

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE UWO CLASSICS GREEK AND LATIN COMPREHENSIVES**

This document is intended to describe possible guidelines for setting and marking the Greek and Latin Comprehensive Examinations of the PhD program in Classics at Western. These are informal guidelines only and need not be followed strictly in every case.

### **Suggested Marking Procedure**

The examination consists of 8 tasks, namely 3 translations and 5 commentaries. Each task will be given a mark out of 10. The mark for the examination will be the sum of the 8 separate marks. 48 marks (60%) will be the minimum passing score. In addition, the translation portion and the commentary portion of the examination must both be passed individually, so the 3 translations must receive at least 18 marks and the 5 commentaries must receive at least 30 marks for the examination to pass.

### **Marking Criteria for Translations**

The standards for a translation on a Comprehensive Examination are high. Each mistake will result in the deduction of one half mark, so that an individual translation will be considered passing if there are 8 or fewer mistakes. What constitutes a mistake will be determined individually on a case-by-case basis, but examples may include a vocabulary mistake (i.e. a translation of a word with an incorrect meaning), a morphological mistake (e.g. a translation of a dative as though it were a nominative or a translation of a verb with an incorrect tense), a syntactic mistake (e.g. a translation of a purpose clause as if it were a causal clause), or a contextual mistake (e.g. a translation of a word with a meaning that is possible in other contexts but inappropriate for particular sentence being translated). To avoid uncertainty as much as possible, the student should translate the Greek or Latin into clear and correct English that reflects as much as possible the vocabulary, morphology, and syntax of the Greek or Latin. Where necessary, the student may use explanatory notes to avoid the appearance of mistranslation.

### **Marking Rubric for Commentaries**

There is no set length for a commentary and quality is more important than quantity, but as a general guideline a passing commentary should be between 300 and 600 words—the equivalent of approximately one to two typed, double-spaced pages.

A passing commentary includes a correct identification of the passage, including the author, title, date (as specifically as possible), and context of the passage. While a passing commentary includes a correct identification of the passage, good and relevant analysis of the passage will result in some marks for the commentary even if the identification is incorrect. Although apart from the identification there is no specific point or issue for any passage without which a commentary must fail, a passing commentary addresses at least one significant scholarly issue pertaining to the passage. The issue addressed may pertain to significant formal characteristics of the passage (e.g. metre, dialect, etc.), the passage's context in the development of the genre and/or literary tradition, or relevant information about the scholarly tradition and/or major interpretative questions regarding the passage or the larger work. While a passing commentary may address the work as a whole, it does so in a way relevant to and arising from the specific passage on the examination. A passing commentary analyzes the passage rather than describing or summarizing it. A passing commentary is written clearly and its analysis is correct and persuasive. The information about the passage, work, historical context, and/or scholarship used to support the analysis is correct and relevant.

Additional factors that improve a mark from barely passing may include clarity of expression, depth of analysis, the significance of the scholarly issue or issues addressed, the mention of specific scholars, and the citation of important and relevant scholarly works. It is not expected that students will cite scholarship on the Comprehensive Exams, but if you happen to know some appropriate scholarship to cite, it can help.

It is generally expected of a barely passing examination that not every commentary and translation will

achieve a barely passing mark, but that a barely passing examination will include some commentaries and translations that are clearly passing and some that barely fail. This means that a student may misidentify a passage and still pass the examination.

### **Some Advice for Writing Commentaries**

Eight tasks in four hours gives you an average of 30 minutes per task. Try practicing writing commentaries of between 300 and 600 words in 30 minutes and manage your time accordingly during the exam. Keep in mind that the 30 minutes includes the time it takes to read the passage in the original language if you are writing a commentary on a passage you have not already translated for the translation part of the exam.

Although most students write by hand, there are secured examination laptops available for the department to check out from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. If you would prefer to type your exam instead of writing it in an exam booklet, please ask. The computers are not guaranteed to be available, but we do our best to make the option to type available to students who prefer it.

Since there is no Greek or Roman history comprehensive exam, the Greek and Latin comprehensive exams are designed to give you an opportunity to show your knowledge of history as well as literature. Don't be afraid to make the issue you discuss in a commentary a historical rather than a literary one. Passages of historiography and oratory are particularly amenable to this kind of analysis, but it's also possible with some poetry passages.

