



BOARD OF STUDIES  
NEW SOUTH WALES

---

# 1997 HSC

---

## EXAMINATION REPORT

Latin

© Board of Studies 1998

Published by  
Board of Studies NSW  
GPO Box 5300  
Sydney NSW 2001  
Australia

June 1998

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 1417 4

98025

## LATIN 2 UNIT

### SECTION I - LIVY, *BOOK V*

#### Question 1 (a) (i)

This passage was generally well translated by most students. Translations were, in some cases, a little free, but, when the sense was clearly retained, credit was given.

- *Pollicentes* was sometimes translated as “promised” and the accusative and infinitive constructions - *vovit...se...facturum...dedicaturum* were sometimes rendered as “promised to...”.
- Those students who made the infinitives passive (“promised...would be dedicated”) were considered to have failed to identify and translate the construction correctly.
- The participle *refectam* was translated in various ways which displayed an understanding of the sense conveyed in the sentence.
- The ablative absolutes - *omnibus...paratis* and *Veiis captis* were generally well translated, as was the phrase *ex senatus consulto*. Some students, however, translated *consulto* as “consulted”.
- The genitive *Matutae Matris* was frequently mistranslated as a dative.
- The military term *signa confert* was generally well translated as was the phrase *ad id bellum*.
- The relative *quibus* confused a few students; the better translations began a new sentence and translated it as “[to] them,” indirect object of *egisset*.
- The phrase *expectatione...spe* was generally translated freely with a good turn of phrase, as was *ut fit*. The final sentence caused problems for many students.
- The linking of *omnia ibi* with *acta*, *summa* with *ratione consilioque* and *fortuna etiam* with *secuta est* challenged students to produce a version which both conveyed the meaning of the original and was couched in readable, logical English.

#### Question 1 (a) (ii)

Some students restricted their answers to general information on the *typical* circumstances which resulted in the appointment of a dictator rather than the specific circumstances which led to the appointment of Camillus. The best responses provided detail about the actual circumstances described in the chapters which preceded the actual appointment of Camillus as dictator.

#### Question 1 (b) (i)

The best responses included references to:

- Camillus’ character, bearing, arrogance and god-like status
- Camillus’ piety which is mentioned in (7) where he pays due reverence to the gods and his actions

- Camillus as a hero/great leader or to his popularity supported by relevant examples from the Livy extract translated or explained in English.

**Question 1 (b) (ii)**

“Approach” was interpreted as “style” by some students who provided numerous examples of assonance, alliteration, participles and individual words. These points were acceptable if linked to the historiography. The best answers referred specifically to the set passage although other references to different parts of Livy were accepted if these were well developed and explained.

The key points in relation to approach were:

- Livy’s dramatic writing style of vivid, colourful and emotive storytelling;
- his moral purpose and didactic intention in depicting Camillus’ arrogance as a pretext for his later exile. Camillus’ hubris is seen as the cause of his exile;
- cause and effect sequence is seen here as divine retribution for people’s folly;
- the psychological analysis of the reasons behind people’s actions and decisions is unique for his time.

**Question 1 (c)**

The translation proved quite challenging for some students.

Common errors were:

- *quocumque* wrongly translated as ‘everywhere’;
- *ruentium* where the force of the present participle was missed
- *animos oraque et oculos* = minds and eyes and ears;
- *ante alios* was commonly mistranslated and *obsessi sunt* was taken as pluperfect tense;
- students failed to translate *obsidebantur* because the verb had been repeated previously in another form;
- the last line proved very difficult for many and although a variety of translations to express *cessaret* were permissible, in some cases too free a paraphrase resulted in the omission of key words like *spectaculo*.

**Question 1 (d) (i)**

Many students gave competent, brief outlines of the context of the three extracts, placing the first after the dispiriting defeat at the Allia, when the Romans are making preparations in the face of the imminent attack of the Gauls; the second as those not staying in the Capitol stream out of Rome towards the Janiculum, when L. Albinus, a plebeian, offers his wagon to take the quirinal priest and the vestal virgins to their destination, Caere; and the third during the siege of Rome’s citadel by the Gauls, when C. Fabius Dorsuo completes his family’s traditional religious rite and returns, unharmed by the Gauls.

(Some students, however, included comment on the **content** of the passages, which properly belonged in the second part of their answers.)

### Question 1 (d) (ii)

Students who had given a brief outline of the content in (i) usually commented perceptively on the role of religion in Livy, *Book V*, by referring to the different aspects exemplified in the extracts as required by the question.

In the best responses students:

- commented on the **renewed** attention paid to the gods and religious matters (after the Roman defeat which Livy shows had followed their failure to fulfil their religious obligations)
- discussed Livy's recording of the group response in the first passage and that of the individual plebeian in the second and the individual patrician in the third.

