Les Études Classiques 76 (2008), p. 361-381.

THE USE OF RHETORIC IN XENOPHON'S *ANABASIS* AND CAESAR'S *DE BELLO GALLICO* *

Résumé. — Entre l'*Anabase* de Xénophon et le *De bello Gallico* de César, on remarque sans peine des similitudes de style et de contenu. Il n'est pas aussi évident d'établir avec certitude que César ait lu l'*Anabase*. Il apparaît qu'il avait lu la *Cyropédie*, mais même Cicéron, qui affirme avoir lu l'*Anabase*, semble l'avoir confondue avec un autre ouvrage. La rhétorique développée par ces deux auteurs laisse entrevoir des traits liés aux époques et aux circonstances vécues par chacun. On peut relever aussi des traits communs entre les deux œuvres, si l'on se concentre sur des passages qui partagent le même sujet. — Beaucoup de commentateurs, dont Norden et Rawson, font remarquer que le style de Xénophon et de César paraît très naïf. Tous deux se sont fait passer pour de simples soldats qui se sont essayés à l'écriture. Ils laissent à penser qu'on peut lire leurs œuvres sans passer par un cadre interprétatif. Les deux auteurs décrivent leur lutte contre les barbares en montagne de façon très détaillée. Xénophon décrit minutieusement sa guerre contre les Carduques, tandis que César ouvre le *De Bello Gallico* sur son conflit avec les tribus helvètes. Il ressort de la comparaison entre ces deux descriptions que les deux œuvres présentent davantage de raffinements rhétoriques qu'on ne le pense généralement. Il semble que les deux auteurs aient choisi cette manière d'écrire en réaction aux circonstances de leur vie publique. Il est dès lors probable que l'on puisse considérer le style de César comme une imitation délibérée de celui de Xénophon, répondant à des objectifs semblables. Cela n'implique cependant pas que ses lecteurs aient pu remarquer de telles réminiscences de l'*Anabase* ou qu'ils y aient réagi.

V. Gray [1], when discussing the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis,* stated that "Narratives had always revealed the qualities of their participants, but the definition of what constituted greatness was open to debate". If this can be said of Xenophon's autobiographical *Anabasis*, the same must also be able to be observed in the case of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*. That Caesar and

* The author wishes to acknowledge the thoughtful and valuable guidance from the anonymous readers of this article, as well as from Ass. Prof. Dexter Hoyos of the University of Sydney and Dr. Arthur Keaveney of the University of Kent at Canterbury.

1. V. Gray, "Interventions and Citations in Xenophon, *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*", *CQ* 53, 1 (2003), p. 112.

many of his later Republican contemporaries, especially those in the Scipionic circle, had read the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon with interest seems to be beyond question [2]. There is also quite strong evidence that other technical works by Xenophon such as the *Cynegetica* and the *Oeconomicus* had been read and adapted by figures such as Cato the Elder. A much more difficult question to answer is whether the historical works of Xenophon, especially the *Anabasis*, had been actively influential on the literary figures of that period. K. Münscher [3] notes that the few mentions of that work in the writings of Cicero in *de Diuinatione* 1, 52 and 122 come, in fact, from another work on dreams and divination. If, however, we can be confident that Caesar had read other works of Xenophon's [4], why should he have not also have read that work by Xenophon which seems to have the closest possible link with his own writings and indeed with conduct of his public life? H. A. Gärtner, when considering passages within the *Anabasis* that involve an aspect of self-reflection by the Greeks or by Xenophon himself, either consciously or in dreams, notes that this stylistic element seems to have been influential on the writing of Caesar [5]. One part of the answer lies in the consideration of those aspects of the *Anabasis*, which could reasonably be expected to have influenced Caesar's war memoirs.

The aim of this article, then, is to show that it is reasonable to expect that Caesar based his style to some extent on that of Xenophon without necessarily being derivative of Xenophon's content. The image that Xenophon presents of himself to the Athenian audience at a point, after the battle of Leuctra, when his Spartan protectors were losing their power, would have also suited the needs of Caesar well, when trying to appear to the Roman people as someone who ultimately carries out the aims of the Senate. Furthermore, E. Norden [6] notes that the writing of Caesar which we have displayed much less obvious rhetorical styling than Cicero. This is understood by E. Norden to be a response to the prevailing style of the time. Interestingly, though, E. Norden also attributes a very natural style to Xenophon, yet despite describing the expression of both authors in very similar terms, and despite the similarity of subject material between their

2. Quintillian, 12, 10, 39.

3. K. MÜNSCHER, "Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Lieratur", *Philologus*, Suppl.-Band XIII, 2 (1920), p. 76.

4. This is implied by Suetonius, *Iul.*, 87 : *cum apud Xenophontem legisset Cyrum ultima ualetudine mandasse quaedam de funere suo*, "since he had read in Xenophon that Cyrus had, in his final illness, made certain orders regarding his own funeral".

5. H. A. GÄRTNER, "Beobachtungen zu Bauelementen in der antiken Historiographie besonders bei Livius und Caesar", *Historia Einzelschriften*, Heft 25 (1975), p. 53-56.

6. E. NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa der römischen Welt*, 1958, p. 209.

works, he fails to make any connection between the two authors. M. von Albrecht [7] makes this link explicitly, but offers little argument, beyond the presentation of the narrative from a third-person viewpoint by both Xenophon and Caesar, as well as the lack of a proem in both the *Anabasis* and the *De Bello Gallico,* a feature approved of by Lucian at *De Historia Conscribenda*, 23.

The grounds for comparison of Xenophon and Caesar

Both Caesar and Xenophon were professional generals writing about their own exploits, as compared with Thucydides, who wrote about the exploits of others, or Livy, who could rightly be considered something of an armchair general. Given the similar content and that Xenophon's works were apparently well received in Caesar's own time, it is not inconceivable firstly that Caesar would use those aspects of Xenophon's style that he found useful and attractive, but also that he might expect his audience to draw a connection between himself and Xenophon.