Keep your identification as brief as possible, and avoid wasting time summarizing the passage or work. Don't just write down everything you can think of. A focused analysis of one or at most two issues is the goal.

The main goal of writing a commentary is to demonstrate your ability to perform a close reading of a passage that says something interesting and relevant. It's a test of skill rather than knowledge. Except for the identification of the passages, this portion of the exam is less something you can study for and more something for which you can prepare by practicing.

**Department of Classical Studies**  
**Comprehensive Examination**  
**Latin**

1. Identify and comment on **FIVE** of the following passages (you will see 8 on the actual exam), with at least two from each section. Commentaries may include (for example): identification of the author and work; identification of any significant formal characteristics (e.g., metre, dialect, etc.); situating the passage in the context of the development of its genre and/or literary tradition; relevant information about the scholarly tradition and/or major interpretative questions regarding the passage or the larger work.
2. Translate **THREE** passages, with at least one from each section.
3. You have four hours to complete the exam. No outside materials may be used.

**Sample question from section A:**

- (a) “non haec sollemnia nobis,  
has ex more dapes, hanc tanti numinis aram  
vana superstitio veterumque ignara deorum  
imposuit: saevis, hospes Troiane, periclis  
servati facimus meritosque novamus honores.  
iam primum saxis suspensam hanc aspice rupem,  
disiectae procul ut moles desertaque montis  
stat domus et scopuli ingentem traxere ruinam.  
hic spelunca fuit vasto summota recessu,  
semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat  
solis inaccessam radiis; semperque recenti  
caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis  
ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo.  
huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros  
ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat.  
attulit et nobis aliquando optantibus aetas  
auxilium adventumque dei.”

**Sample question from section B:**

- (a) Quibus rebus Romam nuntiatis tantus repente terror invasit ut, cum Lentulus consul ad aperiendum aerarium venisset ad pecuniamque Pompeio ex senatus consulto proferendam, protinus aperto sanctiore aerario ex urbe profugeret. Caesar enim adventare iam iamque et adesse eius equites falso nuntiabantur. Hunc Marcellus collega et plerique magistratus consecuti sunt. Cn. Pompeius pridie eius diei ex urbe profectus iter ad legiones habebat quas a Caesare acceptas in Apulia hibernorum causa disposuerat. Dilectus circa urbem intermittuntur. Nihil citra Capuam tutum esse omnibus videtur. Capuae primum sese confirmant et colligunt dilectumque colonorum qui lege Iulia Capuam deducti erant habere instituunt. Gladiatoresque quos ibi Caesar in ludo habebat ad forum productos Lentulus <spe> libertatis confirmat. Atque iis equos attribuit et se sequi iussit. Quos postea, monitus ab suis quod ea res omnium iudicio reprehendebatur, circum familiae patres conventus Campaniae custodiae causa distribuit.

**Department of Classical Studies**  
**Comprehensive Examination (Doctoral)**  
**Greek**

1. Identify and comment on **FIVE** of the following passages (you will see 8 on the actual exam), with at least two from each section. Commentaries may include (for example): identification of the author and work; identification of any significant formal characteristics (e.g., metre, dialect, etc.); situating the passage in the context of the development of its genre and/or literary tradition; relevant information about the scholarly tradition and/or major interpretative questions regarding the passage or the larger work.
2. Translate **THREE** passages, with at least one from each section.
3. You have four hours to complete the exam. No outside materials may be used.

**Sample question from section A:**

- (a) ὀυδέ μοι ἔστι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.  
ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἀμὸν ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλίκων εὖ ναιετάουσαν  
Θήβην ὑψίπυλον κατὰ δ' ἔκτανεν Ἡετίωνα,  
οὐδέ μιν ἐξενάρριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,  
ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν κατέκχε σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν  
ἠδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχεεν· περὶ δὲ πετελέας ἐφύτευσαν  
νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.  
οἱ δὲ μοι ἑπτὰ κασίγνητοι ἔσαν ἐν μεγάροισιν  
οἱ μὲν πάντες ἰῶ κίον ἦματι Ἄϊδος εἴσω·  
πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι καὶ ἀργεννῆς ὄϊεσσι.  
μητέρα δ', ἠ βασίλευεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσση,  
τὴν ἐπεὶ ἄρ δεῦρ' ἦγαγ' ἄμ' ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσιν,  
ἄψ ὃ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα,  
πατρὸς δ' ἐν μεγάροισι βάλ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα.  
Ἔκτορ ἀτὰρ σύ μοι ἔσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ  
ἠδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δὲ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης·

**Sample question from section B:**

- (a) τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελθὼν. ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠύρισκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐ ταῦτ' ἀπερὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὐθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιοῦτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει. κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα ἀκούειν ζῦγκεται. Τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἔργων μέγιστον ἐπράχθη τὸ Μηδικόν, καὶ τοῦτο ὅμως δυοῖν ναυμαχίαιν καὶ πεζομαχίαιν ταχεῖαν τὴν κρίσιν ἔσχεν.



