LUCAN AND CASSIUS DIO AS HEIRS TO LIVY: THE SPEECH OF JULIUS CAESAR AT PLACENTIA

‘... quae dicuntur omnia
cum rebus tum personis accommodata sunt’

by A. V. van Stekelenburg
(University of Stellenbosch)

Quintilian’s well-known dictum referring to the oratorical parts in the work of Livy¹ which is quoted above, does not receive the same amount of support nowadays as it did in antiquity. Different times have different tastes. It may well be that according to the judgement of the Roman empire – as stated by Quintilian and supported by Seneca and Tacitus² – the contiones which Livy put into the mouth of his dramatis personae were unrivalled and completely in harmony with the changing situations and persons. It will, however, be slightly more difficult to convince today’s reader of this. He can, to be sure, be found willing to admit that Livy has succeeded very well in capturing, e.g. the old-Roman simplicity and greatness of an Aemilius Paullus, the dignity and patriotism of a Camillus, or the cold and rational irony of a man like the tribune Valerius (in opposing the abrogation of the Oppian Law; XXXIV. 5–7). But he will be less inclined to subscribe to Quintilian’s conclusion that all the Livian speeches are ‘personis accommodata’ when he observes how the lower characters in Livy’s rendering of the history of Rome are likewise apt to express their thoughts with careful attention to a similar – though less elaborate – set of rhetorical rules as do the leaders of Rome’s commonwealth.³

Similarly it is difficult for us to agree fully with Quintilian’s view that all of Livy’s speeches are ‘rebus... accommodata’ when we are asked to believe in the probability of elaborate and skilful orations being held in the middle of the night during preparations for an ambush or spoken on the spur of the moment by a frightened parent when suddenly confronted with the reckless projects of his son.⁴

1. Quint. X.1,101.
3. E.g., the centurion Sextus Tulius in VIII.13,3–10. The so-called genus dicendi humile (or subtile, tenue, gracile), though, in general, characterised by simple word choice, short sentences and an economical use of ornationes, did clearly not allow for any incongruous or awkward mode of expression, as we would expect in the case of simple and illiterate people. In most of the speeches of this genre (see R. Ullmann, Étude sur le style des discours de Tite Live, Oslo, 1929, 123f for examples) we can discover traces of a neat sequence of exordium, tractatio and conclusio.
4. The speeches of Publius Decius (VII.35,2–12) and of Pacuvius Calavius (XXIII.9,1–8). See P. G. Walsh, Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods, Cambridge, 1961, 229f for these and other examples.
The main reason for this difference in assessment as regards the free inclusion of speeches and monologues in works of history should of course be sought in the different expectations about historiography held by today's public and that of antiquity. Modern man expects in the first place of the historian an exact account of actions and factual occurrences, and deductions based on facts. Throughout the Greek and Roman historiographical tradition, however, the ties that had bound the oldest forms of ancient historiography to epic and drama have always remained perceptible. The ancient historians' predilection for the *oratio recta* has to be explained by this in the first place. Also bearing responsibility for the fact that the insertion of speeches in works of history was seldom seriously opposed in antiquity, was of course the circumstance that the individual and the publicly spoken word played such a far more influential role in matters political and judicial than they do today.

This being so, the problem of the degree to which speeches in historical works correspond to the words actually spoken, still looms large. The humanists already, witness Casaubonus and Vossius, had, with regard to individual orations, come to the conclusion that Greek and Roman authors apparently did not always feel called upon to reproduce the *ipsissima verba* of the characters in their literary works. And early in the nineteenth century it became generally accepted that, to quote a German scholar from that period: '... die weitaus meisten Reden in den Geschichtswerken der Griechen und Römer so lange für erdichtet zu haben seien, bis das Gegenteil in jedem einzelnen Falle gründlich erwiesen worden sei'. For the great researchers on Livy's handling of his sources: Nissen, Hesselbarth and Soltau, this had already become an axiom.

In addition to this, the unique case that enables us to compare the original text of a speech with its adaptation by a Roman historian has brought it home in an irrefutable way -- were proof still needed -- that the historical conscience of classical authors was in this matter clearly speaking a different language from that of modern historians. We are referring, of course, to Tacitus' version of Claudius' *oratio de iure honorum Gallis dando*, the authentic text