G. A. Kennedy [8] notes the popularity of Xenophon among the Scipionic circle, as noted by Quintilian at 12, 10, 39. This neo-Hellenism stands in contrast to the more ornate style adopted by Cicero, and there may be an argument for regarding Caesar as one who associates his style with that of his Scipionic predecessors. This is, however, perhaps somewhat contradicted by the fact that Caesar had, according Suetonius [9], the same instructor in rhetoric as Cicero [10], one Marcus Antonius Gnipho. The apparently very minor influence from Xenophon's historical works on the writings of Cicero would suggest that any influence from that direction on Cicero's expression would be very minor indeed [11]. Without any of Caesar's speeches being extant, it is impossible to say to what degree his style resembled that of Cicero, although Cicero had praised Caesar's style, as mentioned at Pliny, *NH*, 7, 117. Nonetheless, it is difficult to justify Münscher's view that Tacitus is the first writer since Cicero to show any trace of influence from these works [12], given the war-memoir style of Caesar's works.

---

7. M. VON ALBRECHT, *A History of Roman Literature*, vol. 1, p. 413.
8. G. A. KENNEDY, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, p. 69-70.
9. Suetonius, *de gr.,* 7.
10. E. NORDEN, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 209.
11. E. MENSCHING (*Caesars* Bellum Gallicum*: Eine Einführung*, p. 46) notes that Cicero apparently received the works of Xenophon under the pseudonym of Themistocles of Syracuse. Caesar seems to have deliberately avoided hiding his identity with his own commentaries.
12. K. MÜNSCHER, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 93.

There is, however, a clear difference between forensic rhetoric and the journalistic style of history. This is true, regardless of how closely Caesar's forensic speeches may have resembled those of Cicero. Elizabeth Rawson [13] notes that it was the *Cyropaedia,* which held the greatest attraction for Scipio Aemilianus. Elizabeth Rawson also [14] draws our attention to the fact that Cicero himself described the *Cyropaedia* at *Ad fam.*, 5, 12, 7 in the following positive terms:

> *Unus enim Xenophontis libellus in eo rege laudando facile omnis imagines omnium statuasque superauit.*
>
> For one little book by Xenophon in praising that king has readily overcome all the portraits and the statues of all.

The appeal of Xenophon's works to active generals was, therefore, already a phenomenon before Caesar's time. Diodorus Siculus makes eight mentions of Xenophon both as a general and a historian [15], with 14, 37, 1-4 providing a brief summary of parts of the *Anabasis*, suggesting that it is not only the *Cyropaedia*, but also the *Anabasis* that was of direct interest during Caesar's time.

It is also important to consider what Caesar might have been attempting to achieve in the application of any sort of rhetorical techniques to his writing. Th. Mommsen [16] considers the very open and plain style of Caesar to be an attempt to avoid any suggestion that he was publishing these writings for political ends in the year 703 (Roman calendar). If that was the case, the emulation of Xenophon, whose life was itself not distinguished by high political office, would be an effective way of soothing any suspicions that may have been held about the goals of his invasion of Gaul and its propagation as literature to a wider audience. P. Huber draws our attention to another aspect of Caesar's writing and one that is particularly relevant to the passage that will be examined in detail here, namely *BG*, 1, 20-29, which concerns itself Caesar's campaign against the Helvetii. P. Huber notes [17] that it is difficult to take the figures for the migration of the Helvetian tribes and, as a result, the number of troops that Caesar must have overcome, at face value. He also notes that the reasons that Caesar gives for the migration of these tribes and their clumsy seeming attacks on

13. Elizabeth Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society*, p. 179.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

15. Diodorus Siculus, 11, 70, 1; 12, 47, 3; 13, 42, 5; 14, 37, 1; 14, 37, 2; 14, 37, 3; 15, 76, 4; 15, 89, 3.

16. Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte III*, [1856] 1922, p. 615-616.

17. P. Huber, "Die Glaubwürdigkeit Caesars in seinem Bericht über den Gallischen Krieg", [1931], p. 10-30 in G. Walser (ed.), *Bellum Helveticum, Studien zum Beginn der caesarischen Eroberung von Gallien*, 1998, p. 182-190.

the Romans need to be read very carefully, as, by focussing on the very non-political aspects of the war, Caesar avoids the question of whether the Helvetian tribes were actually coming to the aid of Ariovistus in the face of Roman invasion [18]. Again, the apparent similarity between Caesar's actions and those of Xenophon, who was keenly studied among the upper echelon's of Roman society and gave the impression that he was a more or less innocent and politically uninterested figure who responded brilliantly to difficult circumstances, is worth observing. P. Huber [19] notes that the most important words of Caesar's in this respect are those to Ariovistus at 45, 3, where he gives presents himself as little more than an agent of the Senate's wishes:

> *Si iudicium senatus obseruari oporteret, liberam debere esse Galliam, quam bello uictam suis legibus uti uoluisset*.
>
> [He said that] if the decree of the senate ought to be observed, Gaul ought to be free, which, having been conquered in war, could survive by its own laws as it wished.

Having established a range of potential grounds for Caesar's emulation of Xenophon, it is worthwhile to compare this with what we know about Xenophon himself and the *Anabasis*. The *Anabasis* is an interesting work to consider in this context as it was written at a point when there were already a number of versions of the events involving the Ten Thousand in Persia in circulation [20]. For Xenophon to have added his own voice to the mix we should expect this experienced writer and orator to have had a particular goal in mind. The campaign came after Xenophon's departure from Athens and, given his apparent sympathies for the rule of the Thirty, there may have been an extent to which he wished to justify and glorify his exploits. The fact that he does so by apparently taking up his command almost by accident suggests that on some level he found it important to appear a detached and almost unwilling participant in a similar manner to Caesar, who wished to appear as a servant of Rome who has done considerable good to the state. The use of a spare and very straightforward style

18. *Ibid*, p. 188-190. J. J. SCHLICHER ("The Development of Caesar's Narrative Style", *Classical Philology* 31, 1 [1936], p. 216-217) also notes that the distinct style that Caesar employs in the first book of the *De Bello Gallico* reflects the need for justification and defence of the aggressive policy adopted in the opening campaigns.

