

The Pre-Battle Speeches of Alexander at Issus and Gaugamela

J. C. Iglesias-Zoido

THE OBJECTIVE of this study is to examine and compare the pre-battle speeches that Alexander made before his two most important battles: Issus and Gaugamela.¹ We are not concerned here with the authenticity of these speeches such as they have been transmitted to us by Greco-Roman historians.² Neither is it our intention to analyze their relation to the fragmentary Hellenistic sources,³ or to engage in the controversy regarding the reliability of Diodorus, Curtius, and Justin with respect to Arrian.⁴ Our aim is to explain, from a

¹ On the battles see A. M. Devine, "Grand Tactics at the Battle of Issus," *AncW* 12 (1985) 39–57; G. W. Marsden, *The Campaign of Gaugamela* (Liverpool 1964), and G. T. Griffith, "Alexander's Generalship at Gaugamela," *JHS* 67 (1947) 77–89. Cf. R. Sheppard, *Alexander the Great at War* (Oxford 2008) 135–149, 169–183.

² See M. H. Hansen, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography: Fact of Fiction?" *Historia* 42 (1993) 161–180, and "The Little Grey Horse. Henry V's Speech at Agincourt and the Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography," *ClMed* 52 (2001) 95–115. On the other side, W. K. Pritchett, "The General's Exhortations in Greek Warfare," *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam 1994) 27–109, and *Ancient Greek Battle Speeches and a Palfrey* (Gieben 2002).

³ For the state of the question, A. B. Bosworth, "Plus ça change ...: Ancient Historians and their Sources," *ClAnt* 22 (2003) 167–197.

⁴ See N. G. L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge 1983), and *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life of Alexander and Arrian's Anabasis* (Cambridge 1993), in contrast with A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander I* (Oxford 1980).

rhetorical point of view, the different ways in which Alexander's words were presented at two decisive moments in his campaigns.

The act of boosting the troops' morale before an engagement (which at first sight would seem unproblematic given its apparent simplicity) involves a type of speech that contains a wide range of interests. Such speeches are of interest to historians as they provide insights into the different motivational factors to which soldiers reacted at crucial battles.⁵ Above all, however, pre-battle speeches are a privileged example of the influence of rhetoric on ancient historiography, since the presentation of the general's words before a battle provided an excellent opportunity to apply historians' rhetorical training.⁶

In our opinion, rhetoric and historiography went together in the ancient world. This can be seen from Thucydides onwards and is all the more clear in the Imperial era writers. From this point of view, ancient historiography provides rhetorical models for writers who want to describe a night battle or the effects of an epidemic disease, or to write a battle exhortation. The rhetorical manuals give recommendations for some of these cases,⁷ but with regard to the battle speech, the models

⁵ See J. Keegan, *The Mask of Command. A Study of Generalship* (London 1987) 13–90, on Alexander's generalship.

⁶ On this question see J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158, and the state of the question given in J. C. Iglesias-Zoido (ed.), *Retórica e historiografía. El discurso militar en la historiografía desde la Antigüedad hasta el Renacimiento* (Madrid 2008) 19–60. On speeches and methodological issues in ancient historiography see C. W. Fornara, "The Speech in Greek and Roman Historiography," *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983) 142–163; F. W. Walbank, "Speeches in Greek Historians," *Selected Papers. Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography* (Cambridge 1985) 242–261; J. Marincola, "Speeches in Ancient Historiography," *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* I (Oxford 2007) 118–132.

⁷ On the *prosopopoeia* see for example Theon *Progymn.* 115.12–16 Spengel.

are found almost exclusively in the historiography.⁸ In this connection, most often scholars are confronted either with battle speeches that cannot be contrasted with other previous or subsequent versions inserted into the narration of the same historical episode, or simply with totally invented texts. It is, therefore, usually difficult to study the possible adaptations, variations, or changes that a speech has undergone through the historiographical tradition.⁹ Here we refer to the inclusion or exclusion of a speech in an episode, the choice of direct or indirect style, the elaboration of pairs of contrasting speeches, or the predilection for one type of speech as opposed to another. However, in the case of Alexander's campaigns, the existence of a well-established historical tradition from Trogus to Arrian has enabled scholars to study and even compare his speeches, albeit from different perspectives.

The first example is provided by H. Helmreich who, in a study of 1927 that went practically unnoticed by the critics, analyzed and classified the speeches in Q. Curtius, and thereby demonstrated that these speeches adopted the rhetorical norms of the Imperial era.¹⁰ This rhetorical line of investigation was barely touched upon by others. Tarn, for example, devoted an appendix to a comparison of the speeches of Arrian and Curtius in an attempt to determine which of them were "authentic" and which were made up.¹¹ A more interesting ap-

⁸ On the important role that historiography played in rhetorical instruction see R. Nicolai, *La storiografia nella educazione antica* (Pisa 1992).

⁹ Cf. R. Brock, "Versions, 'Inversions' and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the 'Published' Speech," *Papers Leeds Int. Latin Sem.* 8 (1995) 209–224; D. Carmona-Centeno, "Variatio en el discurso exhortativo: la Batalla de Zama," *Anuar.Estud.Filol.* 28 (2005) 5–19.

¹⁰ H. Helmreich, *Die Reden bei Quintus Curtius* (Paderborn 1927) 9: "Für die pathetisch-deklamatorische Behandlung, wie sie in den Rhetorenschulen geübt wurde, eignete sich auch kaum ein Stoff besser als die Erzählung den Taten des grossen König."

¹¹ W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1948) II 286: "It ["genuine"] means that the speech was made on the occasion referred to, and that some one who heard it remembered and wrote down the gist of

proach, in our view, is that of A. B. Bosworth. Less concerned with the historical character of Arrian's speeches, Bosworth adopts a methodological approach that distinguishes three possible compositional techniques in the work of this author.¹² The first consists of taking a discourse conveyed by the original sources and re-elaborating part of the content it transmitted.¹³ The second technique involves expanding on a nucleus (the knowledge that a speech was made or the presence of certain arguments employed), freely adding part of the content.¹⁴ The third is to introduce a totally invented speech wherever the sources failed to provide any information.¹⁵ The application of

what the speaker did say." In a similar vein, see the appendix that P. A. Brunt devotes to the subject: *Arrian, Anabasis II* (Loeb 1983) 528–534.