6. Thucydides' work shows 43 speeches in its seven books (or 24 per cent of its total volume). In Sallust one-quarter of the *Cont. Cat.* and one-sixth of the *Bell. Iug.* is taken up by speeches. In the 35 books of Livy that remain, 407 monologues and speeches of more than five lines (Teubner-ed.) are to be found, comprising 12 per cent of the total volume; O. Kohl, *Über Zweck und Bedeutung der livianischen Reden*, Barmen 1872, and H. Bornecque, *Tit-Live*, Paris, 1933, 157 (= *Wege d. F. CXXXII* (Wege zu Livius), 1967, 395).
In the work of Dion. Hal. the speeches occupy, from the third book onward, one-third of the total text. Earlier Diodorus Sic. had censured such an excessive use of speeches (20.1).
7. As far as we know only by Cratippus and by Pomp. Trogus (resp. in Dion. Hal. *Thuc*. 16 and Iust. 38.3,11).
8. Casaubonus in his Suetonius edition (1611, 117) and Vossius in *De Historicis Graecis* (1627,283).
9. From a work of P. S. Frandsen (1836) as quoted by H. Haupt in *Philologus* 43, 1884, 687.
of which we have in the bronze Tabula Lugdunensis (Table claudienne). 11 The
liberties which Tacitus has permitted himself with the original – with which he
certainly was acquainted – have given rise to a fairly recent and lengthy
discussion during which the question of Tacitus’ trustworthiness and profes­
sional honour has at times been raised rather unnecessarily. 12

It were better to realise that during antiquity it was never required of an
historian to give a literal reproduction of the spoken word. In fact Thucydides
and Polybius in this respect went farthest when they stipulated the rendering of
resp. ‘Η ἐξηγήσις γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων’ and an ‘ἐξήγησις τῶν κατ’ ἀλήθειαν εἰρημένων’. 13 So what they postulated was not a literal reproduction
but ‘the overall purport’ or ‘a résumé’ of what was actually said. It may be
assumed that both authors did their very best to adhere to their principle and
that the speeches in their work are in the last resort based on factual know­
ledge. This, at least, cannot be disproved, though it seems that – understand­
dably and of necessity – they did allow themselves a great measure of
latitude. 14

The fact remains, however, that, as far as we know, Thucydides and Polybius
were left without proselytes for their requirement, which in our view is quite
modest. The prevailing criterion according to which speeches in historical
works were valued since the beginning of the Hellenistic period, was not in
how far they were reliable renderings of the words actually spoken, but the
extent to which they suited the persons and incidents in question. Factual
reliability was made subordinate to this. We find this notion for the first time
expressed by Aristotle’s nephew Callisthenes: ‘... μὴ ἀστοχεῖν τοῦ προσώπου,
ἀλλ’ ὁικεῖος αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς λόγους θεῖαι’. 15

In these words we clearly see Quintilian’s ‘quaes dicuntur cum rebus tum
personis accommodata sunt’ almost literally anticipated. 16 Consequently
Quintilian was not formulating his praise of Livy in terms of criteria drawn
up by himself for the occasion. He was judging the rhetorical parts in Livy’s
work by rules established more than four centuries earlier; rules that showed
more interest in artistic values than in a reliable use of sources.

It would be worth studying – with the above-mentioned observations in

11. CIL XIII.1668; Dessau, 212.
12. For the most important literature see C. Questa, Studi sulle fonti degli Annales di
Tacito, Roma, 1963, 231f and E. Koestermann, Tacitus. Annalen, Band III, Heidelberg,
1967, 81f. For similar reasons it is also interesting to compare the two versions of the same
XV, 127–146.
14. See F. E. Adcock, Thucydides and his History, Cambridge, 1963, 27ff, and for
Polybius: Ziegler in RE XXI, 1527 and F. W. Walbank, Speeches in Greek Historians, The
15. In Athenaeus Meehan. (FGrH 124, F 44).
16. Almost the same wording is to be found in Dion. Hal. Thuc. 36 and in Lucian,
Πῶς δεῖ ἰστορίαν συγγράψαι; 58.
mind – what two authors with completely different objectives have thought suitable to put into the mouth of a historical person in the form of a speech, for the contents of which both were indebted to the same source. The works of Lucan and of Cassius Dio provide this opportunity. Both record a speech (Luc. V, 319–364; Dio 41.27–35) which was delivered by Julius Caesar at Placentia in Northern Italy. For both the source was book CX of Livy, not extant.

What we propose to do is to examine, as far as is possible, the elements from Livy that were selected for reproduction by the two subsequent authors, of whom the one was also a historian, the other a poet, though not without some reputation in historical matters. Next we will try to discover what may have prompted Dio and Lucan to select, omit or emphasise certain elements they found in their source.

The historical moment in question is the month of November 49 BC. Caesar was on his way from Massilia to Rome, the war in Spain having been concluded and Massilia having surrendered. Caesar himself in his Commentarii is quite brief on this trip of his to Rome. 'Ipse ad urbem proficiscitur' is all he elects to say (BC II.22,6). The rest of the second book is devoted to Curio’s campaign in Africa, and only at the beginning of the third book is Caesar mentioned again, when dictator in Rome. On what happened in between Massilia and Rome the Commentarii remain completely silent. And not without reason. For in the course of this journey Caesar was confronted with a mutiny amongst his soldiers so ominous, that even his famous ars dissimulationis would not have been sufficient to reduce it to an insignificant event.