19. SCHLICHER, *op. cit.* (n. 18), p. 185.

20. J. DILLLERY (*Xenophon and the History of His Times*, 1995, p. 59) notes that these include versions in the *Persica* by Ctesias, and the *Anabasis* by Sophaenetus the Stymphalian, who was a veteran of the march, and perhaps a third author who may have been a source for the Oxyrhynchus historian. For further discussion see H. D. WESTLAKE "Diodorus and the Expedition of Cyrus", *Phoenix* 41 (1987), p. 241-254, especially p. 242-243.

of writing divorces his exploits from the political arena, so that he would not appear to be an embittered politician on the make to an Athenian audience, but would instead focus on his qualities and abilities to the exclusion of their reasons. Despite the strong sympathies to Sparta that he was to display elsewhere in his life, Xenophon avoids estranging his former home city with this approach and effectively leaves his options open to return by at once displaying his worth to his city in a military sense and reassuring his audience that he is not interested in using that ability in ways that might be inimical to the administration which he had left behind. Rhetoric is the art of persuasion, and surely this is persuasion of a most deliberate sort, albeit through the avoidance of many, though not all, of the forms and topoi with which it is most commonly associated. Caesar has been most canny in using a similar style to achieve similar effect among his contemporaries in Rome.

The important features of rhetoric in autobiographical historiography

Each field of expression is best suited to certain features of rhetorical expression. Effects of sounds and strong appeals to emotion that are so effective in speeches such as those of Demosthenes or Lysias are less effective in a form of expression where the point of persuasion is implied rather than made explicit, as is so often the case with works such as the *Anabasis* or the *De Bello Gallico* [21]. Features that are important include the arrangement of material to emotive effect, characterisation of the authors themselves, the foreign peoples that they encounter and of their subordinates in the field through speeches, the intervention of the personal voice of the authors and the citation of authorities. Finer features that are important include the use of similes in speeches, rhyme, alliteration, anacoluthon and so on [22]. The developments in rhetorical teaching between Xenophon's and Caesar's time are especially important to consider. The main event that has taken place within that time is a clear distinction between an Attic and an Asiatic school of rhetoric, both of which had considerable influence upon the rhetorical expression employed in the late Republic. G. A. Kennedy [23]

21. Speeches made within histories are far more open to the same style of analysis that we would apply to forensic rhetoric, but have been deliberately overlooked here so as to focus more on what makes the works of these historiographers unique.

22. F.-H. Mutschler (*Erzählstil und Propaganda in Caesars Kommentarien*, 1975, p. 118) notes the importance of the use of scenes after the fashion of drama and 'reflection' on the importance of a scene or event as a means of building atmosphere in Caesar's commentaries. It is worth noting that the scene from the *Anabasis* considered in this article would make a suitable candidate for the same analysis that F.-H. Mutschler has carried out.

23. G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, p. 61.

notes that the Scipionic favoured a simple and elegant style that is more to be associates with the type of Stoic influences mentioned by Cicero at *Pro Mur.*, 66, rather than the more grandly ornamented Asian style that was beginning to be established at the time. Given the popularity of Xenophon among the Scipionic circle and the fact that Cicero [24] describes Caesar's commentary style at *Brutus*, 262 as

> *Nudi enim sunt, recti et uenusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam ueste detracta*,
>
> For they are naked, upright and handsome, devoid of all decoration of speech like a of clothing,

it seems likely that Caesar's style is a product of the fashions among Scipio's associates. It is not possible, however, to state with complete conviction whether this reflects the passion for Xenophon's works in that milieu or the more general enthusiasm for the Attic school of rhetoric in Rome at that time.

The verdict of E. Norden with respect to both authors is that, when compared with their contemporaries in forensic oratory, they were far less likely to employ the finer features of style in abundance. Instead, both authors are credited with a very 'natural' style. The most explicit feature that E. Norden attributes to Caesar is a taste for very harsh asyndeta [25], as well as anaphora [26]. Antitheses are, however, in Norden's opinion only very seldom employed by Caesar. E. Norden [27] also notes that the apparent simplicity attributed to Xenophon by a wide range of commentators is in fact a deliberate and skilful application of a very direct style, rather than naïve and artless discourse. M. von Albrecht notes, too, that Caesar commonly makes uses of a structured approach to descriptions, which has a very economical appearance, but is in fact regular and highly structured in the arrangement different types of construction. Similarly, M. von Albrecht also notes that Caesar uses parallelism and symmetry in his speeches in a manner that belies the apparently naïve nature of his writing [28].

---

24. As noted by G. A. KENNEDY, *op. cit.* (n. 23), p. 288.

25. E. NORDEN (*Die antike Kunstprosa*, *op. cit.* [n. 6], p. 210) notes such features at *De Bello Civili* 1, 3, 3; 1, 6, 8; 1, 15, 2 and 1, 34, 4 f.

26. As discussed more fully by K. LORENZ, *Über Anaphora und Chiasmus in Caesars bellum Gallicum*, Progr. Kreuzburg, 1875, and Ph. FABIA, *De Orationibus quae sunt in commentariis Caesaris de bello Gallico*, Paris, 1889, p. 86 ff.