¹² For his view of the use of rhetoric in Curtius see A. B. Bosworth, "History and Rhetoric in Curtius Rufus," *CP* 78 (1983) 150–161, at 158: "I agree that Curtius punctuated his work with standard rhetorical clichés, using the historical material for sustained moral and psychological commentary ... given that Alexander was a stock example for good or ill in so many of the *topoi* of school debates."

¹³ Callisthenes' speech on *proskynesis* (Arr. *Anab.* 4.11.1–9): A. B. Bosworth, "The Problem of the Speeches," *From Arrian to Alexander* (Oxford 1988) 94–134, at 133: "In the *proskynesis* debate the themes seem derived almost totally from Arrian's immediate sources ... He rearranges and rephrases but does not add significantly new thematic material."

¹⁴ Alexander's speech to the mutineers at Opis (Arr. *Anab.* 7.9.1–10.7): Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 133: "In the Opis speech there are traces of an original digest of contents, but the great bulk of it is Arrian's own composition, a re-embroidery of themes previously expounded but now given a different emphasis." Cf. in the same vein F. R. Wüst, "Die Rede Alexanders der Grossen in Opis," *Historia* 2 (1953/4) 177–188.

¹⁵ The debate on the banks of the Hyphasis river (Arr. *Anab.* 5.25.3–27.9): Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 133: "The debate at the Hyphasis, then, is the clearest example we have of a purely fictitious composition, independent of any report in Arrian's sources." This would have been a debate abounding in topics widely developed in rhetoric, as the comparison with the first *Suasoria* of Seneca (*Deliberat Alexander an Oceanum naviget*) demonstrates. On the influence of declamation on Roman literature see S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and the Early Empire*² (Liverpool 1969) 147–148.

these techniques would serve to demonstrate the literary and rhetorical skills of a historian such as Arrian. It is an approach that, not unexpectedly, prompted the criticism of Hammond, a fierce defender of the reliability of Arrian's work, who even claimed that Arrian had composed the speeches using the *Royal Journal* of Alexander: "Any historian who had access to the *Journal* was able to read the recorded words of Alexander, for instance, issuing orders, naming commanders, and delivering a speech."¹⁶ Therefore, even in the most rhetorical of the speeches, "we should realize that the rhetoric was that of Alexander and not a retrojection from the second century A.D."¹⁷ Finally, in other studies, scholars' interest has focused on certain speeches and key moments that provide information about Alexander's life and character.¹⁸

In view of this state of the question, it is evident that Alexander's pre-battle speeches have received, compared with other speeches, little scholarly attention from a rhetorical point of view.¹⁹ This is the more remarkable considering that Alexander was, above all, an outstanding military leader and that in antiquity this role was closely associated with oratorical skill and

On Seneca's *Suasoria* and its rhetorical context see E. Migliario, *Retorica e storia. Una lettura delle Suasoriae di Seneca Padre* (Bari 2007) 51–62.

¹⁶ N. G. L. Hammond, "The Speeches in Arrian's *Indica* and *Anabasis*," *CQ* 49 (1999) 238–253, at 252.

¹⁷ Hammond, *CQ* 49 (1999) 251.

¹⁸ E.g. Wüst, *Historia* 2 (1953–4) 177–188; D. B. Nagle, "The Cultural Context of Alexander's Speech at Opis," *TAPA* 126 (1996) 151–172; L. Ballesteros-Pastor, "Le discours du Scythe à Alexandre le Grand (Quinte-Curce 7.8.12–30)," *RhM* 146 (2003) 23–37, on the role of the figure of the barbarian; E. F. Bloedow, "Alexander's Speech on the Eve of the Siege of Tyre," *AntCl* 63 (1994) 65–76.

¹⁹ A. B. Breebart, *Enige historiografische aspecten van Arrianus' Anabasis Alexandri* (Leiden 1960) 73–92, provides an example, when, in a chapter about the speeches, he devotes only two pages (77–79) to the pre-battle speeches. A similar case in E. Baynham, *Alexander the Great. The Unique History of Quintus Curtius* (Ann Arbor 1998) 47.

the ability to inspire soldiers in battle.²⁰ This may be because traditionally these exhortations have been considered less important within an historical context in which so many other types of situation abound. In fact, the few pages Helmreich devotes to the deliberative speeches constitute the only available study in this respect.²¹ Hansen and Pritchett, for their part, involved in a polemic concerning the historicity of pre-battle speech in ancient historiography, hardly touch on the subject.²²

To shed light on this question, our study is centered on the analysis of three complementary aspects of these speeches (typology, speech style, argumentation) in order to explain the different ways in which Alexander's words before Issus and Gaugamela were presented by ancient historians. Rhetoric provides valuable information in understanding how these military exhortations were composed and the functions they fulfilled in the writing of these historical episodes.

1. *Pre-battle speech typology*

The first point which emerges from the comparative analysis concerns the typology of these speeches.²³ Ancient historians had a clear conception of the different types of speeches used in the writing of history. Polybius (12.25a.3) classifies historiographical speeches as being of three types: speeches in public assemblies, ambassadors' speeches, and battle exhortations. In this context, the battle exhortation was a type of speech characterised by flexibility in reasoning and the ability to fulfil new functions in the historiographical tradition. Those two features explain why that kind of military speech proved so successful

²⁰ See Onas. 1.13: λέγειν δ' ἰκανόν· ἔνθεν γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι τὸ μέγιστον ὠφελείας ἕξασθαι διὰ στρατεύματος. Cf. B. Campbell, "Teach Yourself how to be a General," *JRS* 77 (1987) 13–29.

²¹ Helmreich, *Die Reden* 12–62, specifically the pair at Curt. 4.14 and the pre-battle speeches at Curt. 6.3 and 9.2.12 ff.

²² Hansen, *Historia* 42 (1993) 171–172; Pritchett, *Essays* 90–94.

²³ On battle exhortations' typology see Iglesias-Zoido, *Retórica e historiografía* 37–40, 537–538.

with ancient historians, and they also account for the existence of different types of exhortations according to the oratorical situation and their functions in the structure of the work. In a military speech, the historian does not restrict himself to reproducing the words spoken by the generals; rather, he primarily seeks to look ahead (setting out the tactics that will be played out afterwards), to show the character and intelligence of a general, and lastly to clarify the true reasons behind a victory or defeat.²⁴ Having to cope with these functions explains the scale of certain battle speeches that could hardly have been heard in full by an army drawn up in formation, and it also explains the inclusion of pairs of opposing speeches in which a general seems to be replying point by point to the arguments advanced by a general in the enemy lines.