Attempts have been made to explain the silence of the Commentarii on this point by suggesting the possibility of a lacuna. This manoeuvre, however, is quite unnecessary, since on other occasions too Caesar did not hesitate to skip episodes that were politically painful to him, e.g. the momentous crossing of the Rubicon and the embarrassing confrontation with the tribune L. Metellus, denying him entrance to the Aedes Saturni.

The mutiny is well attested. Apart from the lengthy treatment it receives 17. To such an extent, in fact, as to have given rise during antiquity to the question: Lucanus historicus an poeta? (Mart. XIV, 194; Servius ad Aen. I,382; Isidor, Orig. VIII.7, 10; Petr. Sat. 118). For modern views on Lucan as a historian see P. Grimal in Entretiens sur l’Ant. Class. XV (Lucain), 1968, 53ff and A. W. Lintott, 'Lucan and the History of the Civil War', CQ 65 (NS 21), 1971, 488ff.


20. Incidents that should have received a place in resp. BC I.8 and 1.33. The Rubicon crossing is dismissed by Caesar in the same casual fashion ('Ariminum ... proficiscitur') as the Placentia rising.
from Lucan and Dio we find it briefly mentioned by Suetonius and Frontinus,\textsuperscript{21} and in more detail by Appian, who also gives a short résumé of the speech made by Caesar on the occasion.\textsuperscript{22} Clearly Appian has in this instance used a different source from that of Lucan and Dio. A series of differences makes this evident.\textsuperscript{23} On the other hand the similarities between Lucan and Dio do render it easy to show that they both derive from the same source. And, though either may occasionally have made use of additional sources,\textsuperscript{24} it may be accepted that where they concur it is Livy whom we read. Comparison with the established other Livy-derivatives: the Periochae, Julius Obsequens, Florus, Eutropius, Orosius, Frontinus, Polyaenus and Valerius Maximus has in numerous instances made this clear.\textsuperscript{25}

To reconstruct for a start the background against which Livy had put Caesar's speech we may compare Lucan, Dio and Frontinus. It appears then that according to Livy there was only a small number of agitators\textsuperscript{26} but under their influence the whole of the Ninth Legion had become seriously dis-
The mutiny erupted during Caesar's absence and tempers flared up so high that threats against Caesar's life were actually uttered. Livy must have strongly stressed Caesar's personal courage in resisting the mutineers without flinching, since this appears as a prominent trait in both Lucan's and Dio's version. Frontinus likewise regarded Livy's story as a suitable paradigm for his chapter De Constantia. As the reasons for the soldiers' discontent Livy had mentioned: firstly, the duration of the campaigns, which they realised had not at all come to an end yet; and secondly, a scheme of the soldiers to extort from their general special concessions, above all leave to pillage the Italian countryside. They expected to get away with their demands because they realised how much Caesar depended on them.

This is all we can deduce with certainty about the background against which Livy had placed Caesar's speech. Still, it gives us a clear and convincing picture. Especially the reality of the soldiers' grievances about pecuniary matters becomes understandable if it is considered that at the end of the Spanish war—the same Ninth Legion had displayed almost excessive bravery—the soldiers had been forced to return their booty. Likewise Massilia, after a siege of almost half a year, had not been turned over to them for pillaging; surely a boost for Caesar's reputation for dementia, but understandably some soldiers were of opinion that this had been achieved at their expense.

We should, however, now pay attention to the speech by which Caesar endeavoured to subdue the rising. What did Livy make him say and what in turn did Lucan and Dio make out of Livy's creation? First we must ask to what extent Livy's speech can be reconstructed. Comparison of the speeches in Lucan and Dio yields the following themes as certainly treated by Livy's Caesar:

I am not afraid of your threats; you may kill me if you want;

Have you forgotten who I am?