27. E. NORDEN, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 101-102.

28. M. VON ALBRECHT, *Masters of Roman Prose*, p. 62-63.

Battle scenes as an appropriate choice for comparison

The decision to examine these two battle scenes is based on their apparent similarity of theme and story, which gives us the greatest opportunity for meaningful comparison between two works, especially given the differing languages in which they are written and the lack of explicit acknowledgement of the works of Xenophon by Caesar. In both cases the authors are describing battle with peoples that can be regarded as a general threat to their nations, in both cases the warfare is of a more guerrilla nature, fought over a number of days over difficult terrain without a single set battle, and in both cases the intellect of the generals is instrumental to victory. The most important difference, when considering the role of rhetoric, is that Caesar had an interest in displaying a degree of clemency. The 'authenticity' of this display of clemency is debatable, as the settlement of the Helvetii and the provision of supplies described in *BG*, 1, 27 does as much to settle the borders with the German tribes and free Caesar's own troops for further campaigning as to show genuine concern for the fate of the conquered. Nonetheless, emphasising its apparent display ties in with the forgiving treatment that Caesar was to show to the great majority of his political opponents in the years after the Civil War. Xenophon, on the other hand, can treat the tribes that he meets as though they would always be external to Greek rule and Greek culture.

The following discussion, then, will examine the relevant features of expression starting at the broadest level of detail – that is the manner in which the discourse is arranged in each passage to create certain emotional and intellectual responses. The discussion will then proceed to standard rhetorical motifs such as citations of sources and appeals to emotion, and finally at the finest level detail effects of sound and similar rhetorical devices.

Arrangement for Rhetorical Effect

The strongest similarity in the two scenes can be seen in the rhetorical arrangement of material. It can be argued that the story line that is presented must reflect the events that actually took place, but there is considerable scope for both authors to stress particular elements much more than others. As rhetoric in narratives is designed to evoke a particular emotional response in the readers, the elements that are most likely to reflect authorial influence are those, which depict the character of the protagonists on either side. It is useful, then, to compare the structural elements of the two passages.

The narrative of *Anabasis* 4, 3, 1-34 proceeds as follows: The Greeks arrive near the river Centrites and are happy, feeling that the trouble they had in the mountains with the Carduchi was past, 4, 3, 1-2. They discover that the river crossing was blocked by Armenians, Medians and Chaldeans acting in league. The valiance of the Chaldean troops is stressed, 4, 3, 3-4. The Greeks discover that all the other places to cross the river are too deep and open to attack to be passable, 4, 3, 5-6. The Carduchi arrive from behind and close the path of retreat. The Greeks fall into despair, 4, 3, 7. Xenophon has a dream in which his fetters fall off, and shares it with Cheirisophus, who is cheered by the news, 4, 3, 8-9. At breakfast two young men tell Xenophon of the hidden ford across the river that they have found, 4, 3, 10-12. Xenophon pours libations, tells the story to Cheirisophus, who does likewise, and then they agree to split the army, with Xenophon to lead the rearguard, 4, 3, 13-15. The young men led the troops to the ford, with enemy cavalry keeping pace on the opposite bank. The Greeks made sacrifices while under fire from arrows. When the sacrifices were favourable, they set out, 4, 3, 16-19. Xenophon and his troops set off for the main ford, and the enemy followed them, 4, 3, 20-21. Lycius with cavalry and Aeschines with peltasts pursued the cavalry, 4, 3, 22. Cheirisophus crossed the river and pushed hill to drive off the enemy infantry, 4, 3, 23. Xenophon returned to the troops crossing over, Lycius pursued and caught the enemy baggage train and Cheirisophus held the bluffs, 4, 3, 24-25. Xenophon advanced on the Carduchi in squads, the Carduchi attack, and Cheirisophus sent archers, slingers and peltasts in support, 4, 3, 26-27. Xenophon ordered the reinforcements not to cross, and ordered his men to charge and then retreat in file and cross the river upon a signal, 4, 3, 28-29. When the Carduchi fired arrows and stones, the Greeks sang a paean, put the Carduchi to flight, and then retreated and crossed the river, 4, 3, 30-32. Only a few Greeks were wounded. Some of the reinforcements disobeyed orders and crossed over. They, too, were wounded. 4, 3, 33-34.

The actions of *BG*, 1, 21-29 are set out in the following way: Caesar finds out that the enemy are encamped at the foot of a mountain 8 miles away and that the approaches to the mountain were good. He sends Labienus with two legions to climb the mountain, while he advanced personally with the cavalry, while Publius Considius led the scouts, 1, 21. Labienus had reached the mountain and had his troops in hiding near the enemy camp. Considius announced to Caesar that Labienus and his troops were nowhere to be seen. Later scouts report that Labienus' men were in place and hiding and that Considius was afraid, since he did not see them. Caesar finished the day three miles from the mountain, 1, 22. After a day's

rest to organise grain stocks Caesar turns to the town of Bibrax for re-supply. The Helvetii are told of this by a deserter from the cavalry, and begin to follow and attack, 1, 23. Caesar sent the cavalry to screen his troop while he drew them up in a triple line of four legions, using a hill to his advantage. The Helvetii advanced uphill and charged, 1, 24. Caesar sent the horses away to remove the temptation to flee. The cohorts broke the Gauls by hurling javelins and charging downhill. The scattered Helvetii withdrew to the mountain. The Boii and the Tulingi faced Labienus' troops and provided a point for the other Helvetii to reform, as they were pursued by Caesar's legions. The Romans pressed the Helvetii on several fronts, 1, 25. The enemy retreated back up the mountain to the supplies and fought until late at night there, using the chariots as cover. The Helvetii eventually retreated and Caesar could not follow. Caesar sent messages to other tribes not to supply the enemy. Due to hunger the Helvetii surrender, while six thousand of the Verbigeni broke away in the night and fled to German held lands, 1, 27. Caesar sent men to recover the escapees and ordered the other tribes to return to their own lands. He ordered the Allobroges to provision them, Caesar ordered the Helvetii to rebuild their villages and towns and accepted the Boii and Haedui as allies, 1, 28. Tablets were discovered in the camp of the Helvetii, which set out how many men were in the migrating tribes, 1, 29.

