf Seeck

THE ATTACKS ON L. CORNELIUS CINNA, PRAETOR IN 44 B.C.

C. Helvius Cinna, tribune in 44 and celebrated neoteric poet¹), was torn to pieces by the Roman mob after the funeral of Julius Caesar on March 20, 44, in mistake for the praetor L. Cornelius Cinna, who was known to have approved of Caesar's assassination. In the present paper I shall try to document precisely Cornelius Cinna's actions on, and in the immediate aftermath of,

1) The identification is certain: see T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet*, Leicester 1974, 44 ff.

the Ides. There is a major disagreement in our sources and the conventional scholarly view of the problem can be shown to be incorrect. It may indeed be said that this is a matter of small historical moment. But when so much in late Republican history is uncertain, any increase in precision should be welcome. Resolution of this particular problem also sheds light on the workings of our sources, particularly Plutarch and Appian. The investigation can therefore be justified.

Cornelius Cinna was not himself a member of the conspiracy against Caesar²), but when the deed was done, he advanced unexpectedly into the forum, laid aside his praetorian robe, as being the gift of a tyrant, called Caesar a tyrant and his killers tyrannicides, declared that the assassination was in accordance with ancestral custom, and proposed public honours for the assassins. This is the account of Appian 2.121.509 f. That Cornelius Cinna did indeed make a speech in the forum on the Ides in support of the conspirators is confirmed by the evidence of Plutarch, Brut. 18.13³). But Appian and Plutarch disagree in detail. According to Appian Cinna made his speech after the conspirators had ascended to the Capitol for the first time and *before* Brutus and Cassius descended to address the populace; the speech failed to win popular approval, but there is no implication in Appian that Cinna got into trouble with the populace *at this stage* because of it. According to Plutarch, however, Cinna made his speech after Brutus and the others had descended from the Capitol to address the people, but though Brutus' speech gained a respectful hearing 'that all were not pleased with the deed they made clear when Cinna began to speak and to denounce Caesar: they broke into a rage and reviled Cinna so bitterly that the conspirators withdrew again to the Capitol'.

2) Pace Plut. Caes. 68.6; C. D. 44.50.4: cf. A. Garzetti, *Plutarchi Vita Caesaris*, Firenze 1954, 246, on Caes. 68.6.

3) ὅτι δ' οὐ πᾶσι πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐγγένοιτο τὸ ἔργον, ἐδήλωσαν ἀρξάμενοι λέγειν Κίinna καὶ κατηγορεῖν Καίσαρος, ἀναρρηγνύμενοι πρὸς ὄργην καὶ κακῶς τὸν Κίinna λέγοντες, ὥστε πάλιν τοὺς ἄνδρας εἰς τὸ Καπετώλιον ἀπελθεῖν. Cinna's speech in favour of the tyrannicides is also attested in Val. Max. 9.9.1; Suet. Caes. 85; Appian 2.147, but these references occur in the accounts of the lynching of Cinna the poet and give no details of the circumstances of the speech. (Suetonius' *pridie contionatum* is an error, unless (a) it is possible to take *pridie* as = 'a short time before' – cf. the very similar Brut. 20.11 ἐκείνος ... ἐναγχοσ λοιδορήσας, or (b) one should emend to *pridem*.)

Further complications are introduced by the fact that, according to Appian 2.126.526 f., on the day of the first meeting of the senate after Caesar's murder, i. e. March 17, Cornelius Cinna, now back in his praetorian robe, was nearly lynched and burnt to death by the Roman mob, and only saved by the armed intervention of Lepidus and his troops. Although this incident is only attested by Appian, its historicity must be accepted, for Appian clearly distinguishes it from Cinna's activities on the Ides and his account here seems credible and circumstantial. But again the *detail* of Appian's account conflicts disturbingly with Plutarch's narrative of events after the Ides, for according to Appian this *second* incident was the *first* clear expression of public opinion in favour of the dead Caesar and greatly worried the conspirators.

The similarities and differences between Appian and Plutarch in their accounts of the adventures of Cornelius Cinna can thus be summarised as follows:

1. both agree that Cinna made a speech on the Ides in favour of the conspirators; this must be historical; but they *disagree* over (a) the precise circumstances under which the speech was made (were the conspirators present or not?), and (b) the reception that the speech got; in Appian Cinna is apparently not abused, whereas in Plutarch the reception is so hostile that the conspirators retreat to the Capitol (for the second time).

2. Appian records Cinna's near lynching of March 17, whereas Plutarch does not. But Plutarch's omission could be explained in terms of narrative technique – his account of the complex series of events after Caesar's murder is necessarily selective. It is more important that Appian's gloss on this incident (it was the first public expression of hostility to the conspirators and greatly frightened them) is suspiciously similar to Plutarch's gloss on Cinna's speech on the Ides.