27. Front., loc. cit.: 'legionem totam exauctoravit'. Though our three informants do not explicitly identify this legion as the Ninth (as do Appian and Suetonius), we may assume that this is a coincidence and that Livy could hardly have left out this detail from such a lengthy account as his manifestly was.
28. Luc. 303f; 319. According to Appian Caesar first heard of it while still in Massilia.
29. Front.: 'maxime animis tumentibus'; Luc. 295ff.
30. Luc. 285ff; 321f; Dio 34,4; 35,1 (the denial being only rhetorical).
31. Also Suetonius: '... sed ut celeriter ad officium redierint, nec tam indulgentia ducis quam auctoritate. Non enim cessit unquam tumultuantibus ...'
32. Luc. 261f; Dio 26,1; 35,1.
33. Luc. 270f; Dio 26,1; 30,2ff.
34. Luc. 246ff; 293f; Dio 26,1.
36. Though they were compensated: ibid. II.87,1.
37. Ibid. II.22,5–6.
38. Luc. 320f; Dio 34,4.
39. Luc. 335ff; Dio 34,2–3; (35,3–4).
I should be glad if I got rid of you;\textsuperscript{40}

You are discharged,\textsuperscript{41} you . . . , and then must have followed some derogatory or contemptuous remark for which Lucan has borrowed the famous 'Quirites'\textsuperscript{42} that Caesar was to use in that other mutiny amongst his soldiers, two years later in Rome.\textsuperscript{43} In Dio it has become a weak: 'ὅ τι ἐν ὑμῖν ὄνομάταμι.'\textsuperscript{44}

This is all that can with certainty be called Livian in Lucan's and Dio's speeches. Still, it is enough to give us an idea of the general tone of the speech and of the line Caesar took. Evidently he confronted the mutineers boldly and unflinchingly with his knowledge of their murderous designs. Instead of pleading with them he, on the contrary, emphasised in a haughty way his personal superiority and told them he would consider it a blessing to be relieved of them. He then curtly discharged the whole of the Ninth Legion and ended with a contemptuous remark.\textsuperscript{45}

Of course this summary is not exhaustive. It contains only the highest common factor in Dio's and Lucan's speeches. Livy probably ascribed to Caesar remarks that have been omitted by the two adapters or that have found their way into the work of only one of them. So will Livy's Caesar probably have dealt with the mutineers' desire to pillage the country, though this features only in Dio's speech and is touched upon by Lucan only in the preliminary account.\textsuperscript{46} Other remarks made by Caesar probably included a taunting invitation to the mutineers to go and join Pompey.\textsuperscript{47}

The available data are certainly too few to decide whether Quintilian's commendation of 'cum rebus tum personis accommodata' would also apply in this instance.\textsuperscript{48} Still, it is interesting to see how from even these few details

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40} Luc. 351ff; Dio 35.2.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Luc. 325; 357f; Dio 35.4.
\item \textsuperscript{42} 358.
\item \textsuperscript{43} App BC II,92; Dio 42.53,3; Polyaen. Strat. VIII.23,15.
\item \textsuperscript{44} 35.4.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Though it is possible, even likely, that this remark was followed by one or two sentences in which Caesar reiterated his resolve never to yield (as in Dio 35,4) or made it clear that the instigators would not escape punishment.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Dio 30,2ff; Luc. 271; 305ff. Likewise, the fact that the rising was mainly the work of only a few instigators gets much more emphasis in Dio's account (26,1; 26,2; 28,2–29; 33,2; 35,1) than in that of Lucan where it is merely mentioned obliquely by Caesar at the end of his speech (359). Irrespective of how it featured in Livy, it would not have suited Lucan to stress the limited number of instigators, because that would have weakened the impression of total and massive rebellion he wanted to create (255ff).
\item \textsuperscript{47} Luc. 349ff; Dio 35.1.
\item \textsuperscript{48} To get an idea of how Livy may have treated the subject one can read his extant speech of Scipio Maior to his mutinous troops at Carthago Nova in 206 (XXVIII.27,2–29,8). It is interesting to note how several items we find in the Placentia speech of Dio and Lucan recur in this one: I don’t know how to call you, citizens, soldiers or enemies (27,3–4); I hope this revolt is the work of only a few (27,6 and 12); I am prepared to die (27,9); I have a glorious past (28,9); the agitators will pay with their lives (29,7–8).
\end{itemize}
a decidedly more convincing Caesar emerges than the man who is portrayed by Appian, whose source, as we have seen, was not Livy. Appian's Caesar is revealed as a person who feels himself wronged and who reproachfully reminds his soldiers of his previous goodwill and of the blessings for which they should be grateful.\(^49\) On the other hand Livy's Caesar is a strong man, showing an iron fist, which in the prevailing situation and in view of the intimidating effect Caesar's words had (also according to Appian), makes him the more acceptable character.