In accordance with these different possibilities, M. H. Hansen has advanced a typology of the battle exhortation with four pre-battle situations:²⁵ (a) the general convokes and addresses the officers before the army is drawn up in battle line; (b) the general convokes and addresses the entire army before it is drawn up in battle line; (c) the general traverses the line after the army has been drawn up in battle order, and shouting short addresses to his men he walks or rides along the front; (d) the general takes up a central position before the entire army drawn up in battle line and delivers a full speech to the entire army. In ancient historiography, however, there are more possibilities. Following a combination of pragmatic and rhetorical criteria, we have distinguished up to six types (T) of pre-battle speeches in historiography from Thucydides to the end of antiquity: T1, Pre-battle speech addressed to army commanders; T2, Pre-battle speech to an assembly of troops some time (hours or days) before the battle; T3, Pre-battle speech to the troops in formation on the battlefield (without any indication of the general's movement); T4, *Epipoleis* or review of troops,

²⁴ See Iglesias-Zoido, *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158.

²⁵ Hansen, *ClMed* 52 (2001) 95–115.

normally occurring before the battle, but which also takes place during or at the end of a battle; T5, Battle speech to troops during the battle; T6, Exhortation to soldiers *after* the battle.²⁶

According to this more detailed typology, the battle speeches that Alexander gave before Issus and Gaugamela, in direct style (D.S.) or indirect style (I.S.), inserted in the extant historical works are:

Pompeius Trogus (epitomized by Justin):

11.9.4–7 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his troops amassed before the battle of Issus. *Epipoleis* T4 (I.S.)

11.13.8–11 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his troops amassed before the battle of Gaugamela. T3 (I.S.)

Quintus Curtius, *History of Alexander the Great*:

3.10 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his troops amassed before the battle of Issus. *Epipoleis* T4 (I.S.)

4.14 Two pre-battle speeches before the battle of Gaugamela:

4.14.1–7: Alexander’s pre-battle speech to commanders and surrounding troops. T1 (I.S.)

4.14.8–26: Darius’ pre-battle speech to his troops. T3 (D.S.)

Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*:

2.7.3–9 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his commanders before the battle of Issus. T1 (D.S. and I.S.)

2.10.2 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his troops before the battle of Issus. *Epipoleis*. T4 (I.S.)

3.9.5–8 Alexander’s pre-battle speech to his commanders (to be transmitted throughout the chain of command to the troops) before the battle of Gaugamela. T1 (I.S.)

To these pre-battle speeches one must add the information supplied by Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch. In Book 17 Diodorus describes the pre-battle speeches given at the Battle of Issus (stating briefly, 17.33.1 (T3), that Alexander rallied the troops “in the usual way”) and at the Battle of Gaugamela (in which Alexander is depicted, 17.56.4 (T1), rallying his com-

²⁶ See D. Carmona, M. L. Harto, J. C. Iglesias, J. Villalba, “*Corpus de Arengas de la Historiografía Grecolatina*,” in Iglesias-Zoido, *Retórica e historiografía* 537–564.

manders).²⁷ Plutarch, in his *Life of Alexander*, is less concerned with presenting Alexander in the moments prior to a battle, which is logical since his aim was to produce a biography, not a monograph.²⁸ In the case of Issus (20), he provides hardly any information about the moments prior to the engagement (mentioning only the relative positions of both armies, 20.4–6). He does, however, highlight the importance of Gaugamela, stating that this was the great battle between both contenders, and not the battle of Arbela “as the majority write.” Indeed, aware of its decisive role in Alexander’s career, Plutarch devotes a comprehensive and rhetorical passage (32.6–33.3) to the account of how Alexander succeeded in rallying his soldiers. For our study, what is important is that Plutarch presents Darius and Alexander both as holding an *epipoleis* (T4).

There is, in short, a comprehensive variety of information provided by historical works of different kinds: monographs (like those of Curtius and Arrian), universal histories (Diodorus and Trogus), and biographies (Plutarch). In all cases, the authors inform about the giving of speeches at these key moments. But they did not insert the same type of exhortation in all cases.

On the one hand, before the battle of Issus, Trogus (Justin), Curtius, Plutarch, and Arrian coincide in presenting Alexander carrying out an *epipoleis* (T4) or “review of the troops.” Thus, in Justin’s (Trogus) and Curtius’ accounts, the king moves in and out of the lines of soldiers using different arguments depending on their status and ethnic background.²⁹ Arrian, for his part, explains that when the two armies came face to face,

²⁷ See G. Squillace, “Propaganda macedone e spedizione asiatica. Gli *oikeioi logoi* di Alessandro Magno alle truppe,” *EtCl* 72 (2004) 217–234.

²⁸ Cf. Hammond, *Three Historians* 38–42. In the preface (*Alex.* 1) Plutarch states that he does not write about history but about lives.

²⁹ Just. 11.9.3: *itaque cum spes metum vinceret, periculosius bellum differre ratus, ne desperatio suis cresceret, circumvectus suos singulas gentes diversa oratione adloquitur.* Curt. 3.10.4: *cumque agmini obequitaret, varia oratione, ut cuiusque animis aptum erat, milites adloquebatur.*

Alexander reviewed his men on horseback (2.10.2: *παριππεύων πάντη*). Evidently, these historians chose, at this decisive moment, to present a type of pre-battle speech reminiscent of the Homeric poems³⁰ which allowed them to portray the protagonist as a paradigmatic general. They present Alexander with his army arrayed on the battlefield, already in sight of the enemy, inspecting the lines of troops in the moments prior to the attack and rallying each section differently.³¹ In Arrian's case, although an *epipoleis* takes place (2.10.2), it is particularly noteworthy that the weight of the exhortative argumentation does not fall on this review of troops, but on a prior, complementary speech (2.7.3–9) delivered to commanders. This is the only historian who inserted two speeches in the same episode.

In contrast to the apparent uniformity concerning Issus, the typological differences between these authors are greater in the pre-battle speeches of Gaugamela. In fact, three distinct possibilities exist when describing Alexander addressing his troops. The most frequent: Diodorus, Curtius, and Arrian present Alexander exhorting only the army commanders (T1). Trogus (Justin) presents him rallying the troops in formation (T3). Finally, Plutarch states that Alexander carried out an *epipoleis* (T4). In addition, it is noteworthy that Curtius also takes the opportunity to introduce two opposing speeches: Alexander's to the commanders (T1) contrasting with Darius' in direct style and addressed to his troops arrayed before the battle (T3).

