

Rhetoric Used by the Voice of the Narrator in Julius Caesar's *The Civil War*

Debbie Turkilsen
Third Year Undergraduate,
University of New England

In 2011, Luca Grillo published an article discussing the voice of the narrator within Julius Caesar's text *The Civil War* in which he argued that Caesar 'does not try to persuade; rather facts and judgements...are recorded with the same matter of fact tone'.¹ However, even though Caesar chose to write in a style that was predominantly simple and unadorned, he did choose to use his rhetorical training to emphasise portions of the text in *The Civil War* in a highly decorative manner. Caesar also used the simplicity of his word choice in particular paragraphs of his work to manipulate the imagery of his narration. This essay will analyse certain elements of Book I of *The Civil War* to argue against Grillo's contention that Caesar 'does not try to persuade' and to determine the ways in which Caesar intentionally used the voice of the narrator as a means of persuasion. It will demonstrate the rhetorical devices used by Caesar within the text to infiltrate the voice of the narrator and thus coerce the reader into accepting Caesar's version of events regarding the Civil War and his use of narrative technique to falsify the record of particular events. This essay will also show that Caesar's 'matter-of-fact' tone contradicts the subliminal imagery he used to convince the Roman populace that his stance against Pompey was correct.

¹ Luca Grillo, 'Scribam Ipse De Me: The Personality of the Narrator in Caesar's *Bellum Civile*', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 132 (2011), 246.

Grillo asserts that *The Civil War* dealt with the topic of Civil War in Rome and, as such, was 'biased, since Caesar played a role in many...events', which Grillo himself states were unpleasant.² Appian records instances of civil unrest in his work *The Civil Wars* and states that 'undisciplined arrogance' caused evil to grow within Rome causing 'large armies...to attack [their own country] as though it were enemy soil'.³ Appian encapsulates the feelings of horror which the topic of Civil War caused the Roman people. Caesar understood the Roman psyche against Civil War, the Roman virtue of liberty (*libertas*), and the Roman declaration that the Republic was the property of the people.⁴ Liberty was a concept defended by the senate of the Roman Republic against those aiming at 'extraordinary power' who would hold the balance of power.⁵ All proposals would be debated by the senate; this process was viewed as the best defence against tyranny.⁶ Deciding to write his Commentary in the literary style of a 'third-person narrative' enabled Caesar to attempt to compose an 'objective history'.⁷ This is a rhetorical pretence used by the author to distance himself from the narrative. Cicero stated that the voice of the narrator or orator 'who desire to win...the goodwill' of their audience 'shape and adapt themselves completely' to gain both agreement of opinion and approval.⁸ The readers of Caesar's work were aware of his authorship and recognised 'it was the business of the artist to persuade'.⁹ This contradicts Grillo's contention that the voice of the narrator is not being used as a means of persuasion.

The narrative technique of character portrayal is an essential component of Caesar's writing and argument within the text. This is evident in his character portrayals of certain individuals such as Scipio, Pompey and Lentulus in the first five chapters of *The Civil War* Book I and his allegations that liberty had been definitively stripped from the Roman senate and people.¹⁰ Caesar claims these men made statements such as:

'but if they kept an eye on Caesar and tried to please him... he would decide for himself what to do and would not obey the authority of the Senate'; 'Less impetuous views were expressed...these were all attacked and abused by the consul Lucius Lentulus'; 'the tribunes of the plebs were forced to flee immediately from the city'.¹¹

2 *Ibid.*, 246.

3 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, I.2, trans. John Carter (Camberwell: Penguin Books Australia Ltd, 2000): 'Tiberius Gracchus...became the first man to die from civil unrest...disorders did not end with that foul act...Undisciplined arrogance soon became the rule, along with a shameful contempt for law and justice. As this evil grew...large armies were led with violence against their native land by men who had been exiled, or condemned in the courts, or were feuding amongst themselves over some office or command...they attacked [their own country] as if it were foreign soil'.

4 Cicero, *The Republic*, 1.39, 47 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998): '...the Republic is the property of the public...brought together by legal consent and community of interest'; 'Nothing is sweeter than liberty. Yet if it isn't equal throughout, it isn't liberty at all'.

5 Kurt A. Raaflaub, 'Caesar the Liberator?', in *Caesar Against Liberty?: Perspectives on his Autocracy*, eds. Francis Cairns & Elaine Fantham (Cambridge: Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., 2003), 51.