**Ideal<sup>1</sup> PhD Comprehensive Commentary Response**  
**[Passage selected by and commented upon by Debra Nousek]**

Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si sciam, dicere ausim, quippe qui cum veterem tum volgatam esse rem videam, dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt. Utcumque erit, iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi pro virili parte et ipsum consuluisse; et si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler. Res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua; et legentium plerisque haud dubito quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitura voluptatis sint, festinantibus ad haec nova quibus iam pridem praevaletis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt: ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca [tota] illa mente repeto, auertam, omnis expertae curae quae scribentis animum, etsi non flectere a uero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset.

This passage is the opening of the *praefatio* of Livy's monumental history, known as the *Ab Urbe Condita* (AUC). Written in the last few decades of the first century BCE and continued into the new century right up until Livy's death in 12 or 17 CE (the exact date is uncertain), the *History* recounts the story of Rome from its first beginnings in the legendary period of Romulus and Remus up to Livy's contemporary era. There has been substantial debate about the dates of both author and project: Livy's life falls almost exactly contemporary with that of Augustus, and while it used to be argued – on the strength of a reference to 'Caesar Augustus' early in Book 1 – that the composition of the work must post-date the conferral of that name in 27 BCE, it has been convincingly argued by T. J. Luce (1965) that this need not be the case; after all, it would be relatively easy to insert a second nominal element into the text in the period between the start of composition and eventual publication.

The work itself once spanned 142 books, though only thirty-five books are extant (1-10, 21-45), with substantial fragments of others and the later summaries (the *Periochae*) offering additional information for those books that have not survived. Much scholarship has focused on the underlying structure and arrangement of the books (see, e.g. work by Philip Stadter and T.J. Luce included in the new Chaplin/Kraus collection of classic articles). Livian scholarship has been occupied with a number of other questions, including determining (insofar as this is possible) the attitude of Livy to the Augustan regime; Livy's methodology in using his sources; Livy's use of literary devices; and his relationship to both other Augustan writers and to the historiographical tradition at Rome.

The passage at hand is the opening to the *praefatio*, a short introduction that prefaces the work as a whole, but especially the first pentad or decade (scholars are divided on whether the books should be grouped into five-book units or ten-book units), which seems to have been published on its own before the completion of the whole project. In this *praefatio*, Livy gives an account of his reasons for undertaking the project and represents himself with false modesty (*nec satis scio, nec, si sciam, ausim dicere*; cf. *si in tanta scriptorum turba ... consoler*). Two themes are apparent in the selected passage: first, the greatness of the historian's task, and second the greatness of his subject. Both are tropes common to ancient historiography (see, in general, Marincola's *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, and on Livy specifically John Moles' article "Livy's Preface"). Livy first places himself in the tradition of Roman historians who have come before him, by implication (and through the authorial choice to writing his account *a primordio urbis*) the tradition of annalistic historians active first in the middle of the third century BCE (e.g. Fabius Pictor),

---

<sup>1</sup> By "ideal" I mean, in essence, that this is the type of commentary to strive for. Think of it as the Platonic Form of comprehensive commentary.

and more recently in the first half of the first century BCE (authors such as Valerius Antias and Q. Claudius Quadrigarius). His patriotic stance regarding the *patria* is at the forefront of the second theme, though he alludes to the challenge of writing contemporary history on account of the conflict and political dissolution that plagued the last decades of the Republic. Although it is only hinted at here, he will later in the *praefatio* famously announce the moral purpose of his *History*, namely that it – and history more broadly – is intended to serve as a guide to what behavior ought to be adopted, and what avoided. The importance of correct behavior, as learned through reading the deeds of famous and heroic men (that is, through *exempla* [see Chaplin 2000 and, to a lesser extent Feldherr 1998]).