Behind this clear tendency of the historians to present Alexander as either conducting an *epipoleis* before Issus or de-

³⁰ See especially the *epipoleis* in *Il.* 4.223–421, where Agamemnon counts on the effectiveness of the appeal to shame and honor, apportioning the one or the other as he considers appropriate. Cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad. A Commentary* I (Cambridge 1985) 353–359.

³¹ On the *epipoleis* in ancient historiography see O. Longo, “I discorsi tucididei: uditorio indiviso e scomposizione d'uditorio,” *MCr* 18 (1983) 139–160; E. Keitel, “Homeric Antecedents to the *cohortatio* in the Ancient Historians,” *CW* 80 (1987) 153–172; and especially D. Carmona-Centeno, *La Epipólesis en la historiografía grecolatina* (diss. Cáceres 2008), the most complete study to date.

delivering a speech to the commanders before Gaugamela, we believe the influence of two rhetorical models of the general is to be found, models which are merged and integrated into the figure of Alexander. On the one hand, these decisive battles provide a perfect opportunity to portray Alexander as a “soldier-general,” a commander who, like Agamemnon or Achilles in the *Iliad*, goes in and out of the lines of troops exhorting those with whom he is about to fight shoulder to shoulder.³² However, in addition to this intention and especially in the case of Gaugamela, there is also the influence of a form of rallying that is characteristic of another influential model of the general. This is the military paradigm that Xenophon presents in the *Cyropaedia*. In this work, in contrast to the previous historiographical tradition, this kind of exhortation prevails.³³ Cyrus delivers pre-battle speeches to his commanders almost exclusively in direct style. That is, he does this in front of those sufficiently well educated to be able to obtain a real benefit from his words of encouragement.³⁴ This fact is particularly noteworthy in the case of Arrian, since, as occurs in some episodes of the *Cyropaedia* (4.2.27, 6.4.20), he states that the speech before Gaugamela was delivered to the commanders with the express intention that its essence should be transmitted down the chain of command to the troops.

What is more, in Arrian’s case, the existence of this double influence makes it possible to offer a new explanation for the fact that Alexander is presented delivering two speeches before Issus, one addressed to the commanders and another in an *epipoleis* to the troops. The interpretation maintained until now concerned the possible existence of two different traditions re-

³² See E. L. Wheeler, “The General as Hoplite,” in V. D. Hanson, *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London 1991) 121–170; Carmona, *La Epipólesis* 135–170.

³³ See J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, “La arenga militar en Jenofonte: a propósito de *Ciropedia* 3.3.48–55,” *Norba* 16 (1996–2003) 157–166; D. L. Gera, *Xenophon’s Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford 1993) 109–115.

³⁴ *Cyr.* 1.5.7–14; 2.3.2–16; 3.3.34–43; 4.2.21–26; 6.2.14–20; 6.4.12–20.

garding these speeches: one of these is to be found in Arrian and the other derives from a common source and is the one followed by Curtius and Justin.³⁵ However, the only thing that is certain is that the earlier tradition held that an *epipoleis* took place on this occasion, as demonstrated in the passages of Trogus and Curtius. Diodorus (17.33.1) only refers to a speech delivered to the soldiers which employed the usual arguments; he does not mention one given to the commanders. Faced with this situation, the expert soldier Arrian, given the paramount importance of the battle and with a view to presenting the facts to the readers of his day, would have felt it necessary to make the weight of the exhortation fall on a speech to the commanders.³⁶ His own military experience, together with the strength of models like that provided by the *Cyropaedia*, would have led this new Xenophon, in search of a new model of a general,³⁷ to develop the principal arguments in a speech addressed to army commanders. Hence from Arrian's perspective, which combines the historian and the experienced soldier in the same individual, this brief exhortation undoubtedly comes closer than Curtius' version to what Alexander might actually have said on his tour of the ranks. Indeed, a lengthier speech would have made it more difficult for him to complete this tour. In our view, Arrian, in inserting these two pre-battle speeches, did not intend to include false data. Rather, his intention was to adapt a type of speech (an *epipoleis*), of long literary

³⁵ See Brunt, *Anabasis* 528–534; Pritchett, *Essays* 91: “The Arrian speech is taken to come from the ‘factual’ narrative of Ptolemy/Aristoboulos, who based their accounts on Kallisthenes; the Curtius tradition, here as elsewhere, derives from declamations of the rhetorical schools.”

³⁶ See P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 90: “His presentation of Alexander's military achievement reflects his own acquaintance with warfare and his effort to understand the factors which made Alexander such a successful general.”

³⁷ See, in this sense, Stadter, *Arrian* 89: “First and foremost in Arrian's eyes Alexander was the personification of the ideal general”; cf. 90: Arrian “would have expected at least some of his readers ... to use his book as a kind of manual of generalship.”

tradition, to the real (and more probable) situation on the battlefield, introducing one complementary speech to commanders.³⁸ Once again, the explanation can be found in the work itself. In a manner consistent with his own methodology,³⁹ Arrian presents Alexander as a model of a general whose words and behavior may be compared to those of Achilles, Cyrus, or Xenophon himself. All these models would be represented through the inclusion of these two pre-battle speeches. This would, therefore, constitute an example of how rhetoric, when specific scenes are narrated, imposes its influence on a tradition which conveys Alexander's words in an unsatisfactory way (at least in the view of one particular historian).⁴⁰

2. *Pre-battle speech style*

These speeches also reveal a very significant point which has not received sufficient attention: almost all of Alexander's pre-battle exhortations delivered at two moments crucial to his process of conquest appear in indirect style. Only the first of Arrian's speeches of Alexander mixes both styles (*Anab.* 3.9.5–8).⁴¹ Initially, it seems strange that historians did not take the opportunity to introduce more speeches in direct style, not only because of the importance of both battles to the Asian campaign, but also because throughout these same works there are

³⁸ In keeping with the famous passage of Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F 44, according to which the historian has to adapt the speeches to suit both the speaker and the facts narrated. See in this connection Fornara, *Nature* 142–163.

³⁹ See Arr. *Anab.* 1.1–3, 7.30, and especially 1.12.2–5, which expressly compares what earlier historians have celebrated about Alexander to the figure of Achilles, as Homer describes him, or to the expedition of the Ten Thousand, as narrated by Xenophon.