6 Kurt A. Raaflaub (2003), 49; App. *B.C.* 2.30: An example of this fear of tyranny is expressed by a debate which was said to occur as the Civil War between the Caesarians and Pompeians began. Curio, a member of the senate, argued that both sides should lay down their arms. Marcellus, another senator, argued that by doing this liberty would be lost and Rome would submit to Caesar as master.

7 William Batstone & Cynthia Damon, *Caesar's Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 145.

8 Cicero, *Orator*, 24, ed. Jeffery Henderson (Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 1962): All 'qui probari volunt voluntatem...fingunt et accomodant' themselves to gain approval.

9 Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 3.3.12.4, ed. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 2001): 'artificis est persuadere'.

10 Caesar, *The Civil War: Books I & II*, I.1-5, ed. J. M. Carter (Oxford & Havertown: Oxbow Books, 2014).

11 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.1.1.3; 1.2.2.4; 1.5.5: 'Sin Caesarem respiciant atque eius gratiam sequantur...se sibi consilium capturum

As Cicero writes, ‘and when he has gained attention by the introduction’ the narrator can then make his own case, which in *The Civil War* is the claim that he is acting for the liberty of the people.¹² Caesar uses the narrator’s voice to further enhance this loss of liberty by a careful selection of word choice which, when used repetitively in a single paragraph, convey a sense of isolation between the senate and people. This is evident in Chapter Two of *The Civil War* when Caesar chooses words such as ‘these views were...attacked...abused by the consul...taking fright from this abuse...thus the majority...forced...by fear...by threats...under duress’.¹³ By phrasing the verbs in a passive form the central message is one of fear, compulsion and unwillingness being forced upon the people.

Caesar is again careful in word choice when giving his speech to his soldiers in Chapter Seven by stating in indirect speech that Pompey ‘had been detached from him [by his enemies] and his judgment twisted from malice and jealousy of his own renown’.¹⁴ Ronald Mellor argues that Caesar chose the literary technique of indirect discourse to establish ‘less of an interruption in the narrative flow’.¹⁵ However Caesar’s speech is highly passionate and filled with emotional sentiment.¹⁶ The narrator amplifies this sentiment through careful word selection which highlights personal insult: ‘he detailed all the wrongs done to him by his enemies...from malice and jealousy of his own renown’.¹⁷ Even though Caesar has chosen to address his soldiers in indirect speech, his personal feelings are revealed. Grillo’s contention that ‘judgements...are recorded with the same ‘matter-of-fact tone’ is incorrect. The narrator is purposely consulting with his audience, the people of Rome.¹⁸

William Batstone and Cynthia Damon argue that Caesar’s characterisation of the Pompeians in the first five chapters was extremely damaging to their reputation, creating a scene ‘of cruel duplicity against Caesar’s silence’.¹⁹ This is further enhanced by the implication that the Pompeians were claiming that the senate still held its authority and liberty to discuss the matter of Caesar.²⁰ However, in the same paragraph this illusion is exposed with Lentulus asserting ‘he...would deny the authority of the Senate’.²¹ This type of invective was designed to bring ‘hatred to those whose advantages had been ruined by vice’.²² This characterisation of the Pompeians stands in direct contrast to the image Caesar creates for himself. In the first five chapters of *The Civil War* the narrator describes Caesar’s practice of using leniency (*lenitas*).²³ An analysis of Cicero’s letters

neque senatus auctoritati obtemperatum’; ‘dixerat aliquis leniorem sententiam...hi omnes convicio L. Lentuli consulis correpti exagitabantur’; ‘profugiunt statim ex urbe tribuni plebis’.

12 Cic. *Or.* 50: ‘cumque animos prima aggressionem occupaverit’.

13 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.2.4-6: ‘hi...convicio...consulis correpti exagitabantur...perterritus conviciis...sic...terrore...compulsi, inviti, coacti’.

14 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.7.1: Pompey ‘deductum ac depravatam...invidia atque obtrectatione laudis suae’.

15 Ronald Mellor, *The Roman Historians* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 173.

16 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.7

17 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.7.1: ‘omnium temporum iniurias inimicorum in se commemorat...invidia atque obtrectatione laudis suae’.

18 Cic. *Or.* 138: ‘he will seem to consult the audience...sometimes even with the opponent; he will portray the talk and ways of men...he will divert the attention of the audience from the point at issue’.

19 Batstone & Damon (2006), 45-46.

20 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.1.2

21 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.1.3: ‘se...neque senatus auctoritati obtemperatum’.