It remains to mention Livy's language and style, for which he was justly famous in antiquity and remains so. Quintilian described Livy's style as *illa Livi lactea ubertas*, a "milky richness" that is apparent even here. Indeed, Livy begins the preface – and thus his whole literary project – with a hexameter half-line (*Facturusne operae pretium sim...*), perhaps as a nod to epic – thereby creating a kind of prose epic, with lofty subject matter, elevated language and themes suitable to that poetic genre as well. Incidentally, a further nod to poetic form and process occurs at the end of the preface, as Livy gets ready to turn to his subject proper. Overall, Livy's style is expansive and eloquent, writing in a full, often periodic style (see MacDonald's article in *JRS* [1957]). He is master of what the Greeks called *enargeia*, crafting memorable scenes throughout his work (e.g., the *urbs capta* motif, the dramatic spectacle of the rape of Lucretia).

### **Examples of actual student commentary answers on recent comprehensive exams awarded a passing grade:**

[Arist. *Frogs*]

δαιμόνιε φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, οὐδ' ἐλαίρεις  
παῖδά τε νηπίαχον καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον, ἢ τάχα χήρη  
σεῦ ἔσομαι· τάχα γὰρ σε κατακτανέουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ  
πάντες ἐφορμηθέντες· ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἶη  
σεῦ ἀφαμαρτούση χθόνα δύμεναι· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλη  
ἔσται θαλπωρὴ ἐπεὶ ἂν σύ γε πότμον ἐπίσπης  
ἀλλ' ἄχε'· οὐδέ μοι ἔστι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.  
ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἄμὸν ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλικῶν εὖ ναιετάουσαν  
Θήβην ὑψίπτυλον· κατὰ δ' ἔκτανεν Ἡετίωνα,  
οὐδέ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,  
ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν κατέκθη σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν  
ἠδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχεεν·

Commentary:

This passage is from Aristophanes' play *Frogs* which dates to the late fifth century BC. It is an example of Old Comedy which marks the early stages of Greek comedy, followed by Middle (lost) and New Comedy (e.g. Menander's *Dyskolos*). In the play, Dionysus comically dressed up as Herakles, is unhappy with the current playwrights and the quality of their plays. He decides to travel to the underworld to get back Euripides but in the end betrays him and brings back Aeschylus instead. I believe the passage above is from Aeschylus and Euripides' contest in which they try to convince Dionysus to take them back to the world of living by showing whose plays are better. Here Euripides (I think) is accused of writing bad poetry and showing obscene and scandalous things on stage. Different kinds of obscenity (e.g. references to Kleisthenes sexual passivity at the beginning of the play) and bodily humour in particular are very popular as Old Comedy has roots in satyr play (which used sexually explicit costumes). Euripides

(tragedian) is accused of using elements (like obscenity and sexual transgressions like incest) in his plays which really should be beneath him as a tragedian. He is portrayed here as the source of all evil and the reason why Athens is in decline and there is no other playwright to “carry the torch” and write something good. This play is also an example of Aristophanes’ skill at word play for which his plays are known (e.g. the glorious descriptor “democrat-monkeys” above. Old comedy is also known for its satirical elements and caricatures of public personas known at the time (like poor Kleisthenes at the beginning of the play “served *under* Kleisthenes” or something along those lines). Similarly, the portrayal of Dionysus as a buffoon is very typical of Aristophanes’ plays (and thus of Old Comedy in general). There is also some dancing and song (like the amazing frog chorus) which are some of the main elements of comedy. Moreover, the *Frogs* (and other plays of this kind) usually served as a political commentary (or criticism) of the time.

[*Aeneid* 12.815-828]

non ut tela tamen, non ut contenderet arcum;  
adiuro Stygii caput implacabile fontis,  
una superstitio superis quae reddita divis.  
et nunc cedo equidem pugnasque exosa relinquo.  
illud te, nulla fati quod lege tenetur,  
pro Latio obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:  
cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)  
component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,  
ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos  
neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari  
aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem.  
sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,  
sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago:  
occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia.