In a different way he was also acceptable for Lucan's purposes. The Caesar he needed, 'acer et indemitus', 'saevus' and 'praeceps',\(^50\) could quite easily be created out of the strong-willed and unyielding character he found in Livy. Livy's Caesar needed only adaptation in the form of reinforcement, though it is precisely in this process of reinforcement that Lucan's Caesar moves away from its original model. What in Livy was Caesar's \textit{fortitudo} and \textit{constantia} becomes in Lucan his characteristic delight in matching his strength with his opponents, preferably in a bloody contest.\(^51\) Says Lucan, after describing the uproar in the camp: What general would not have been terrified by such a tumult? (300):

\begin{quote}
Fata sed in praeceps solitus demittere Caesar  
fortunamque suam per summa pericula gaudens  
exercere venit; nec dum desaeviat ira  
expectat; medias properat temptare furores. (301-304)
\end{quote}

Clearly this Caesar is incompatible with the cautious picture we may presume Livy had drawn of him. Though already a 'Pompeian' in Augustus' eyes,\(^52\) the historian would have risked more than a harmless reprimand-and certainly have lost the emperor's friendship—if he had described Julius

\(^{49}\text{App. BC II.47,194: "You know what kind of speed I use in everything I undertake. This war is not prolonged by us, but by the enemy, who keep retiring from us. You reaped great advantages from my command in Gaul, and you took an oath to me for the whole of this war and not for a part only; and now you abandon us in the midst of our labours, you revolt against your officers, you propose to give orders to those from whom you are bound to receive orders. Being myself the witness of my liberality to you heretofore I shall now execute the law of our country by decimating the ninth legion, where this mutiny began." (Translation by H. White; Loeb Class. Libr.)}

\(^{50}\text{Resp. I.146, VIII,134; 765 and II,656. See Syndikus, \textit{op. cit.}, 96ff for the characteristics of Lucan's Caesar.}

\(^{51}\text{Thus the observation of Gundolf is correct that Lucan's Caesar differs mainly from that of Livy (and Cicero): 'in dem fetteren Farbenauftrag . . . in dem wilderen Pinselstrich'. But we must realise that this modification in emphasis went so far as to bring about all but essential differences; F. Gundolf, \textit{Caesar, Geschichte seines Ruhms}, Berlin, 1924, 35 (=
\textit{Wege d. F. CCXXXV (Lucan)}, 1970, 13).}

\(^{52}\text{Tac. \textit{Ann.} IV.34.}
Caesar’s acts and personality in a more negative way than would suggest that ‘in incerto esse utrum illum nasci magis rei publicae profuerit an non nasci’. In Lucan Caesar is the devil incarnate, bent on destruction, preferring to succeed by force rather than by peaceful means:

> Caesar in arma furens nullas nisi sanguine fuso
> gaudet habere vias... (II, 439f)
> ... gaudensque viam fecisse ruina (I,150)

The utterances of this Lucanian Caesar we find in the speech, which, condensed, reads as follows: ‘You soldiers, who recently raged against me in my absence, I offer you my breast bare and ready for your stabs. Kill me and fly if you wish to end the war (319–321). Your words prove what cowards you are. My countless victories do not satisfy your greed (322–324). Begone and leave me to my own fortune (325). I won’t have trouble in finding soldiers willing to share my triumph (326–334). Do you really think Caesar would miss you? As little as the ocean would miss the water of the rivers (335–339). It was never you who decided the battle, but the fact that you were fighting under Caesar’s banners; had they been those of Pompey, you would have lost (339–347). I do not care whether you fight with me or against me (348–351). How do the gods bless me by taking away from me soldiers for whom even possession of the world is not enough (351–356). Begone from the camp and surrender my standards to men, ‘Quirites’ (357–358); but not before the instigators amongst you have paid with their lives (359–361). You recruits, who will now form the backbone of my army, watch their execution and learn how to slay and to be slain’ (362–364).

As mentioned already, it was by reinforcement of traits already present in Livy’s Caesar that Lucan has given shape to the terrifying tyrant he presents here. We have established that in Livy’s speech Caesar must have laid stress on his personal superiority and – as a counteraction to the mutineers’ efforts to blackmail him – on his lack of interest in the continuation of their service. On these data Lucan has elaborated to such an extent that they became the major theme in his speech. Both elements, though, Caesar’s haughty show of his superiority and of his independence of support from his soldiers, in Lucan converge in one: Caesar’s glorification of his superior Fortuna, that would – as it always had – bring him victory over his enemies.

The words Fortuna, Fatum, cura deorum, all different names for the unalter-
able decree of destiny, occur in these few lines with even higher frequency than in the rest of the Pharsalia. What Caesar does tell his soldiers is that his strides through history will never be hindered by their insignificant actions – as little as they were ever promoted by them:

... An vos momenta putatis ulla dedisse mihi? (339f)

Fortuna would lead him, 'impius Caesar', to the accomplishment of his mission, which was to be the destruction of a free Rome. He had appeared on earth like a force of nature, like the ocean independent of lesser phenomena. It was his Fortuna that had always made him victorious, not their valour: under Pompey they would have lost, since it was Pompey's unalterable destiny to be sacrificed along with the Republic. Fortuna was now delivering him from cowardly and greedy soldiers and would provide substitutes, who would gladly join the party whose triumph was so sure.