22 Quint. *Inst. Or.* 3.7.19: ‘quibusdam bona vitiis corrupta odium’.

23 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.1.4, 2.2, 5.5: Charlton T. Lewis, *An Elementary Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 466: *lenitas* is defined as a form of lenience or mildness against one’s enemies.

indicates that leniency was a virtue which Caesar was attempting to promote both privately and publicly.²⁴ This suggests Caesar used the voice of narrator to create an image of himself as someone without malice or anger towards his enemies, which contradicts Grillo's denial that the narrator is being used as a means of persuasion.

Grillo argues that the narrator uses an 'impersonal narrative without rhetorical adornment'.²⁵ However, the narrator uses assonance and the narrative technique of tricolon crescens to heighten the panic and personal danger felt by the Caesarians in Rome, such as 'Caesar's relations were allowed no time...the tribunes of the plebs were unable to entreat against...their danger...they had been restrained from voting'.²⁶ These statements must be taken in context with Caesar's use of alliteration to describe the following events: 'since after seven days they were forced to look to their own safety'.²⁷ This is a deliberate use of rhetorical technique by Caesar to create tension between Pompeian and Caesarian supporters and belies a 'matter-of-fact' tone. Caesar also aligns his character with the verbal action of discussion to emphasise his readiness to debate the issue of war.²⁸ Caesar states that 'discussion would resolve...their differences', accusing the enemy of not being able 'to spare the time for discussion', and that he attempted to mediate a peace through discussion 'several times in vain'.²⁹ Moreover, Caesar uses the act of discussion in a positive manner when talking of himself. For the Pompeian narrative it is attributed to duplicitous actions or threatening language, such as 'Domitius...spoke secretly with a few of his associates...to make a plan to escape', that soldiers belonging to the Pompeian side gained 'the chance of unimpeded discussion' with Caesar's soldiers 'by the absence of their commanders', and accusing Petreius, a Pompeian commander, of killing 'the soldiers he interrupted in discussion'.³⁰ The narrator is attempting to persuade his audience by subliminally using the same word to demonstrate the different temperaments between the two camps.

Cicero, in his work *The Orator*, discusses the importance of invention (*inventio*) in rhetorical training and argument structure:

'For to discover and decide what to say is important and is to eloquence what the mind is to the body, but it is a matter of ordinary intelligence rather than of eloquence: for that matter is there any cause in which intelligence is superfluous?'³¹

By means of invention an author could conceal episodes which could not be explained or bring forward other aspects to distract the audience from episodes which contain elements that would

24 Cicero, *Ad Atticus*, IX.7B; IX.7C.1; IX.16; XI.12

25 Grillo (2011), 244.

26 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.5.1: the use of assonance is demonstrated by the vowel sounds '*nec docendi Caesaris propinquis...nec tribunis plebis sui periculi deprecandi neque...extremi iuris intercessione retinendi*'.

27 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.5.2: '*sed de sua salute septimo die cogitare coguntur*'.

28 C. T. Lewis (1993), 140, 168: *Colloquor* is defined as the act of 'discussing, talking together/over' certain issues.

29 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.9.6; I.11.3; I.22.1; I.26; I.32; I.77; I.84; I.85: '*per colloquia...controversiae componantur*'; '*tempus...colloquio non dare*'; '*colloquitur: velle, si sibi fiat potestas, Caesarem convenire*'; '*a colloquio...Pompeium proficiscitur...saepius rem frustra*'.

30 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.19, 74, 75: '*Domitius...arcano cum paucis familiaribus suis colloquitur consiliumque fugae capere*'; '*quorum discessu liberam nacti milites colloquiorum facultatem*'; '*colloquia militum interrumpit...interficiunt*'.

31 C. T. Lewis (1993), 441: *inventio* is defined as 'the art of inventing'; Cic. *Or.* 44: 'to discover and decide what you will say is important, to be sure, and is to eloquence what the mind is to the body; but it is a matter of ordinary intelligence rather than eloquence'.