Commentary:

This passage is from book 12 of Vergil’s *Aeneid*. This work is an epic poem written in dactylic hexameter and follows in the footsteps of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The *Aeneid* was published after Vergil’s death in 19 BC, who wanted his work to be destroyed. It is generally believed that this work remains unfinished. In the passage above, Juno and Jupiter have discussed the recent events. Juno finally admits her defeat and promises to stop interfering in the battle. She had just helped Turnus’ sister but promises that from now on she will let events run their course. However, she asks Zeus to honour her terms of surrender by not ordering (negative command; *iubeas*) the Italians to lose their customs, clothes and voice (i.e. language) when they join the Trojans in peace. In fact, Juno will only allow the Trojans to settle in Italy and marry into the royal family if they are the ones who lose their identity by relinquishing their name and becoming Italians instead. As such, this passage can offer a poignant reading of a refugee story. The Trojans whose identity as descendants of an Eastern royal line had been highlighted throughout the epic and Aeneas’ son Ascanius is repeatedly called the hope of his people. However, if they wish to find peace in this new land and fulfill their destiny (foretold in book 1) they need to assimilate into the new society they encountered and lose their identity. Only by doing this they will find peace and Juno will vengeful quest. As such, it could be argued that the Trojan mission was only partially successful. While they are able to found a new line of Latin and Alban kings and lay the foundation for the glory of Rome and their

“empire without end,” they are no longer able to call themselves Trojans and associate themselves with their royal line. The Romans always had a troubled relationship with the East and its luxuries and wanton morals, and given the clash with Cleopatra and Anthony in the East just about ten years earlier it makes sense that this passage would distance the Romans from their Eastern origins. Their eastern roots can be seen as a sense of pride and a way to create their own identity (i.e. stemming from an illustrious and warlike people), but it is still essential for them to distance themselves from the luxuries (e.g. the clothing-*vestis*) and their effects on morality.

[Caes. *BG* 1.7]

Caesari cum id nuntiatum esset, eos per provinciam nostram iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci et quam maximis potest itineribus in Galliam ulteriorem contendit et ad Genavam pervenit. Provinciae toti quam maximum potest militum numerum imperat (erat omnino in Gallia ulteriore legio una), pontem, qui erat ad Genavam, iubet rescindi. Ubi de eius adventu Helvetii certiores facti sunt, legatos ad eum mittunt nobilissimos civitatis, cuius legationis Nammeius et Verucloetius principem locum obtinebant, qui dicerent sibi esse in animo sine ullo maleficio iter per provinciam facere, propterea quod aliud iter haberent nullum: rogare ut eius voluntate id sibi facere liceat. Caesar, quod memoria tenebat L. Cassium consulem occisum exercitumque eius ab Helvetiis pulsum et sub iugum missum, concedendum non putabat; neque homines inimico animo, data facultate per provinciam itineris faciundi, temperaturos ab iniuria et maleficio existimabat.

This passage is taken from Caesar's Gallic war. In this passage, the Helvetians were about to cross the bridge at Geneva into the Roman province. This passage is remarkable because of the way Caesar characterizes himself in contrast to his enemies, the Helvetians. Caesar portrayed them as being maleficient and being unable to restrain themselves from causing harm, considering the way they killed Lucius Cassius and his soldiers. This seems to be a way for Caesar to show the Helvetians as a barbaric 'other.' It is a common trope for barbarians to lack self-restraint, hence, Caesar saying that he did not think that the Helvetians will be able to restrain themselves from evil-deeds testify to that point: '..temperaturos ab iniuria et maleficio.' It is worth mentioning that this passage marks the first place where Caesar's name was mentioned in the Book one of the Gallic war. His name was placed first at the beginning of this chapter in the emphatic position to portray Caesar's character as a man of action. Next, Caesar describes his action, using his common *topos* of swiftness "quam maximis potest....contendit." The idea of swiftness is common *topos* Caesar often uses to describe himself in his writing, in contrast to his enemies, who are often depicted as being slow. It is also worth noting that Caesar narrates his history in the third person. This is a way through which Caesar distant himself from his narration, and to differentiate between Caesar the actor from Caesar the author. Also, this technique is also a way for Caesar to portray himself as being unbiased in his narration. Considering Caesar's style, Caesar oftentimes, tends to write using series of indirect statements (*oratio obliqua*). These instances can be seen in lines 8 'sibi esse...facere,' and 9 'rogare, ut....' Etc. Therefore, there have been debates on his mode of writing since antiquity. In fact, some have termed his writing as inelegant. However, Cicero praises Caesar's style of writing, admitting that there is elegance in its inelegance.