### Question 1 (e)

The length of the serial sentence, beginning with *itaque*, proved challenging to many students who were unable to link the correct clauses to *dum* and identify the principal verb (*iussit*) and its subject. *Capitolinus exercitus, iubet, parat, instruitque* were correctly linked to *dum* by a minority of students.

Many did not correctly identify *adoriatur* as a subjunctive of purpose dependent on *quibus*. Some did not successfully link *sineret* to *cum*. The indirect question in *appareret* was generally well translated, although *ecquod* - linked to *auxilium* - was often ignored.

The ablative absolutes - *spe...cibo...deficiente* and *obruentibus...armis* were generally well translated, as was the clause *cum...procederent*. The passive infinitives *dissimulari, ferri, vinci, dedi, redimi* were recognised by most students, although a few thought *ferri* to be the genitive of *ferrum*. The final ablative absolute - *iactantibus...Gallis* was generally well translated, along with the accompanying *adduci posse* and the ablative of price *magna mercede*.

A few students incorrectly translated the final *ut....relinquant* clause, treating it as a purpose, not an indirect command.

Most students produced a liberal, sometimes convoluted version. The better versions showed care in dividing the sentence into its constituent clauses and correctly and unambiguously linking subjects to verbs. Some students chose to translate more freely - for example, changing the voice of some infinitives but retaining the sense. A few translations lost accuracy through attempts to produce too free a version.

Some students had, apparently, committed a translation to memory and, in re-producing it, omitted key words and, in some cases, phrases. *Per se*, for example, was omitted

from some translations. A few students incorrectly linked *per se* to *Ardeae* (through *Ardea* itself) or its true sense was not recognised.

Common errors included:

- *a Veiis* was sometimes rendered as *to veii*
- translations of *interim*, *iam*, *postremo* and *fessus* were forgotten by some students.

On the other hand, the balanced *quoque...non solum* and the *litotes haud obscure* were often effectively translated.

## SECTION II - VIRGIL, *AENEID*, XII

### Question 2 (a) (i)

The standard of translation was generally very good. However, some students tended to follow the Latin word order too closely in some parts and this led to some awkwardness of expression.

Common errors included:

- *praestans* was treated as an epithet of *animi*
- *impensius* was not recognised as a comparative adverb if translated at all
- *aequum* was taken to qualify *me*
- *casus* was variously translated and in some cases the translations did not suggest the unexpected or accidental
- *anmus* was not suggestive of “goodwill”, “generosity” etc but simply translated as “mind or courage”
- *aliae* was frequently translated as “many”
- *latio* was sometimes treated as an adjective qualifying *agro*
- *sine* was rarely translated as “without”
- the ablative absolute *sublati...dolis* was ignored
- *dolis* was translated as “grief or pain”.

Some students treated *hoc* as qualifying *animo*. Also, *hauri* was treated as a present passive infinitive, often following *sine*. The *id* of *idque* was sometimes ignored as was *-que*. Some students translated *canebant* by the present tense.

### Question 2 (a) (ii)

The scansion proved very challenging for most students.

In the first line many students did not recognise the consonantal “i” of *iuvenis* and elided the final “-i” of *animi* (occasionally the “-i-” of *iuvenis*). The elision at *-tum ipse* was generally recognised.

The second line presented even greater difficulty. Many students did not identify the three cases of elision in the line. Often the first elision was not recognised and this threw the scansion of the rest of the line into chaos. The *caesuras* were generally marked (in their own cute ways) at the correct points although the frequent incorrect scansion made this difficult. A few students did not mark any *caesuras* or marked the

scansion made this difficult. A few students did not mark any *caesuras* or marked the *caesura* in one line but not in the other. A few students marked two or three *caesuras* in the one line.

### Question 2 (b)

Students were required to firstly identify the emotional and physical reaction (embarrassment, grief, etc) of Lavinia to her mother's words. This was done satisfactorily by most students.

Students were then required to identify the language, etc used by Virgil to describe this reaction.

Many students saw this as an opportunity to do a language appreciation of the passage generally and did not address the actual question which focused on Virgil's use of language etc to describe and reinforce Lavinia's reaction.

### Question 2 (c)

On the whole this translation was well handled.

Key problem areas included mistakes involving translations which were too freely or clumsily handled, words missing, mistaking singular for plural and vice versa, eg *ripa* = riverbank, **not** riverbanks, *insidiis* = ambush, not ambushes (or traps would have been acceptable). Some words, eg *interdum* = sometimes, not meanwhile and *urget* = presses on, **not** urges, were mistranslated. In a phrase like *cursu...latatribus* the correct case should be maintained - "with running...with barking".