weaken his position.³² Caesar's use of invention is evident in his Commentary where he deliberately excludes events such as the abdication of Labienus and the crossing of the river Rubicon.³³ Caesar chose to divert attention from his crossing of the Rubicon by having the narrator concentrate on acts committed by the Pompeians against him and their effects upon his soldiers.³⁴ Batsone and Damon argue that the clarity of the structure depicting major characters and their causes in Chapters One to Eleven in *The Civil War* 'violates chronology and ignores...the illegality of Caesar crossing the Rubicon'.³⁵ As Cynthia Damon asserted in a later article, invention contained a balance of 'true and truth-like' and she proposes that Caesar 'was either forgetful or calculating' in his omission of these events.³⁶ Close analysis of the text thus supports a more compelling argument for Caesar being deliberately calculating in his topic selection and word choice, such as alternate terms of 'hostile enemies' (*inimicus*) and 'recalled soldiers' (*evocatus*).³⁷ There is an emphasis not only upon the actions of Caesar's enemies within the text but his depiction as victim is enhanced by the image of his enemies being supplemented with friends or retired soldiers of the Pompeian generals being called forth to fight against him. This is also evident with the narrative technique used to portray the moment of the 'Ultimate Decree of the Senate' (*Senatus Consultum Ultimum*) being passed against Caesar.³⁸ The majority of the verbs in Chapter Five are either in the subjunctive or passive form – 'having been recorded', 'having been passed', 'to be resolved' – which places emphasis on the personal injury to Caesar's dignity.³⁹ These techniques equate to acts of persuasion as Caesar endeavours to justify his own actions.⁴⁰

Caesar also attempts to persuade with his insinuation by word choice and syntax that the Pompeians were treating the Republic as their own Private Republic.⁴¹ This is backed up by Caesar's claims that for eight years as the man who 'had carried the Republic'.⁴² Caesar accuses Pompey of using private channels in an attempt to negotiate, implying that Pompey was worried about his own self more so than the people and was preventing the opportunity for public debate.⁴³ As Batsone and Damon argue, this gives Caesar freedom within the text as private concerns are more difficult to verify, removing him from 'the constraints of veracity'.⁴⁴ However, evidence stipulates that Caesar had chosen to defend himself for his own private reasons: 'When did anyone hear such

32 Cic. *Or.* 49: 'invenire et iudicare quid dicas magna illa quidem sunt et tanquam animi instar in corpore, sed propria magis prudentiae quam eloquentiae: qua tamen in causa est vacua prudentia?'

33 Cic. *Ad. Att.* VII.12.5: 'It is pretty well established that Labienus has left Caesar'; App. *Civ. Wars* 1.100: Sulla c.82-80 BC and the change of laws gave authority to Governors of provinces while outside the boundary of the city of Rome. Crossing the river Rubicon in military readiness was seen as an act of war.

34 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.8.1

35 Batsone & Damon (2006), 61.

36 Cynthia Damon, 'Rhetoric & Historiography', in *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, eds. William Dominik & Jon Hall (Malden, Oxford & Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 440, 442.

37 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.4: C. T. Lewis (1993), 288, 416: *inimicus* is defined as one who is hostile, an enemy, hateful, and someone who intends to do someone injurious harm, whereas *evocatus* is more subtle in meaning, usually alluding to the recall of veteran soldiers.

38 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.5; J. M. Carter, 'Commentary', in Julius Caesar, *The Civil War: Books I & II*, ed. J. M. Carter (Oxford & Havertown: Oxbow Books, 2014), 159: The *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* was an emergency decree enacted by the senate to acknowledge 'that the state was in danger and that strong action was required'.

39 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.3-4: *perscribuntur*, '*decernitur*', *deduci*'.

40 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.8.1: 'Having discovered the feelings of his soldiers, he set out with his legion to Ariminum'.

41 Batsone & Damon (2006), 41: Taking the *Res Publica* and turning it into their own private state (*Res Privata*).

42 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.7.7: '*rem publicam...gesserint*'. 'The man who will have carried the Republic'.

43 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.8.2.4.

44 Batsone & Damon (2006), 58.

a thing from you, Caesar, and what other object did your arms wish other than repelling insult from yourself?⁴⁵ Once again, Caesar is attempting to persuade his audience by manipulating facts and transferring 'to his opponent the blame for the very act with which he is charged.'⁴⁶

As mentioned earlier, Grillo asserts that, in certain sections of *The Civil War*, Caesar wrote an 'impersonal narrative without rhetorical adornment...[which] achieves credibility'.⁴⁷ However, each of these segments contain the private thoughts and judgements of Caesar about his rivals effectively contradicting Grillo's contention of 'impersonal narrative'.⁴⁸ While it could be argued that Grillo was insinuating that Caesar had depersonalised the narrative to make these accusations appear factual, close analysis of certain segments of the text brought forth by Grillo as evidence demonstrate an intentional objective to purposely persuade the audience. For example, Chapter Six claims money 'was exacted from the towns, and taken from the temples', yet Caesar later contradicts this claim in Chapter Fourteen.⁴⁹ This provides evidence that Caesar was purposely attempting to use a seemingly 'impersonal narrative' as a means of persuasion and allowing his own personal motivations to influence the text.