It can be seen from the above analysis that there are a number of strong similarities and significant differences between the two passages under consideration. Firstly there is the terrain in which both battles take place. Both leaders are invaders to a mountainous area and are fighting against indigenous tribes. The terrain is tactically important in both cases as both the Greek and Roman forces and the barbarian tribes are separated, and Caesar and Xenophon both make effective use of terrain features to make the most of this separation. In both cases the fellow commanders and subordinates are important. In the case of Xenophon it is Cheirisophus who is mentioned most often. His position in the decision making process is only slightly subordinate to that of Xenophon, as can be seen by the agreement that they forge over the day's actions in *Anabasis*, 4, 3, 13-15. In the case of Caesar we hear of Labienus, who is trusted with considerable autonomy and repays that trust with his actions against the Helvetii at *BG*, 1, 26. Publius Considius, however, is noted explicitly for his panic at *BG*, 1, 22, may be viewed as analogous in the story to the Greek troops who disobey orders not pursue the fleeing enemy and are wounded in *Anabasis*, 4, 3, 33-34, as both provide an illustrative failure of their commander's, though not critical ones.

There is a similarity in the tension that is developed in the narrative in both passages. Both writers show the development of a difficult situation against an enemy that is poorly understood. Subsequently both figures contrive a plan for deliverance, with subordinates and colleagues filling important roles in its execution. The plans work, but not without a sense of physical danger and potential for great reversal. Finally, in both cases there is a passage, which diffuses the tension by showing the successful escape from danger and the consequences of its resolution.

A further point of congruence is the characterisation of opposing troops. A great general needs effective enemies. It is a difficult balancing act to show that on the one hand the opposing troops were difficult to overcome; yet on the other hand they were convincingly beaten by the better force. The characterisation of the troops can serve to show that they were brave and well-motivated without needing to imply some overwhelming superiority that needed to be overcome. In the case of Xenophon, there is a range of personalities that are depicted for the enemy. The Chaldeans are especially brave, whereas the Carduchi are easily deceived by the deployment of troops by Xenophon. There is no sense that the commanders of the enemy are particularly distinctive, and the way that the enemy retreat rather than continue to pursue the Greek forces once they have crossed the river shows that they are a territorial people, but not a hostile or conquering one. The combination of bravery, territoriality, the ability to co-ordinate actions and the ability to resist the urge to pursue needlessly gives a neutral to positive depiction of the enemy. Far from being bloodthirsty savages, Xenophon's enemy are worthy and aggressive foes.

Caesar depicts his enemies in a similar manner. E. Mensching notes that the Caesar uses distinct forms of characterisation for the Gauls, the Britains and the Germans, with a focus on the wild nature and the tactics employed in the face of disparate troop numbers in the case of the Germans. Sadly E. Mensching is silent on Caesar's handling of the Helvetians [29]. The list of troop numbers at *BG*, 1, 29 shows that his foes were certainly numerous enough to be dangerous. There is some sense of pathos in the depiction of their suffering in starvation after being routed and their surrender, though the latter is ameliorated somewhat by the generous resettlement that Caesar offers them. Caesar, after all, can clearly see that they would be worthwhile citizens for any new province and an effective buffer for Rome against other invaders. The careful depiction of the reason for the migrations of the Helvetii taking place ensures that they do not appear foolish or capricious. This is further emphasised by their ability to

29. E. MENSCHING, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 112-121.

maintain battle over a number of days and the co-ordinated response to the attacks on several fronts, which they receive – a feat also possible for the Carduchi in the *Anabasis*.

Characterisation is also important for the generals themselves. In the case of Xenophon there are three important points to observe. The first of these is his attitude towards his subordinates. This appears at a number of critical moments, including the discussion that he has with the scouts who find the river crossing, his orders to the troops at the start of the movement to escape from their predicament and his response to incidents such as the disobedience by the men under him when they pursue the fleeing Carduchi. In Caesar the characterisation is most strongly felt when Caesar is talking about subordinates, including situations where, as Mensching notes, the important focus becomes their opinions towards Caesar's command and the factors that make them subordinate to Caesar on some level [30]. There is, however, no mention of the interaction with them, when he himself is in a dangerous situation, such as when he sends the horses away during battle, and when he accepts the surrender of the enemy, when he shows clemency and obedience to the wishes of the senate. Despite the differences in content, we can see from these examples that a remarkably similar character emerges, namely that both generals are kind to those in a disadvantaged position compared with themselves, obedient to some sort of higher order and brave in the face of danger and discouragement.

The main differences between these passages come in the intent of the two commanders. Caesar comes to conquer, and his acceptance of surrender from the Helvetii in *BG*, 1, 27 and resettlement of the peoples in 1, 28 as a counter to the ongoing threat from the movement of the German tribes has no equivalent with Xenophon. Similarly, Xenophon is only seeking to bring his troops to safety and a safe exit from the field of battle with the enemy in rout can be regarded as a complete success in the circumstances. These differences highlight different qualities, which each commander might wish to highlight. In the case of Xenophon, the ethical dilemmas are entirely internalised. The interactions between Xenophon and his troops and the safety, which he provides to them is all important. Caesar has, however, two goals. He needs to be seen both as a commander concerned for success and the lives of his troops, but also as someone who leaves effective structures for the protection and eventual colonisation of a region behind him. As a result, he also needs to display the appearance, and to a degree the substance, of clemency towards the enemies, good management skills and foresight for the province that is to come. Lastly, while it is

30. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

unlikely that enemies within the Senate would be convinced by such a display, Caesar also displays to Roman society at large a sense of humble obedience towards those for whose benefit he is acting – namely the Senate and the people of Rome.

The Use of Diction

A range of devices are used by both authors to engage the reader's interest and sympathy in a way that gives the impression of guileless sincerity. The features of diction that are important in these passages can be summarised as follows.