Thus Lucan has translated Caesar's arrogantia in the semantics of his Pharsalia. We do not know to what extent Caesar's arrogance permeated the speech that was originally drafted by Livy. In Dio's adaptation it is restricted to a reference by Caesar to his ancestry and his own glorious deeds (34,2–3) and to the duty of subordinates to obey (33,2–5). In Lucan, however, it has provided, in an extreme form, the major color of the speech, because it created another opportunity to portray Caesar as Lucan saw him, the embodiment of the tyrant as described by Cicero: 'ista in figura hominis feritas et immanitas beluae'.

55. The terminological and functional differences between Fatum (fate, destiny) and Fortuna (fortune) – with which Lucan shows himself acquainted (II, 7–13) – need not occupy us here. It suffices to remark that Lucan generally uses both terms – and cura deorum – more or less as equivalents; B. F. Dick in CPh 62, 1967, 235ff and W. H. Friedrich in Hermes 73, 1938, 391ff (=Wege d. F. CCXXXV, 70ff). 'La Fortune apparait ... comme l'exécutrice de la volonté des dieux, c'est-à-dire du Destin'; J. Brisset, Les idées politiques d'Lucain, Paris, 1964, 55.

56. Fatum in 325,342; Fortuna in 327,354; cura deorum in 340,352. See Dick, op. cit. n. 10 for the frequency of Fatum and Fortuna in the Pharsalia. It is not possible to determine if the well-known topic of the Fortuna Caesaris also figured in Livy's speech. Certainly the extreme form in which it occurs in Lucan is the poet's own invention. For the Fortuna Caesaris as a propagandistic and literary theme see, e.g. H. Erkell and F. Bömer in Wege d. F. XLIII (Caesar), 1967, resp. 48ff and 89ff.


58. Elsewhere Caesar is likened to a gale (III,362f), a fire (III,364) and a thunderstorm (I,151ff).

59. See Brisset, op. cit., 72ff on how the fate of Pompey and that of Rome are intertwined in the Pharsalia.

60. De Off. III,32. See Syndikus, op. cit., 94 on the relation of Lucan's Caesar to the traditional image of the tyrant.
Dio’s adaptation of Caesar’s speech is a fine illustration of what Millar called: ‘a general, though not quite universal, tendency in Dio, to use his speeches not to focus a particular political situation or a particular character, but to set forth the moral sentiments appropriate to the situation’. The result of this tendency on his part—to which he may have been prompted by his association with the second sophistic movement—has never yet met with much appreciation. And indeed, Dio’s rhetorical showpieces for the greater part make quite tedious and unexciting reading.

In the case in question Dio seems to have put forward his personal moralistic observations mainly in the first seven chapters of his speech (27–33). At least, nearly all the Livian elements he shares with Lucan are to be found in the last two chapters (34–35). In addition, it would be offensive to the memory of the Pataviniön if we ascribed to his pen much, if anything, of what precedes those final chapters. We give a summary: ‘Soldiers, I love you like a father, and therefore it is my duty to make you refrain from evil (27,1–2). And evil it is, to put temporary advantage before lasting benefit (27,3). You never had reason to complain and I hoped, by waiting, to let the agitators come to their senses without my having to take action. But since they persist, I must act (28). For in no community can the criminal element be allowed to remain unpunished, because this would corrupt the rest, like a sick member would the rest of the body. This applies also to armies. If crime and good behaviour were to receive equal treatment, what incentive would there remain for good conduct? (29) Those few bad men harm your reputation. For you will bear an equal share of the reproach (30). Do not think that the soldiery can put themselves above the citizens (31). It is the task of the soldier to defend the country against danger and not to harm it. Also, outrageous behaviour by you would greatly harm my cause (32). And it would not be a good thing—even contrary to nature—for subjects to dictate to their rulers (33). That is why I, Caesar, will rather die than yield (34). Those who did threaten to go over to Pompey may do so. I would be glad. Never will I yield. You are discharged’ (35).