⁴⁰ Cf. Stadter, *Arrian* 62: “Arrian is making the point that earlier historians of this subject have not been satisfactory.”

⁴¹ Cf. Baynham, *Alexander the Great* 46–47. On the role of the indirect style in historiography see A. Laird, *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford 1999).

numerous speeches in direct style.⁴² Curtius' work offers an extreme case of this situation: Alexander's speech in indirect style before Gaugamela contrasts with a long speech by his enemy Darius in direct style (4.14.8–26).⁴³ Also evident is the contrast with other sections of Curtius' work, in which it is common to find Alexander delivering speeches in *oratio recta*. However, from an internal perspective, these occasions appear framed in a context of military assemblies or, to use the Latin term, *contiones*.⁴⁴ In other words, these are speeches of military content but not exhortations prior to battle. The differences between these two types of military speech are due as much to the situation in which the troops find themselves at the moment in question as to other formal indicators, such as the narrative settings which introduce the speeches and which, from the narrator's point of view, serve to manifest that specific situation.⁴⁵

A similar situation occurs in the case of Arrian, in whose work speeches in direct style are to be found, such as those that Alexander delivered before the capture of Tyre (2.17) and when the Macedonian troops express their weariness and reluctance to continue the campaign in the East (5.25.3 ff.). As in Curtius' work, all these cases refer to speeches delivered at military assemblies. As we can see from Thucydides onward, the motifs of exhortation associated with these occasions could easily be lifted from the public assembly over to assemblies

⁴² On the style of Polybian speeches see recently S. Usher, "Oratio Recta and Oratio Obliqua in Polybius," *GRBS* 49 (2009) 487–514.

⁴³ The same approach at Curt. 8.5.10–12, which contrasts the speech of Cleon (I.S.) with that of Callisthenes (D.S.), though with the intent to emphasize the latter's words over those of Cleon.

⁴⁴ On this question see F. Pina, *Contra arma verbis. Der Redner vor dem Volk in der späten römischen Republik* (Stuttgart 1996).

⁴⁵ See Curt. 5.13.4: *ducibus convocatis*; 6.2.21–4: *vocari ad contionem*; 9.2.12–30: *ad contionem vocatis militibus*. On the importance of the settings of speeches in historiography see J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "El sistema de engarce narrativo de los discursos de Tucídides," *Talia Dixit* 1 (2006) 1–28.

made up of soldier-citizens.⁴⁶ When dealing with military assemblies like these, Arrian chose to use more generic expressions both at the beginning of the speeches, such as ἔλεξεν ὧδε (2.16.4, 5.25.2), and at the end, such as ταῦτα λέγων (2.18.1) and ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα εἰπόντος Ἀλεξάνδρου (5.27.1). Quite apart from the question of the importance of the respective deictics and their value in providing information about the greater or lesser accuracy about what was actually said,⁴⁷ the fact is that these settings permit a clear distinction between certain types of speech and others. Indeed, one of the elements that distinguish the three pre-battle speeches of Arrian under study is the systematic use of the Greek term which, in the majority of cases, introduces them: the verb παρακαλέω.⁴⁸ These introductory settings reveal that, from the historian's perspective, the speeches delivered before Issus and Gaugamela are exhortations or παρακλήσεις, three pre-battle speeches perfectly well defined from the point of view of ancient historiography.⁴⁹ Consequently, and in clear contrast with the other group of speeches associated with military assemblies (the *contiones*), these pre-battle speeches were inserted in indirect style. In any case, this is a perfectly formalized procedure that is followed scrupulously by all the historians who analyzed these events, as can be seen if the versions of Trogus (Justin) and Plutarch are compared.

⁴⁶ See C. Mossé, "Armée et cité grecque (à propos de Thucydide VII, 77, 4–5)," *REA* 65 (1963) 290–297, at 294–295: "les soldats athéniens en armes représentaient l'*ekklesia*, à laquelle les stratèges s'adressent, comme s'ils étaient à la tribune de l'Assemblée."

⁴⁷ In the same vein as Tarn, *Alexander the Great* II 286–296, and Hammond, *CQ* 49 (1999) 238–253.

⁴⁸ Arr. *Anab.* 2.7.3: παρακάλει θαρρεῖν; 2.10.2: παρακάλει ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γίγνεσθαι; 3.9.5: παρακαλεῖσθαι.

⁴⁹ See Plb. 12.25a.3 for the use of the term παρακλήσεις and the comparison with other types of historiographical speeches.

In this light, contrasting with these pre-battle speeches of Alexander, a case of Curtius requires examination: Darius' exhortation to his troops in direct style before Gaugamela (4.14.8–26). We believe that the inclusion of this pre-battle speech in direct style in contrast with Alexander's in indirect style is due to the influence of previous historiographical models. As occurs with other speeches and typical scenes,⁵⁰ we believe that Curtius may have opted to reproduce a situation described in classical historiography. In a significant passage of Thucydides (5.69), two different ways of rallying the troops are deliberately opposed: the different types of speech used by the Athenians and their allies as opposed to the laconic way in which the Spartans raised morale for battle.⁵¹ Thucydides recounts how, before the battle of Mantinea, the generals on the Athenian side delivered three exhortations separately, each pursuing a different exhortative argument (5.69.1): the Mantineans are urged to fight to prevent their country from becoming enslaved; the Argives are spurred on by the chance to regain their former leading role and to avenge wrongs done to them in the past; and the Athenians are exhorted to bear in mind that it is noble not to be found lacking in battle, and that victory brings great rewards. All three argue that the noble takes precedence over the expedient. These three exhortations do not seek to heighten the intensity of the passage; rather, they are intended to compare the approach taken by the allies with the behavior of the Spartans in matters of war, the latter placing their trust more in their war songs and their training than in a speech (5.69.3). We find a similar situation in Xenophon, in a fundamental passage in the *Cyropaedia* (3.3.48–55), in which the silence of Cyrus before his soldiers is opposed to the news that his enemy, the Assyrian king, has delivered a lengthy exhortation. The discussion between Cyrus and his general Chrysantas, who questions this silence and urges a speech to

⁵⁰ See Ballesteros-Pastor, *RhM* 146 (2003) 23–37.