The last 2 lines were not generally well translated as students tended to translate them too loosely.

### Question 2 (d)

Many students did not translate the first two lines well. The following were the most common errors.

*tandem* - omitted or translated as "however"

*iam* - omitted

*ne* - negative purpose clause (or negative command) not identified

*tacitam* - omitted

*saepe* - omitted

### Question 2 (e)

(i) The best answers to this question included reference to the *Dira* sent by Jupiter as a signal to Juturna to withdraw and as an omen confirming Turnus' doom; her resignation statement which follows and her subsequent departure. This question was answered well by the majority of students.

(ii) The tragic elements of *Book XII* present in this passage include:

- the impotence of mortals/immortals who do not fit into the scheme of Fate;
- divine manipulation resulting in tragic outcomes.

Students were required to identify at least 2 points from the passage and link these to the tragic elements.

Points identified by students included:

- Juturna's personal tragedy, her utter helplessness exacerbated by the curse of her divinity;
- denial of a profound human brother/sister relationship;
- Juturna's involvement at the instigation of Juno, acting as Juno's agent, manipulated, dismissed;
- Turnus: for all his noble qualities and heroic attributes his downfall/death is assured. Fate will prevail.

### Question 2 (f)

This section of this question which related to Aeneas was generally answered well. However, students had difficulty applying the term *pietas* to Turnus.

Some students wrote a pre-prepared answer about the ambivalent feelings which arise from the end of *Book XII* which did not address the question. Some concentrated on the difference in character of Aeneas and Turnus, with little real understanding of the concept of *pietas*.

The best responses concentrated on the concept of 'filial' piety and those students who gained the best marks did this fairly succinctly. In the first passage Turnus is conceding defeat and is not asking for mercy for his own sake, but for his father Daunus - (*miseri te si qua...potest...Dauni miserere senectae*). He appeals to the *pietas* he knows is part of Aeneas by referring to his father Anchises (*fuit et tibi talis...genitor*) and asks either that he be sent back alive to his father or that his dead body be sent back for burial - *et me...meis*. (Some students said that this showed Turnus' *pietas* towards his father, some believed he was using Aeneas' feelings of *pietas* to gain *clementia*.)

In the 2nd passage, we see that, although Aeneas has recognised and has been almost swayed by the appeal to his *pietas*, he hesitates, showing his own *pietas*. He feels a higher obligation to take vengeance for the death of Pallas when he sees the sword-belt, because of his promise to Evander and the surrogate father/son relationship involved - again revealing filial *pietas*.

It was possible to answer this question in different ways and students were also given credit for mentioning such points as Turnus' lack of *pietas* earlier in rejecting Latinus and Amata's pleas in the light of his plea here; his lack of *pietas* in gloating about Evander when he killed Pallas; his *pietas* now towards the gods in finally accepting his fate.



Similarly some felt that Aeneas acted with the opposite of *pietas* at the end, being swayed by *furor* after the conflict between the two. However, some argued that it would have shown lack of *pietas* towards the gods in allowing Turnus to live, as ‘the old order’ was destined to go.

### SECTION III - ACCIDENCE AND SYNTAX OR PROSE COMPOSITION

#### Question 3 (a) Accidence and Syntax

- (i) *profectus*:  
Most could identify this correctly.
- (ii) *maiore*:  
Most knew the superlative form but wrote it in
  - (1) abl masc/neuter singular
  - (2) as adverb ‘maxime’
- (iii) *acta*:  
Many felt this was nominative case and linked it with *fortuna*.
- (iv) *ut fit*:  
Less than half realized it was indicative.  
Some who did, could not supply the reason.
- (v) *fudit*:  
Very few knew all the principal parts - particularly the present stem and infinitive.
- (vi) *castris*:  
Most students identified the case and linked it to *exiit*.
- (vii) *praeda*:  
Most students identified the case and linked it to *potitus*.  
A few thought it nominative.
- (viii) *militi*:  
Most realized it was dative case and indirect object.
- (ix) *densioraque castella facta*:  
Many students answered *est*.
- (x) *quae*:
  - Many neuters!
  - Many accusatives!
- (xi) *temere*:

Quite a few knew the correct answer but there were many answers identifying *temere* as an adjective, verb (a variety of forms eg infinitive; 3rd person plural perfect tense), noun.

(xii) *edicto*:

Most realized it was an ablative absolute. Some linked it with *iniussu*. A few thought it was an adverb.

(xiii) *pugnaret*:

The mood was correct - the reason for its use was problematic, eg purpose clause.

(xiv) *agi*:

The majority of students knew it was infinitive but were not specific enough, eg present passive infinitive.