Features relying on content

This includes features such as the use of characterisation in speeches, sudden emotional engagement with the topic material, exaggeration or understatement. Characterisation can further be suggested by the use of similes, whether brief or developed. Mensching notes that Xenophon uses a direct form of expression in speeches, as do Polybius and Sallust, where Caesar follows the norm of Roman historians, Livy and Tacitus in particular, with a tendency to indirect speech [31]. Lastly, as V. Gray notes [32] interventions by the writer to ensure the appropriate interpretation of an event by the reader and citations of sources for information that might otherwise appear unbelievable are also a common element in the *Anabasis*, and it is reasonable to look for similar features in the *De Bello Gallico*.

Appeals to Emotion

Exaggeration and Understatement: Despite the fact that both works appear to be cool and unbiased representations of the actions of the authors, there is a noticeable difference between the two writers in the use of exaggeration and understatement for dramatic effect. Understatement, or its appearance, however, creates an impression in the reader's mind that the dangers encountered must, on some level, have been greater than what is described. Hints of this use of understatement from Caesar include the ease with which his troops broke the lines of the Helvetii at *BG*, 1, 25. Similarly, the lack of details on troop numbers faced and the numbers wounded or slain as the battle progresses gives a sense of ease to Caesar's victory in *BG*, 1, 26-28. The reckoning of the numbers of the Helvetii and associated tribes at *BG*, 1, 28, however, with the exacting detail given, gives a sense of near overwhelming numbers overcome. This late revelation of the scope of Caesar's victory, when set in contrast to the apparently

31. E. Mensching, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 54.
32. V. Gray, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 112-116.

coolly achieved victory against not insurmountable odds, throws a sharp emphasis on the effectiveness of Caesar's campaigning without making any explicit claims.

There is no such equivalent reckoning in *Anabasis*, 4, 3, 1-34, though there are mentions of small numbers of casualties in a number of instances, as at 4, 3, 33. However, in Xenophon there is a sense of exaggeration not present in the *De Bello Gallico* in the description of the travails in the land of the Carduchi as

> […] κακὰ ὅσα οὐδὲ τὰ σύμπαντα ὑπὸ βασιλέως καὶ Τισσαφέρνους.
>
> […] more evils than they suffered altogether at the hands of the king and Tissaphernes. (*Anabasis*, 4, 3, 2.)

Interventions

Interventions in the *Anabasis* are often very terse. An example of this is the description of the magnitude of the evils suffered by the Greeks at *Anabasis* 4, 3, 2.

Interventions regarding the personal values of Caesar's opponents and generals are very common. Examples include the praise of Publius Considius at *BG*, 1, 21, which also has an element of citation, as his qualities are put forward as a matter of common opinion. Similarly, Caesar justifies the apparent cowardice of Labienus at *BG*, 1, 22.

A more traditional intervention is the description of the enemy's motivations, such as that for the decision of the Helvetians to follow the Romans at *BG*, 1, 24. Another example is the description of the escape of the Helvetii at *BG*, 1, 27.

Justification of Caesar's own actions in this way features most strongly in *BG*, 1, 29, in which the reasoning behind the peace-terms for the various tribes are set down.

Time and Space

Mensching discusses in detail the way that Cesar expands and collapses the progress of time and the distances travelled by the Roman troops. The most important point that Mensching makes is that this stands in contrast to Xenophon, who makes frequent and very sequential references to how far his troops travel and the times involved, even when there is little apparent action taking place, with 3 lines spent on Caesar's crossing of the Saône at *BG*, 1, 13, 1, compared with 38 lines on the Helvetians at 1, 13, 2 -1, 14, 7 [33]. This has the effect of focussing the reader's attentions still further on

33. E. MENSCHING, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 73-74.

the personalities of important figures on both sides in the *De Bello Gallico* at the expense of those of the soldiers who served them, when compared with the *Anabasis*.

Citations

The brevity of citation possible in the *Anabasis* can be seen in the attribution of the fighting qualities of the Chaldeans to an unknown source at *Anabasis* 4, 3, 4:

> Ἐλέγοντο δὲ οἱ Χαλδαῖοι ἐλεύθεροί τε καὶ ἄλκιμοι εἶναι.
>
> The Chaldaeans were said to be both free and brave.

Another very brief citation is that concerning the counsels of war held before the troops set out to cross the river at *Anabasis* 4, 3, 15:

> Καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς […]
>
> And it seemed good to them, that […]

An example of self-citation can be seen at 4, 3, 24, where Xenophon records how proceedings seemed to him during the battle:

> Ξενοφῶν δ' ἐπεὶ τὰ πέραν ἑώρα καλῶς γιγνόμενα […]
>
> But when Xenophon saw that things were going well on the other side […]

There are also, however, far more explicit citations, such as the news that is presented by the scouts about the river crossing which they discover at *Anabasis* 4, 3, 11:

> Καὶ τότε ἔλεγον ὅτι τυγχάνοιεν φρύγανα συλλέγοντες ὡς ἐπὶ πῦρ […]
>
> And then they said that they had happened to be gathering sticks for the fire […]

Xenophon emphasises the value for the expedition that is to come from this information by a rhetorical use of dramatic foreshadowing at 4, 3, 10:

> […] ἐξείη αὐτῷ […] προσελθεῖν καὶ εἰ καθεύδοι ἐπεγείραντα εἰπεῖν, εἴ τίς τι ἔχοι τῶν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον.
>
> […] they had permission […] to approach him and, if he were sleeping, to awaken him, if one had anything to say concerning the business of war.

In Caesar there is a great deal of self-citation. For example, in *BG*, 1, 20, Caesar sets out what others say about Dumnorix and states what he himself says about him. Another example is the discovery by Caesar of the escape of the Helvetii at *BG*, 1, 28. Third person citations from scouts are

common, as in *BG*, 1, 21 and 1, 22. Another source of citation that Caesar uses is reports from captives, as at *BG*, 1, 22. There is something of the intervention and citation combined at *BG*, 1, 22, where Caesar cites the words of his scouts when mentioning that Considius had reacted in fear to the Helvetians.