⁵¹ Cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides II* (Oxford 1995) 80.

the troops, demonstrates that a rallying speech can, even when long, be useless if the troops to whom it is directed do not possess the necessary training or values. This kind of reflection concerning the usefulness of pre-battle speeches is also to be found in Latin historiography. Sallust, whose work clearly influenced Curtius, at the end of *Catiline*, introduces a pre-battle speech by the protagonist in direct style, in which Catiline expresses doubt as to the usefulness of this type of exhortation at times of desperation (*Cat.* 58.1–2).

In view of these precedents, in the case of the speech of Darius inserted by Curtius, it would be perfectly feasible for Darius' troops to suffer their more important defeat despite the rallying speech they were subjected to. There is a clear contrast between word and action: the exhortation was useless because the Persian troops did not possess the necessary training or motivation. This is, therefore, an example of how a historian such as Curtius resorted to a model that provided him with precedents in the same genre by which to reinforce an idea (the causes of the Persians' defeat) present in his sources.

3. *Rhetorical argumentation in pre-battle speeches*

Any study of the argumentation of the military harangues has to consider two elements widely discussed by scholars: the lines of argumentation and the *topoi* of the battle exhortation.⁵² In the first case, Albertus, after analyzing the argumentation of battle exhortations, concludes that there are two essential lines of argument: an explanatory type (*διδασχῆ*), in agreement with the narrative functions that these speeches perform in the work; and an exhortative type (*παρακέλευσις*) that employs paraegetic topics used already in the epic. The combination of both argumentative lines from Thucydides generated a new type of

⁵² On these argumentative recourses see J. Albertus, *Die paraklētikoi in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Strassburg 1908); L. Pernot, "Lieu et lieu commun dans la rhétorique antique," *BAssBudé* 56 (1986) 253–284; J. C. Iglesias-Zoido, "La argumentación en las arengas militares de Tucídides," *AntCl* 77 (2008) 19–40.

historiographic speech characterized by its flexibility and its capacity for adaptation to the narrative context—a type of speech widely mentioned in the rhetorical manuals of the Imperial age.⁵³ On the second matter, Albertus noted that the *topoi* of Greco-Roman historiographic harangues largely match those which the rhetorical rules of the Imperial age included under the term “heads of purpose” (τελικά κεφάλαια, *capitula finalia*). In using this term, the rhetoricians were alluding to a number of “heads” relating to the purpose of actions, since that would, in principle, enable the grounds for a proposed action to be considered. No doubt what historians and rhetoricians alike found interesting in these motifs of exhortation was that they enabled the criteria for action to be established. Accordingly, the orator using them was seeking to show that the action put forward was just (δίκαιον), expedient (συμφέρον), noble (καλόν), feasible (δύνατον), and mindful of the potential consequences (ἐκβησόμενον). Unlike Aristotle, who had systematically established a distinctive end for each of the genres of rhetoric (*Rh.* 1358b20–30), the Imperial rhetoricians followed the sophistic model represented by the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (1421b20–33), which combined motifs in much the same way that Thucydides combined them in composing his battle speeches.⁵⁴

An analysis of the argumentative content of Alexander’s pre-battle speeches before Issus reveals the systematic use of these argumentative resources by the historians with significant differences. We have seen how the majority of the historians inserted an *epiopsis* into their account. In accordance with this type of pre-battle speech, Curtius chose to develop a series of arguments in indirect style in which he shows the king first addressing his Macedonian compatriots (3.10.4–7), second the whole of the Greek forces (8–9), and finally the Illyrians and Thracians (9–10). He addresses each group according to their

⁵³ See Iglesias-Zoido, *Rhetorica* 25 (2007) 141–158.

⁵⁴ See Iglesias-Zoido, *AntCl* 77 (2008) 19–40.

different national characteristics. The Macedonians he exhorts by pointing out the riches and benefits to be had from victory (4–6), the weakness of the enemy (6), and finally (7–8) he reminds them of the example of his father, Philip, and of the victories obtained since leaving Greece to reach that part of Asia. As for the Greek force, he reminds them (*admonebat, referebat*) of the official excuse for the campaign in Asia: to avenge the attack by the Persians against Greece in the Greco-Persian Wars. The soldiers from Thrace and Illyria he invites, directly and with no qualms, to pillage. Evidently, in length and content, the most significant address is that directed to the Macedonians. In fact, it is the part that most closely resembles the classical model of a pre-battle speech: there is an instructive line of argumentation (*διδασχῆ*) with frequent recourse to the *τελικὰ κεφάλαια*. Alexander points out the huge benefits of the struggle (*συμφέρον*), minimizes the strength of the enemy (*δύνατον*), and finally resorts to examples from the past (*καλόν*).

In his account of this same historical event, Arrian is the only one of the historians who behaves differently, providing in this case two pre-battle speeches: an exhortation addressed by Alexander only to the commanders of his army in his campaign tent and, when the two armies are standing face to face, an *epi poleis* to all his troops. In this way, like a new Xenophon and on such a significant occasion, Arrian draws a distinction between those arguments that are addressed exclusively to the leaders and those intended for the troops with the battle imminent. The first speech has a long and explicative exposition (2.7.3–9: *διδασχῆ*) in indirect style in which, however, the author informs the reader that he has omitted the arguments most commonly employed in similar situations (9). The second (2.10.2: *παρὰ κέλευσις*) involves an *epi poleis*, in which the argumentative content is reduced to a minimum: basically all it says is that Alexander urged the troops to behave valiantly (*παρεκάλει ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γίγνεσθαι*). The essence here lies in the external elements that make it possible to identify the type of exhortation. Arrian tells us that the Macedonian monarch addressed them by their names (*ὀνομαστί*) and according to the honors to

which the generals and the other commanders, and even those mercenaries who had acquitted themselves well on the battlefield, were entitled. In so doing, Arrian delves less into the argumentative content of the speech and focuses more on its affective qualities, such as those derived from the recognition of merits earned in battle by the members of the different sections of the army. Such an approach allows Arrian to remain faithful to the earlier historiographical tradition and the rest of this *παρακείμεσις* can be easily completed by the readers.⁵⁵

However, from Arrian's point of view, it must not be forgotten that the moment he is writing about was one of the most crucial for Alexander, a crossroads with his dominion over Asia at stake. Therefore, this brief pre-battle speech to the whole army would not have done justice to such a situation or allowed the whole context that surrounded it to be understood. For this reason, on this occasion Arrian chose to develop what in Curtius is no more than the first part of his *epipoleisis*, the one addressed to the Macedonians, enlarging and extending it in such a way as to convert it into a different speech: a speech to the commanders. In fact, the speech at 2.7.3–9 was carefully elaborated both in its argumentative structure and, above all, in its language. Arrian had no qualms about introducing some of the clichés that had characterized the pre-battle speech since the time of classical historiography,⁵⁶ which clearly gives it the air of a rhetorical exercise.⁵⁷ The argument of the speech to the

⁵⁵ See, for example, Thuc. 7.69.2: Thucydides, aware that his readers are familiar with the Homeric model, invites them to complete the exhortation for themselves by saying that the arguments were the usual ones voiced in situations in which men are content to "say what has always been said" (*ἀρχαιολογεῖν*).