To try to analyse Caesar’s (read: Dio’s) reflections in order to discover the philosophy that lies behind them, would be as wearisome as it would be vain. They are the worn-out clichés of the old philosophical schools that can be considered as part of the intellectual stock-in-trade of any educated Roman. Something should, however, be said about the interest Dio clearly shows in the relationship of the soldiery to their country and their generals. It is a recurring

63. The admonition not to let temporary pleasure prevail over lasting benefit (27,3) appears to derive from stoic principles, but remarks like those on the duties of the guardians of the country (32) or those referring to the specialised nature of leadership (33) are already too obvious to bear comparison with similar Platonic or Aristotelian ideas.
64. See my *De Redevoeringen, etc.*, 24f on a similar mixture of diluted cynical and stoical doctrines in Dio’s speech of Philiscus (38.18–19; see below, n. 69).
theme in his work. Further on he makes Caesar remark to the senate, after his return to Rome in 46: 'And do not fear the soldiers, either, or regard them in any other light than as guardians of my empire, which is at the same time yours. That they should be supported is necessary, for many reasons, but they will be supported for your benefit, not against you; and they will be content with what is given them and will think well of the givers'. These reflections resemble those in the Placentia speech and emphasise—in a similar naïve way—the subservient role the army should play in society. And amongst the guidelines Dio makes Augustus give to the senators at the beginning of his reign, we find: 'Maintain the soldiery adequately, so that they may not on account of want desire anything which belongs to others; keep them in hand and under discipline, that they may not become presumptuous and do harm'.

One of the characteristics of Dio's speeches—apart from their moralising tendency—is that their content frequently goes beyond the limits of their historical setting. The most striking illustration of this characteristic is to be found in that best-known of his speeches, the debate between Agrippa and Maecenas on the question as to whether the republican or the monarchical is the preferable form of government. The measures proposed by Maecenas, advocating the monarchy, go far beyond what was relevant to Augustus at the time, and some of them were even only in statu nascendi during Dio's time. Likewise Dio probably introduced a contemporary sophist into a fictional consolatory monologue, set in republican times. Furthermore, the dialogue in which Livia tries to mitigate Augustus' severitas would hardly have failed to remind Dio's contemporaries of the severitas of Caracalla—during whose reign Dio wrote this episode—and of the attempts to change his disposition made by the Augusta of that time: Julia Domna.

In the same way it seems that Dio's interest in the matter of military discipline was inspired by the idiosyncrasies of his own time. According to Millar's chronological table of the composition of the different books, the forty-first
book was written in or around the year 213, at the beginning of Caracalla’s reign that is. Dio reports that Septimius Severus, before he died at York in 211, told his sons: ‘... enrich the soldiers and scorn all other men’.\textsuperscript{74} Which, according to Dio, was precisely what he had done himself and in which his son Caracalla was to emulate him, his motto being: ‘Nobody in the world should have money but me; and I want to bestow it upon my soldiers’.\textsuperscript{75}

The slackening of the discipline amongst the soldiers that resulted from this attitude of the Severi had of course never been their aim. It was the undesired by-product of the imperative necessity to retain the soldiers’ goodwill. Septimius himself was the proof that once again, as in the year 68, the secret had been discovered by the soldiers that ‘posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri’.\textsuperscript{76} And the fate of his immediate predecessors Pertinax and Julianus – both killed by the troops – must have made it quite clear what the risks were of the loss of popularity with the soldiery.\textsuperscript{77}

The tendency nowadays is to see in many of the army reforms of the Severi – and especially in those of Septimius – more proof of good statesmanship than of indulgence. It is pointed out that the doubling of the soldiers’ pay must be seen in connection with the depreciation of the currency at that time, that the recognition of soldier marriages was already an established custom before the rise of the Severi, and that the equestrian gold ring had already become too cheap an article to be very much affected by the Severi’s free bestowal of it on centurions and principes.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless these and other steps taken by the Severi were evidently seen by some of their contemporaries – witness Dio and Herodian – as so many cajoleries that would inevitably lead to only more and more vociferous claims by pretorians and legionaries, and to a deterioration of the discipline. And particularly measures like the frequent bestowal of gratuities\textsuperscript{79} and favouring the troops to the detriment of the senate in affairs of state\textsuperscript{80} must have given rise to accusations of this nature. Irrespective of the fact that in our century many Severan reforms are seen as ‘the civilizing and refining of the legionary’s life’\textsuperscript{81} the overall impression they made on the more conservative people of the time was clearly different. Dio’s younger contemp-

\textsuperscript{74} Dio 77.15,2.

\textsuperscript{75} Dio 78.10,4.

\textsuperscript{76} Tac. Hist. 1.4.

\textsuperscript{77} Pertinax was killed as a result of his refusal to give the soldiers leave to plunder (Dio 73,8,1; Herod. II.4,4: 5,1). The troops seemed simply to have lost their interest in Julianus because he had proved himself unreliable as a source of money (Herod. II.7,6; 11.7-8).


\textsuperscript{79} Dio 78.10,1; 24,1; Herod. II.14,5; III.6,8; 8,4; IV.4,7-8.

\textsuperscript{80} As was the case when Septimius had Albinus declared a \textit{hostis} (Herod. III.6,8), Caracalla a \textit{Caesar} (H.A. Serv. X,3) and Commodus a \textit{divus} (H.A. Serv. XI,3).