Rhetorical artifice is also evident in Chapter Sixty-Seven of the text when Caesar claims 'in daylight, when all could see him, a man felt ashamed, and further ashamed beneath the gaze of officers and centurions who stood beside him'.⁵⁰ Mellor argues that Caesar avoided 'rhetorical artifice and moralising' which he viewed as prevalent in other histories such as Livy's *The History of the City of Rome* and Tacitus' *Histories*.⁵¹ However, this passage enhances the theme of morality by alleging the soldiers felt shame by the rhetorical use of onomatopoeia and the use of the letter 'm'. Caesar had previously stated that soldiers were driven more by fear rather than oath when it came to events such as the Civil War.⁵² Caesar is careful not to associate feelings of shame with his own men, only the Pompeians. This passage thus draws Mellor's argument into question.

Caesar makes use of the rhetorical devices of ellipsis and asyndeton throughout the text, which quicken the speed of the narrative.⁵³ It could be argued that these techniques allow Caesar to confine and simplify the progression of the events which were unfolding and camouflage the fact that many in Italy at this time were hesitant to join him.⁵⁴ The narrator combines asyndeton and assonance to increase the panic both of himself and the Roman populace as images of the Pompeians bringing Civil War back to Italy are combined with passive verb endings, portraying an

45 Cicero, *Pro Ligario*, 18, ed. Jeffery Henderson (Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 1953): 'Quando hoc quisquam ex te, Caesar, audivit, aut tua quid aliud arma voluerunt nisi a te contumeliam propulsare?'

46 Cic. *Or.* 137.17-19: *ut in eo ipso, in quo reprehendatur, culpam in adversarium conferat*'.

47 Grillo (2011), 244: These are specifically I.1, 6, 20, 67 & 69.

48 Caes. *Civ. War*, I.1: accusations of treacherous behaviour by Lentulus; I.6: tyrannical behaviour of Pompeians; I.20: cowardice of Domitius; I.67: accusations of action usually attributed to factions; I.69: accusations of arrogance.

49 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.6.8; I.14.1: Money 'a municipiis exiguntur, e fanis tolluntur'; 'The consul Lentulus had come to open the treasury and provide funds for Pompey in accordance with a senatorial decree, he fled from the city the moment he had opened the inner treasury'.

50 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.67.4: *lucem multum per se pudorem omnium oculis, multum etiam tribunorum militum...centurionum praesentium*'.

51 Mellor (1999), 173-174.

52 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.67.3

53 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.6.1, 33.4: asyndeton is used with short sentences creating a rapid effect without the use of conjunctions; I. 14-15: these two chapters are examples of segments where Caesar has used ellipsis.

54 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.53

imagery rich with fear, injury and suffering by combining the names of Pompey, Sulla and Juba, a king from the East.⁵⁵

Ogilvie argues that the form of Commentary was adopted by Roman statesmen as a ‘factual account of their achievements...published for...self-justification’ and to benefit descendants.⁵⁶ It is evident that Caesar was developing a scenario that, not only himself but Rome also, was in grave peril, thereby justifying Caesar’s future actions for posterity. Given that the style of Commentary allowed the author opportunity to justify his actions, it is expected that persuasive rhetoric would be an element of this style of writing. Caesar readily portrayed himself as the avenger of Rome.⁵⁷ Caesar heightens the divide between his own forces and that of Pompey by making a clear delineation of ‘our forces’ when describing his men as joined with Rome, creating the image of a united front against ‘the forces of them’, the Pompeian forces.⁵⁸

Caesar employs assonance in portions of the text where he intentionally attempts to heighten the element of drama. Caesar chooses to augment the superior position of the Pompeian forces using language to highlight the fact that the Lusitani and other native tribes, who had joined the Pompeians, were accustomed to spending long periods of time in these regions.⁵⁹ Caesar again uses assonance shortly after to emphasise the massive effort of his undermanned forces still fighting back even when all the weapons had been ‘thrown and used up’ leaving the cohorts with limited resources.⁶⁰ As Cicero states, this creates a rhythm in prose which is used for narrative, persuasion, and ‘with speech...as a form of beauty and light’.⁶¹ Caesar also uses assonance to describe the panic in Rome:

‘throughout all of Italy conscriptions were being held, weapons were being requisitioned... money being exacted, taken from temples, all the laws divine and human being overturned’.⁶²

The theme of both human and divine law being overturned was a common theme in invective at Rome.⁶³ By portraying this imagery of events with the use of tricolons crescens the text becomes very descriptive and emotive, and belies a ‘matter-of-fact’ tone.