⁵⁶ See L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (New York 1960) 197: "The speech which Arrian puts in the mouth of Alexander is based on familiar Herodotean motifs."

⁵⁷ So it is seen by Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, in his Appendix 15 (286–296). After pointing out that this speech is nothing like what might have actually been said at that moment, he states (286): "I take it to be part of a school exercise."

commanders is full of commonplaces that are framed in what Albertus calls the *δύνατον* and the *ῥάδιον*,⁵⁸ that is, that victory is possible and easy. What is interesting, however, is that the speech finishes with an indication that Alexander also employed the rest of the arguments with which a good leader would rally brave men.⁵⁹ The terms employed are hugely significant and, given the information provided about the situation of the speaker himself and his listeners, the rhetorical air is clear and undeniable. This explains why Arrian ends Alexander's address by making reference to the arguments that would be present in the minds of the addressees of the work and so he does not consider it necessary to include them now. It is a particularly interesting, a perfect example both of rhetorical expansion and typological variation from a prior argumentative nucleus. It is a case of argumentative expansion that, one perceives, might even be greater or smaller depending on the interests and objectives of the historian. The key lies in the typological situation posed by the historian: the existence of a military speech (*παράκλησιν*), delivered just before facing the perils of battle (*πρὸ τῶν κινδύνων*), addressed to valiant commanders (*ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς*) by a seasoned general (*ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ ἡγεμόνος*). It is clear that the historian is putting his readers in a situation which corresponds to a pre-battle speech delivered to commanders (T1), exactly as we described above. Moreover, this is not an isolated instance but rather a technique frequently used in classical historiography, which contains other examples of this kind of *et cetera*.⁶⁰ This is, therefore, a clear instance of rhetorical expansion, akin to the second type described by Bos-

⁵⁸ Albertus, *Die paraklētikoí* 68–70.

⁵⁹ Arr. *Anab.* 2.7.9: ὅσα τε ἄλλα ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε πρὸ τῶν κινδύνων ἐς παράκλησιν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ ἡγεμόνος παραινέσθαι εἰκός.

⁶⁰ See for example Thuc. 2.13.9 regarding the words that Pericles would have used. A case in point is Diod. 17.33.1, reducing Alexander's speech before Issus to *τοῖς οἰκείοις λόγοις παρεκάλεσεν*.

worth:⁶¹ Arrian, adhering to the rhetorical rules of plausibility (*παραινέσθαι εἰκός*), would on this occasion thus have developed another type of exhortation speech, a distinct speech to commanders (T1), out of what for earlier authors were only a few argumentative ideas elaborated in the framework of an *epipoleis* (T4). This is clear evidence of how Arrian works with different types of perfectly formalized pre-battle speeches. In dealing with the same event, the battle of Issus, Curtius and Arrian chose to develop two different types of rallying speech whose argumentations were also adapted to different methodological aims.

In the case of Alexander's address prior to the battle of Gaugamela, the historians offer a less than uniform approach to the facts, adopting different rhetorical possibilities.⁶² Justin (Trogus) describes the typical situation in which both armies are already in formation and can observe each other, at a moment when the generals commanding the various sections were continuously going up and down the ranks (11.13.6: *sed nec duces circumire suos cessabant*). Justin recounts in indirect style the speech delivered by Alexander to his troops just before the battle (8–11), and each section is introduced by a different verb that shows the diverse lines of argumentation. Thus, 8 is introduced by *monebat*, 9–10 by *meminisse iubet*, and the end of the speech (11) by *hortatur*. It is therefore possible to see how this summary in indirect style makes a clear division between the explanatory part or *διδασχῆ* (Alexander “warns” and “orders to remember”) and the part devoted to the exhortation or *παρακέλευσις* (Alexander “exhorts”) present in so many Greco-Roman pre-battle speeches.⁶³ In the explanatory part, Alexander warns his soldiers not to be intimidated by either the number or the size of their enemies, and reminds them that

⁶¹ Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 133.

⁶² This is particularly noticeable in this case, since there seems to have been some discord among the sources about the importance of this battle compared with others.

⁶³ See Iglesias-Zoido, *AntCl* 77 (2008) 19–40.

they are fighting against the same enemies for the third time. In the part corresponding to the exhortation, he urges them to despise the enemy, as a victory is not won with the impressiveness of one's equipment but by one's force of arms.

Plutarch, for his part, starts his comprehensive account by contrasting the behavior of Darius and Alexander. He briefly (31.8) states that Darius was moving up and down the ranks of his army (*ἐπιπορευόμενος τὰς τάξεις*), without mentioning what Darius said to his troops. Much more comprehensive is the information that Plutarch gives regarding Alexander's behavior at that decisive moment (31.9–32.3). Alexander, together with the soothsayer Aristarchus, made offerings to the god of fear (*τῷ Φόβῳ σφαγιαζόμενος*). He then proceeded to reassure his commanders, who were terrified by the sight of the huge enemy army, convincing them of the need for a decisive victory (31.10–14). He even permitted himself the luxury of sleeping soundly that night (32.1). Later, after a setback on the left flank (32.5–7), Plutarch describes in great detail how Alexander attired himself (32.8–11). Finally, he explains how Alexander rallied his soldiers, introducing once again an *epi-poleis* (32.12–33.3). First, he reports that Alexander went up and down the ranks on horseback (*παρεξήλυνεν*), exhorting them (*παρακελευόμενος*) and giving instructions (*διδάσκων*). Throughout this “review of the troops,” where he employed the two habitual lines of argumentation of one historiographic harangue, he talked to the different Greek units, invoked the gods, and, above all, a favourable omen was observed (the flight of an eagle over Alexander's head) which was interpreted by the soothsayer Aristandrus, who accompanied him on his ride (*παριππεύων*). The consequence was decisive for the troops' motivation.⁶⁴ Plutarch's biographical account clearly focuses on showing how everything was in Alexander's favor: his reassuring behavior, his words to the troops (both instruct-

⁶⁴ *Alex.* 33.3: ὥστε πολὺ μὲν θάρσος ἐγγενέσθαι τοῖς ὀρώσιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ θαρρέϊν καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἀλλήλους.

ing and exhorting), and finally the occurrence of favorable omens. Thus, the consequence is that it is quite understandable that the troops went into battle full of valor (*θάρσος*), the key factor which all the historians cite in these moments and, also, the essential objective of the battle exhortations.