Citations in Caesar can even mention physical sources of information. In the passage under consideration tablets in Greek, which set down the statistics for the Helvetian tribes, are mentioned at *BG*, 1, 29.

Both authors, therefore, use a range of citations, including reports from scouts, captured enemy troops and even the discovery of physical material to reveal information of things that they themselves could not have seen. A high priority is placed, therefore, in both works on the appearance of integrity of information to support the image that they give of what has taken place. A notable difference is that Xenophon, in the case of the reports by the scouts regarding the river crossing, appears to use his information to generate a sense of drama, whereas Caesar does so more to create a justification for the actions that he took after the fact.

Features relying on expression:

This includes the finer details used to build tension or invite identification with certain aspects of the narrative. The choice of features described below is based on Norden's comments on Xenophon's and Caesar's style [34].

Anaphora

Both authors make frequent use of anaphora, though they are not slavish in the repetition. Many of the anaphora outlined below contribute to the rhetorical climaxes which are a common feature to build narrative tension in both authors.

Xenophon:

> [...] καὶ τἀπιτήδεια ἔχοντες καὶ πολλὰ [...] μνημονεύοντες. (4, 3, 2.)
>
> [...] ὁρῶσι μὲν τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὴν δυσπορίαν, ὁρῶσι δὲ τοὺς διαβαίνειν κωλύσοντας, ὁρῶσι δὲ τοῖς διαβαίνουσιν ἐπικεισομένους τοὺς Καρδούχους ὄπισθεν. (4, 3, 7.)
>
> [...] εἰ καθεύδοι ἐπεγείραντα εἰπεῖν, εἰ τίς τι ἔχοι τῶν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον. (4, 3, 10.)
>
> Σπείσας δ' εὐθὺς [...] Σπείσαντες δὲ [...]. (4, 3, 13-14.)

34. E. NORDEN, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 101-102 and 210, respectively.

[...] ὁρῶντες μὲν τοὺς ἀμφὶ Χειρίσοφον [...], ὁρῶντες δὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ Ξενοφῶντα [...]. (4, 3, 21.)

Λύκιος δ' ὁ τὴν τάξιν ἔχων [...] Αἰσχίνης ὁ τὴν τάξιν τῶν πελταστῶν [...] (4, 3, 22.)

[...] ὁρῶντες μὲν τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἱππέας φεύγοντας, ὁρῶντες δ' ὁπλίτας [...] (4, 3, 23.)

[...] οἱ μὲν ὑποζυγίων, οἱ δὲ σκευῶν, οἱ δ' ἑταιρῶν. (4, 3, 29-30.)

[...] ἱκανῶς πρὸς τὸ ἐπιδραμεῖν καὶ φεύγειν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ εἰς χεῖρας δέχεσθαι οὐχ ἱκανῶς. (4, 3, 31.)

[...] οἱ μέν πολέμιοι ἔφευγον [...] οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες [...] ἔφευγον [...] (4, 3, 32.)

Caesar:

[...] *qualis esset natura montis et qualis in circuitu ascensus*. (*BG*, 1, 21, 1.)

[...] *seu quod* [...] *existimarent, eo magis quod* [...] *commisissent, siue eo quod* [...] *confiderent*. (*BG*, 1, 23, 3.)

[...] *neque euellere neque* [...] *pugnare poterant*. (*BG*, 1, 25, 3.)

[...] *alteri se* [...] *receperunt, alteri* [...] *se contulerunt*. (*BG*, 1, 26, 1.)

[...] *et propter uulnera militum et propter sepulturam occisorum*. (*BG*, 1, 26, 5.)

[...] *siue timore perterriti,* [...]*, siue spe salutis inducti*. (*BG*, 1, 27, 4 .)

Asyndeta

Asyndeta are far more in Caesar than in Xenophon. The most notable examples from this passage are set out below.

Caesar:

Considius equo admisso ad eum accurrit, dicit [...] (*BG*, 1, 22, 2.)

Caesar ad Lingonas litteras misit nuntiosque misit, ne eos frumento neue alia re iuuarent: qui si iuuissent [...] (*BG*, 1, 26, 6.)

[...] *obsides, arma, seruos,* [...]*, poposcit*. (*BG*, 1, 27, 3.)

[...] *obsidibus, armis, perfugis traditis*. (*BG*, 1, 28, 2.)

Polysyndeta

Genuine polysyndeta are more common in Xenophon than in Caesar, but are, nevertheless, apparent in both authors. The notable difference between the two authors is that Caesar makes more common use of a range of conjunctions within the one sentence, as in *BG*, 1, 26, 3 cited below.

Xenophon:

> […] οὗτοι Ὀρόντα καὶ Ἀρτούχα Ἀρμένιοι καὶ Μάρδοι καὶ Χαλδαῖοι μισθοφόροι. (4, 3, 4.)
>
> […] γέροντά τε καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ παιδίσκας […] (4, 3, 11.)
>
> […] καὶ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ ποταμοῦ […] καὶ αὐτὸς πρῶτος Χειρίσοφος […] καὶ ἀποδὺς […] καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι παρήγγελλε, καὶ τοὺς λοχαγοὺς ἐκέλευεν […] (4, 3, 17.)
>
> […] τοὺς πελταστὰς καὶ σφενδονήτας καὶ τοξότας καὶ κελεύει […] (4, 3, 27.)

Caesar:

> […] *et montem ab suis teneri et Heluetios castra mouisse et Considium timore perterritum* […] *pro uiso sibi renuntiauisse*. (*BG*, 1, 22, 4.)
>
> […] *et e loco superiore* […] *et nonnulli inter carros* […] *ac tragulas subiciebant nostrosque uulnerabant*. (*BG*, 1, 26, 3.)

Rhetorical Climax

Both authors make frequent use of striking effects of sound and rhythm to build towards a climax in the actions depicted. A notable difference is that Caesar will build to a climax, divert the tension, and then build the tension further again by using similar language between two climactic episodes.