(xv) *intermitteretur*:

Most students put the word into the (a) indicative, (b) imperfect. However, many left it as a passive, or wrote it as 1st/3rd/4th conjugation eg

*intermittabat*  
*intermittiebat*

(xvi) *munitorum*:

A variety of answers was accepted. Many students had problems with 'correct' terminology but demonstrated an understanding of the relationship of the word to *numerus*. A few students felt that *numerus* and *munitorum* **agreed**.

### Question 3 (b) Prose Composition

Only a small number of students attempted this question. All those who attempted it achieved very high marks.

## SECTION IV - UNSEEN TRANSLATION

### Question 4 (a)

The verse unseen was a good discriminator. Very many students experienced difficulty with the Latin verse word order. In addition, many failed to recognise the syntax of the accusative and infinitive construction relating to *templa...facta* and subject/verb agreement generally.

Adjective/noun agreement proved to be a common fault particularly with: *summa, tuo, Gallica, Capitolino, tui*.

Tense/mood errors occurred chiefly in: *fuerat, cecidisset, occideret*.

Commonly mistranslated vocabulary included: *quondam*, *alte*, *quam*, *vixit* (too often ‘conquered’), *crimine*, *regni*.

*Ante* was a problem to those translating it as a preposition rather than an adverb.

Also worthy of mention is *regni*, the significance of which students found very difficult to express.

#### **Question 4 (b) Unseen Translation**

This translation was generally well done.

Areas of difficulty were:

- Translation of:
  - arreptum and rapit*
  - ad munera*
  - aciem* confused with *arcem*
  - signum/signiferum*
- Recognition of syntax:
  - ablative absolute - *clamore sublato*
  - accusative and infinitive - *emissum signum*
    - *concitados antesignanos*
    - *pulsum Antiatem*
    - *terrorem perlatus*
  - purpose clause *idque .....repeteretur*
  - prepositional phrase - in + accusative
  - quod* as a connective
- Consistency of tenses - *desilit/rapit*

## LATIN 3 UNIT

### SECTION I - CATULLUS

#### Question 1 (a) (i)

Translated very well by almost all students.

#### Question 1 (a) (ii)

The scansion was reasonably well done; the final foot caused a few problems.

#### Question 1 (b)

This translation was done very well by most students.

Some common errors were:

- not differentiating between the many typically Catullan items of vocabulary, eg *dicax*, *urbanus*, *venustus*, *bellus* etc. The translation 'witty' was used indiscriminately;
- confusing the plural *milia* for the singular *mille*;
- not translating the prefix *per* of *perscripta*;
- not recognising the deliberative subjunctive *putemus* and translating it accordingly;
- making *infaceto* (as well as *infacetior*) agree with *idem*, eg 'the same man is crude and more crude than the countryside' - only, *infacetior* agrees with *idem*;
- confusing *nimirum* with *nimum*;
- mistranslating the partitive genitive *quot manticae* as 'the knapsack which'.

#### Question 1 (c) (i)

The best responses included **some** of the following:

- prayer/appeal - to the gods for health
- resignation that Lesbia affair is finished
- challenge to the gods to **reward** him for his *pietas*
- the difficulty Catullus experienced in giving up Lesbia.

Most students answered this question adequately.

### Question 1 (c) (ii)

This question proved challenging for most students. Many explained the structure of the poem in relation to the last line, but very few students managed to combine structure **and** language.

The best answers included the following points:

#### Language

- language of accounting
- language of religion
- desperate nature of vocabulary - repetition
- self-absorption of Catullus
- cyclical nature of poem - last line returns to 1st section of the poem
- uses of subjunctives, imperatives, conditionals, questions.

#### Structure

- What **should** happen
- What **has** happened
- Prayer

### Question 1 (c) (iii)

This question was answered competently by many students. The mood **and** language of Poem 76 had to be compared with at least 2 other poems. Many answers did not mention language at all. Knowledge of other Lesbia poems was good - some students could quote the Latin, others could give a translation. Comparisons were valid for **all** of the Lesbia poems.

## SECTION II - Unseen Verse Translation

### Question 2

Nearly all students followed the instruction to write on alternative lines. A few wrote in pencil which should be avoided, as should the practice of offering alternate translations in brackets.

#### Translation

While this unseen passage allowed good students to demonstrate the skills they have developed, it also gave weaker students the opportunity for a 'new start' in each couplet. In fact many students who had difficulty with the second and third couplets managed to give good translations of the last two couplets and thus finished this unseen piece triumphantly.

#### Common difficulties

Few students were able to deal well with *en!*, *porrigimus*, *opus est*, *veniam*, *laus* and *necte*. Most did not connect *qui deceat* meaningfully with the main clause, but did handle successfully the mixture of tenses in the passage.