Which version is correct? Scholars have generally supposed that it is Plutarch's account in Brut. 18.13 that is at fault⁴). On this view Brut. 18.13 can be seen as a *conflation* of two separate events: (1) Cinna's speech on the Ides and (2) Cinna's near lynching on the 17th and its effect on the morale of the conspirators. In itself such an interpretation seems not implausible, for confluations of two (or

4) So, e.g. P. Groebe in W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms I*, Berlin 1899, repr. Hildesheim 1964, 415; F. Münzer, RE 4 (1901) 1287; N. Horsfall, G&R 21 (1974) 197, n. 3, is agnostic (and inaccurate in his formulation of the alternatives).

even more) separate items, whether through simple incompetence or (sometimes) through deliberate literary technique⁵) are common in Plutarch's *Lives*. Yet closer investigation makes it quite clear that in this case it is Appian, not Plutarch, who is at fault. It seems to have escaped notice that Appian's account of Cinna's activities is self-contradictory. Brutus made a speech on the Capitol on March 16, whose content is recorded by Appian 2.137.570 ff.⁶). There Brutus says that he and the rest of the conspirators went to the Capitol because 'the sudden and unexpected attack made upon Cinna compelled us to do so'. He is *not* saying why they intend to *stay* on the Capitol: he is explaining why they took refuge there in the first place. 'The sudden and unexpected attack made upon Cinna' cannot therefore be the attack on Cinna on the 17th. The pattern of cause (attack on Cinna) and effect (conspirators retreat to the Capitol) is identical to that in Plutarch. In other words in his narrative Appian has incorrectly referred 'the sudden and unexpected attack upon Cinna' to the events of March 17. In fact, Cinna got into trouble with the Roman mob *twice*. On the Ides he made an anti-Caesar speech, throwing away his praetorian robe, and was roughly handled by the crowd, and it was this that impelled the conspirators to take refuge on the Capitol. On the 17th Cinna had learnt his lesson and put his robe back on, but he was again attacked. Plutarch's version of events is correct, Appian's incorrect, despite the fact that it is clear that, so far as their basic information is concerned, the two writers are following the same source (almost certainly Asinius Pollio⁷). Whether it is necessary to convict Appian of incompetence *tout court* may be debated. Appian, like Plutarch, is a skilled literary artist and often avoids the duplication of similar items in the interests of narrative clarity⁸). Here, however, it must be said that he has failed to synthesise his material successfully, for the evidence of

5) See most recently C. B. R. Pelling, *JHS* 100 (1980) 127 f.

6) In fact Appian wrongly dates Brutus' *contio Capitolina* (Cic. *Ad Att.* 15.1a.2) to the same day as the first meeting of the senate, which was in fact March 17 (*Ad Att.* 14.10.1, 14.14.2; *Phil.* 2.35.89); this is because Appian, like Plutarch and Cassius Dio, misdates the first meeting of the senate to March 16, simply skipping a day. The actual contents of Appian's version of Brutus' *contio Capitolina* are decisive for the dating March 16 (cf. 2.137.570 'Here, citizens, we meet you, we who *yesterday* met together with you in the forum').

7) Asinius Pollio is Appian's main historical source for the Civil Wars from 60 B.C., and Plutarch's also: cf. recently and trenchantly Pelling, *JHS* 99 (1979) 84 f. This is common ground among those who take *Quellenforschung* seriously.

8) Cf. Pelling, *Plutarch's Life of Caesar*, Oxford D. Phil. thesis 1974, 437 f.

2.137.570 ff. (Brutus' speech) cannot be reconciled with the narrative of 2.121.509 f. and 2.126.526 f. Appian 2.137.570 ff. and Plut. Brut. 18.13 preserve the correct account of Cinna's speech on the Ides, and Appian has glossed Cinna's near lynching on the 17th with comments that are properly appropriate to the effect of that speech.

University College of North Wales,
Bangor

John Moles

PANAITIOS BEI PLUTARCH DE TRANQUILLITATE ANIMI?

Otto Kaiser
30.11.84
Heraklit B 101

Die Forschung ist uneins, ob und wie weit Panaitios mit seinem Werk ‚Über die heitere Seelenstille‘ auf die gleichnamige Hervorbringung Plutarchs eingewirkt hat. Pohlenz redet einer weitgehenden Beeinflussung das Wort, die selbst die epikureisch gefärbten Partien umgreifen soll¹); van Straaten hingegen ist nicht bereit, ein Stück aus dem Plutarchischen Essay in seine Sammlung der Panaitios-Fragmente aufzunehmen²). Mag er das Votum des späten Wilamowitz auf seiner Seite haben³), so sollte man nicht aus

1) Vgl. Ausg. p.187; ders., *Die Stoa*, Göttingen ⁴1970/⁴1972, 2. Bd. 102; 239, ders., *RE* 18 B (1949) 438.

2) *Ind. font.* S. 58; gemildert: ders., *Panétius*, Amsterdam 1946 (Diss. Nymwegen), 296–300; ebenso B. N. Tatakis, *Panétius de Rhode*, Paris 1931, 56; vgl. A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy*, London 1974, 114. 211–216; J. M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy*, Cambridge 1977 (= 1969), 196 A.5 (wendet sich gegen G. Siefert, *Plutarchos' Schrift περί εὐθυμίας*, Programm Pforta 1908, bes. 51, und H. Broecker, *Animadversiones ad Plutarchi libellum περί εὐθυμίας*, Diss. Bonn 1954).

3) U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Reden und Vorträge*, 2 Bde. in 1 Bd., Dublin/Zürich ⁵1967 (= ⁴1925/⁴1926), 2, 192 A. 2; vgl. ders., *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 Bde., Darmstadt ²1955, 2, 389–395.