Xenophon:

A sense of rhetorical climax leading up to the revelation of the solution to the dilemma of the Greeks is created by the anaphora in 4, 3, 7 cited above, together with the rhymes in -ους […] -ους in the final clause. The assonance of ἀριστῶντι καὶ δειπνοῦντι and εἰ καθεύδοι […], εἴ τίς τι ἔχοι in 4, 3, 10 builds tension towards the revelation of the news of the scouts. The four-fold repetition of forms of διαβαίνω in 4, 3, 12 […] διαβῆναι […] διαβαίνειν […] διαβῆναι […] διαβάντες […] echoes the sense of wonder building in the audience as they find out that the crossing will be possible, which then relieves some of the tension for the reader for the time being. This is then picked up again with ἐπὶ τὴν διάβασιν […]

κατὰ τὴν διάβασιν […] at 4, 3, 16-17, leading up to the climactic description of the sacrifice to the river before embarking at 4, 3, 17 as the last stage of the preparation καὶ οἱ μὲν μάντεις ἐσφαγιάζοντο εἰς τὸν ποταμόν. The repetition of ὁρῶντες μὲν […], ὁρῶντες δὲ […] in 4, 3, 21 noted above under anaphora is resolved in a rhetorical climax by the final participle phrase δείσαντες μὴ ἀποληφθείησαν. The deployment of the Greek troops to face the Carduchi as the retreat is underway and the scene that confronts the Carduchi before they advance is built up with long coordinating phrases marked by frequent rhymes in -ους in 4, 3, 26-27, as in καὶ τοὺς μὲν λοχαγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐνωμοτάρχους πρὸς τῶν Καρδούχων ἰέναι, οὐραγοὺς δὲ […] τοὺς ὀπισθοφύλακας τοῦ ὄχλου ψιλουμένους καὶ ὀλίγους ἤδη φαινομένους with the resolution of the climax coming in the description of the Carduchi singing ᾠδάς τινας ᾄδοντες. The preparations of the Carduchi to cross the river and the efforts to prevent them in 4, 3, 28 are similarly characterised by a repetition of διαβάντας […] διαβαίνειν […] διαβησομένους, with the swarming opposition to that advance characterised by the assonance of ἐναντίους ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν σφῶν ἐμβαίνειν.

Caesar:

The description of the qualifications of Publius Considius with its coordinating mentions of his famous mentors *et in exercitu L. Sullae et postea in M. Crassi fuerat* builds tension before his dispatch to scout enemy positions at *BG*, 1, 21, 3. The rhyme of endings in *-em*, *-it* at *BG*, 1, 22, 3 *Caesar suas copias in proximum collem subducit, aciem instruit* emphasises the rise in tension as Casesar leads his troops into action for the first time in this episode. This expression is near exactly repeated to create the sense of tension again at 1, 24, 1 : *copias suas Caesar in proximum collem subducit equitatumque,* […]*, misit*. The deployment of the Helvetian and Roman troops and the build up of tension before battle is emphasised by the repetition of […] *in unum locum conferri* […] *in unum locum contulerunt* in 1, 24, 3-4. A similar effect is achieved by the language used to describe the drawing up of the Roman battle lines at *BG*, 1, 25, 7 : *ut uictis ac summotis resisteret,* […]*, ut uenientes sustineret*.

Conclusion

The first point to note is that, if Caesar was influenced by Xenophon in his composition of *BG*, 1, 21-29, it was not a slavish copy of each of the features characteristic of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, but rather an attempt to create a passage that had a familiar feel, but which also emphasised the

issues regarding the conflict with the Gallic tribes which Caesar found important on a political and personal level. These issues that are particular to Caesar include the issue of whether he should have come to armed conflict with the Gallic tribes at all and the extent to which the positive outcome reflects the personal skill of Caesar as a general in comparison with his contemporaries.

The rhetorical devices employed by both authors give the impression of a naïve style, yet are actually the result of careful placement of a range of devices, which build the reader's interest in the action, sympathy for the figures involved and admiration for qualities of the opponents, which were faced. As has been noted above, the influence of the *Cyropaedia* on Caesar's writing is highly likely, given the contemporary witnesses that we have to its popularity and availability in his social circle. The focus of that work on the development of the desirable character traits of a rule in Cyrus will have been an important example for Caesar's writing in this passage, where we get our earliest self-testimony of his skills as a general and leader of men. And yet one of the difficulties Caesar must have faced is how to achieve this while maintaining a self-effacing and humble pose as the author of his own actions. More generally, E. Mensching, following Th. Mommsen, notes that both authors compress any details of their own lives beyond the time covered by their memoirs to give an autobiographical work that has the outer form of historiography [35]. Another symptom of the apparent self-effacement is that way that subordinates are given considerable focus in both the passage from the *Anabasis* and the *De Bello Gallico* discussed here, and the emphasis given to their actions and characters effectively suggests the qualities, which are to be considered in their superiors without constant reference to either Xenophon or Caesar. Frequent mentions of these subordinates also allow for the use of devices such as appeals to the reader's emotions without doing so through a focus on the authors themselves, which might be considered self-aggrandising or crass.

The question of whether Caesar could have been influenced by the *Anabasis* cannot be answered by direct testimony. However, the evidence presented above concerning popularity of other works of Xenophon among the literary circles in which Caesar moved, the striking similarity in topic material, the lack of other famous military commentaries at that period and the similarities in style suggest that the influence should be accepted. The factors that have held us back from this judgement previously included difficulty in showing any direct influence on content and language, which

35. E. MENSCHING, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 163 and 166.

we would use in other forms of inter-textual study, and the difficult question of the familiarity of educated readers of the late Republic with the *Anabasis*. The arguments here show us, perhaps, a type of silent evidence for the popularity of that work among at least some readers, if not with Cicero.

Adam BARTLEY
University of Kent at Canterbury