55 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.6.3: ‘Immediately the remaining business was brought before the senate; to hold recruitment throughout all Italy; Faustus Sulla to be sent with speed into Mauretania; money to be given to Pompey out of the treasury. A proposal...that King Juba would become both ally and friend’; App. *Civ. Wars* 1.77-81.

56 R. M. Ogilvie, ‘Caesar’, in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Vol. 2*, eds. E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 281.

57 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.9; Caesar, *The Gallic Wars*, 1.12, trans. Carolyn Hammond (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): Caesar also portrays himself as the avenger of Rome in this text, punishing the Tigurini of the Helvetii tribe for their killing of Lucius Cassius and their yoking of his army.

58 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.44-48

59 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.44.2: ‘*Lusitanis reliquisque barbaris...multum earum regionum consuetudine moveatur*’.

60 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.46.1: ‘*consumptis...telis gladiis destructis...cohortis...paucisque disiectis*’.

61 Cic. *Or.* 180-181: ‘*orationis...quasi...formae et lumina*’.

62 Caes. *Civ. War.* I.6.8: ‘*tota Italia dilectus habentur, arma imperantur, pecuniae...exiguntur, e templa tolluntur, omnia divina humanaque iura permiscentur*’.

63 Cicero, *De Officiis*, 1.26, trans. Walter Miller (Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 2005): ‘[Caesar], who overturned every law of god and man’.

Caesar includes elements of anaphora in his text to stress his role as victim in the causes for Civil War, such as 'many...many...more' and 'other...others'.⁶⁴ P. Eden contends that this use of repetition was not a result of carelessness or inaccuracy, simply a 'glimpse [of] the basic substratum of Caesar's annalistic style'.⁶⁵ However, Quintilian labels this technique *epidiegesis* which enables a text to produce 'either indignation or pity'.⁶⁶ This allows Caesar to create a rhetorical artifice to portray himself as the merciful benefactor of Rome as he claims he grants mercy to certain Pompeians towards the end of Book One of *The Civil War*.⁶⁷ The image of being the grantor of leniency was central to Caesar's argument. It could be hypothesised that Caesar was utilising the text as a political pamphlet, ensuring the populace knew that the pity and mercy his enemies would not grant him, he would graciously distribute amongst them.⁶⁸

Academia over the last century has continuously debated the history of Caesar, the Civil War and his role in its initiation. Caesar knew this would occur as Civil War was deemed a taboo event in Rome. When this fact is taken into account and combined with the rhetorical devices Caesar utilised throughout his *Bellum Civile* it can only result in a strong consensus that he was using the text as a means of persuasion and justification. The fact that he allowed himself and his personal thoughts to intrude into the text supports the view that he does not maintain a 'matter-of-fact' tone throughout the narration. Even when Caesar uses a simplified system of word choice, there is a semblance of subliminal imagery infiltrating the text to emphasise his beliefs that he had been unjustly injured and that Rome needed him to avenge the wrongs committed against her by the Pompeians. Upon critical analysis, a text that appears predominantly unadorned is indeed highly decorative with rhetorical training. When Grillo's argument is placed alongside the works of Cicero and Quintilian who discuss the artifices of rhetoric in Rome, there is enough evidence to suggest that Caesar did use rhetoric in his writing and that Grillo's argument is open to debate.

64 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.49.1; 53.2: '*multum...multum...magna*', '*alii...alii*'.

65 P. T. Eden, 'Caesar's Style: Inheritance versus Intelligence', *Glotta*, Vol. 40 (1962), 83.

66 Quint. *Inst. Or.* 4.2.128: to produce '*invidiae gratia vel miserationis*'.

67 Caes. *Civ. War*. I.72, 84, 85.

68 Cic. *Ad Att.* IX.7C.1; IX.16.2: Cicero discusses his thoughts on his belief that Caesar's claims of mercy (*misericordia*) was political and not a natural characteristic to his personality.