From another perspective on the same episode, Arrian opted for a different possibility when presenting Alexander's words. He introduces the pre-battle speech in indirect style (3.9.5–8), with the particular feature that it is initially addressed to the commanders with the express intention that it be relayed down the chain of command to the troops. Arrian, therefore, opted for an elaborate form of speech from the rhetorical point of view,⁶⁵ into which he introduced a significant Xenophonic variation by preferring to present Alexander addressing his commanders as opposed to the troops.

Finally, Curtius employs the more complex approach to the same situation. He chooses to use, at this crucial moment, the most rhetorical model: two opposing speeches which constitute a true antilogy. Alexander's speech before Gaugamela (4.14.1–7) is not addressed to the whole army: as Curtius himself points out in the initial and final scenes, the priority addressees are the generals and the soldiers who are closer by. Alexander begins with a section (1) in which he states that this is the last test to be overcome in order to achieve their ultimate objective. The argument is structured in four parts: first, the reminder (1–2) of the victories already achieved by the Macedonians over the Persians; second, the advice (3–5) not to fear an army formed by a rabble of barbarians compared with their own brave Macedonian forces; third, the example that Alexander himself sets: his scars and his generous behavior (6); finally, the words addressed to those who may be afraid, making it clear that flight is impossible (7).

Compared with Alexander's speech, it is noteworthy that Darius' pre-battle speech in direct style is far more extensive

⁶⁵ Regarding the points of contact with Thucydidean historiography at this level (lexical, rhetorical, etc.), see Bosworth, *Historical Commentary* 35–36.

(4.14.9–26). As is explained in the initial setting (8–9), Darius delivers a speech to the whole of his army in formation, from a single spot and standing on a wagon, from which he addresses the battalions situated to his right and his left. What in Trogus, as Justin records (8–11), was merely a statement about the numerical superiority of the Persians over the Macedonians, which might correspond to the argument developed in the third section of Curtius' speech (12–13), in Curtius becomes a very extensive pre-battle speech. Curtius portrays Darius exhaustively and almost hopelessly using the common exhortative *topoi* of this type of speech: Just (*δίκαιον*): Alexander is nothing but a reckless fool (18–19) and what has occurred until now has been a warning from the gods about human fragility (20–21). Expedient (*συμφέρον*): victory in this battle means victory in the war (15–17). Noble (*καλόν*): remember the ancestors and the homeland's gods in order to be brave and transmit this glory to future generations (24–25). Feasible (*δύνατον*): numbers are on our side (12–14). Finally, the potential consequences of defeat (*ἐκβησόμενον*): our fight is for life and freedom and there is no chance of flight (9–11), and also his mother and children have been taken prisoner (22–23).

As we can see, this speech is like a rhetorical exercise, a genuine *amplificatio* that manifests all the rhetorical possibilities regarding the expansion of a simple argument and which, in the light of the results, produces a notable contrast. It shows also how a feature present in the historiographical tradition (extensive pre-battle speeches that do not eventually succeed in avoiding defeat contrasted with the laconism of the victor) receives the aid of rhetorical formation in shaping the more complex and also the more useless speech of this episode. To sum up, three different rhetorical possibilities to describe the same event are to be found in the Alexander's speeches prior to the battle of Gaugamela.

4. *Conclusions*

Alexander's pre-battle speeches provided ancient authors with a fine opportunity to exhibit their rhetorical training and expertise. The battles of Issus and Gaugamela were two per-

factly familiar historical events which, however, are narrated by ancient historians with significant changes. These changes, especially visible in Alexander's words, affect the typology of the speeches, their style, and their rhetorical argumentation.

What possible reasons could be behind this behavior of the ancient historians towards Alexander's pre-battle speeches? Critics have attempted to explain these differences as the result of the influence of information from the varied sources to which the historians had access. Such an approach adopts a perspective which considers that these historians were duty-bound to adhere faithfully to what their sources related about a particular event. From our point of view, however, these speeches provide a practical illustration of what Bosworth already postulated about the case of Alexander: the possibility of rhetorical expansion from an argumentative nucleus within a well-known context.⁶⁶ There is also evidence to support Brock's theory cited above: that if a previously published version of an event existed, ancient historians did not usually supply their readers with the same exact version of the words of the historical personages.⁶⁷ Rather, depending on their objectives, their methodology, or their background, they chose to develop types of speeches, styles (*oratio recta* or *obliqua*), or rhetorical arguments employed by earlier authors. This behavior, in reality, constitutes a very interesting form of *aemulatio*. Without discarding the possibility of remaining faithful to the different historical sources on Alexander, our study demonstrates that the influence of rhetoric provides a coherent explanation for the different ways in which an episode, even one so well known as Issus or Gaugamela, could be presented and even recreated. Above all, it demonstrates that pre-battle speeches, despite their apparent simplicity, provide considerable creative scope. This is a facet of pre-battle speeches that some scholars have neglected, more concerned with the issue of authenticity. The

⁶⁶ Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 133.

⁶⁷ Brock, *Papers Leeds Int. Latin Sem.* 8 (1995) 209–224.

different ways of rallying troops (choosing a type of speech, a style, or a line of argumentation) illustrate the existence of perfectly established and formalized rhetorical models of battle exhortations that were available to ancient historians.⁶⁸

December, 2009

Departamento de Ciencias de la Antigüedad
Universidad de Extremadura
10.075 Cáceres, Spain
iglesias@unex.es

⁶⁸ This paper was undertaken as part of a research project “The military speech in historiography from Antiquity to the Renaissance II” (HUM 2006–09270). I wish to express my gratitude to the readers for *GRBS* for their helpful suggestions and criticisms that have led to a more clear and focused presentation. Remaining deficiencies are mine alone.