\textsuperscript{81} Platnauer, \textit{op. cit.}, 169.
orary Herodian considered Septimius as ‘the first to undermine the tough austerity of the soldiers’ diet, their obedience in face of hardship and their disciplined respect for commanders, by teaching the men to be greedy for riches and seducing them into a life of luxury’; whereas Dio quotes Caracalla’s successor Macrinus as speaking ironically of ‘the many means devised by Severus and his son for the undermining of military discipline’.

Thus Dio’s frequent – and in the case of the Placentia speech, extensive – digressions on the function and duties of the army become more meaningful when considered in conjunction with the specific problems of his own time. Furthermore, he seems to have personally supported the ideas he makes Julius Caesar profess in such a naive way. At least, it would appear that he tried to put them into practice when the opportunity offered, which happened when he had already turned sixty. It was only then that the old senator, who had gone through the most sanguinary period of the empire till then (of the seven emperors he had known six had been murdered) and whose survival had apparently in large part been due to his ability to trim his sails to the wind and to dissemble, rose to sudden prominence. The good Alexander Severus, after 222, appointed him consecutively as proconsul of Africa and legate first of Dalmatia, and then of Pannonia. Afterwards he was to share, in 229, the consulate with Alexander. But his return from his province to Rome was a risky move, because . . . ‘the Pretorians complained of me to Ulpianus (then praefectus praetorio), because I ruled the soldiers in Pannonia with a strong hand; and they demanded my surrender, through fear that someone might compel them to submit to a régime similar to that of the Pannonian troops’. Alexander had to come to his rescue in this dilemma and he allowed Dio to spend his consulate outside Rome: ‘And thus later I came both to Rome and to Campania to visit him, and spent a few days in his company, during which the soldiers saw me without offering to do me any harm; then, having asked to be excused because of the ailment of my feet, I set out for home (Bithynia) with the intention of spending all the rest of my life in my native land’.

82. III,8,5; translation by C. R. Whittaker (Loeb Class. Libr.).
83. 79.36,2.
84. Dio had started his literary career by composing a pamphlet on the omina that had foretold Septimius Severus’ ascent to the throne. This pamphlet he had hurriedly and respectfully presented to Severus on the occasion of the latter’s arrival in Rome in 193 (Dio 73.23,1-2).
85. See Millar, op. cit., 23ff on this part of Dio’s career.
86. 80.4,2.
87. 80.5,2. The murder of the jurist and praefectus praetorio Ulpian by his own troops in the very palace of the emperor may have strengthened him in his decision. However, it should not be suggested that Dio was a coward: his visit to Alexander in Rome took place after the murder of Ulpian, which was traditionally accepted to have taken place in 228 (W. Kunkel, Herkunft und soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen, Weimar, 1952, 246). The publication in 1966 of P. Oxy. XXXI,2565 has not as satisfactorily shown as is sometimes accepted today that this traditional date is incorrect and should be replaced by 223.
Thus Dio’s firm but rather out-dated and simplistic ideas on military discipline clashed with the harsh and irreversible realities of his age. What was left of the third century was to provide only too clear proof that the armed forces were not prepared any more to play the subservient role that should be theirs according to anachronistic moralistic theories and elderly statesmen who still clung to them.

What we have done so far – having determined what data Lucan and Dio found in the Livian original of their speeches – is to consider the motivations that induced the two authors to highlight, to adapt or to suppress certain of these elements, or to add statements of their own invention. The conclusions we came to as a result of this inquiry are certainly not such as to rock the traditional views held concerning Lucan and Dio. Still, it enabled us to catch a few glimpses of the motivations that prompted the two authors to handle the same subject in such different ways.

If we were to apply Quintilian’s criteria, or were to ask in a more general way to what extent the two speeches make meaningful contributions to the organic structure of the respective works, we would certainly have to award the laurels to Lucan. Lucan’s poetic talents gave him an edge on Dio not only in the field of rhetoric but also in that of historiography. His speech fits both the person and the circumstances in a far better way than does Dio’s. Of course Lucan’s task was in a certain sense rendered the easier by the fact that the Caesar in his work was a figure of limited and very clearly defined dimensions. The reason why Lucan’s Caesar, in all his vigorous and almost supernatural strength, still remains a convincing one, is in great part due to the fact that the poet is consistent in accentuating a single characteristic behind which ultimately the historic Caesar yet remains recognisable.

It is in this same respect that Dio’s main failure may be observed. His Caesar speech cannot stand the test of acceptability because Dio has attributed to Caesar a dimension which never was his, but purely the author’s: that of a moralising dabbler.
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