



BOARD OF STUDIES
NEW SOUTH WALES

1998 HSC

**EXAMINATION
REPORT**

Latin

© Board of Studies 1999

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

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9367 8484

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

June 1999

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 4272 0

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 2/3 Unit (Common) | 4 |
| Written Examination | 4 |
| Section I — Livy, <i>Book V</i> | 4 |
| Section II — Virgil, <i>Aeneid XII</i> | 7 |
| Section III — Accidence and syntax or Prose composition | 10 |
| Section IV — Unseen Translation | 12 |
| 3 Unit (Additional) | 15 |
| Written Examination | 15 |
| Section I — Catullus | 15 |
| Section II — Unseen Verse Translation | 16 |

1998 Higher School Certificate

Examination Report

Latin

2/3 Unit (Common)

Written Examination

Section I — Livy, *Book V* (30 marks)

Question 1

Part(a)

On the whole this translation was well done. Those students who were well prepared not only had a good understanding of the syntax but also were sensitive to the word order and the style of the Latin. It is important to note that a correct translation is not just a matter of translating every vocabulary item in isolation, but also of taking into account its context and any stylistic clues given by the author.

Good translations made the rather long indirect statement of sections 8–9 more manageable and fluid in English by the appropriate use of punctuation and by adding phrases such as ‘Licinius went on to say that...’ to remind the reader that what they were translating was reported speech. It was not necessary to change the passive voice of the infinitives in section 8 in order to produce an idiomatic, readable translation, but in **good** translations, where the voice of *reconciliari* and *succurri* was changed from the passive, a change of subject for the active *sentire* was also appropriately signalled.

Students who were sensitive to the correct meaning of the Latin **in its context** were able to translate appropriately the words *gratius/laetius* as ‘more gratifying/welcome/pleasing rather than as ‘happier/more joyful’. Latin words, which can have a multitude of meanings, can also be problematic. It was pleasing, in this regard, to see *animos* in section 8 frequently rendered as ‘feelings’. Many made the effort to translate with different English verbs the three Latin verbs *delegasse*, *reiectam* and *permittere*, which are quite similar in meaning, thus indicating sensitivity to the style of the passage.

Finally, students need to make a conscious effort not to omit demonstratives (*eam, eo* etc) and other little words which can easily be overlooked.

Part (b)

Sub-section (i)

The great majority of the students were able to explain the significance of the comparison in its context. Very many also expanded on the relevance of the comparison to the theme of *pietas*, the

fulfilment of Camillus' vow, and the link between *pietas* and Roman military success or *fortuna*.

Sub-section (ii)

The analysis of language was generally well answered, with good explanations given of Livy's various linguistic features. Some of the points well covered were:

- the manner in which the *iuvenes* were selected and their purification was carried out;
- the description of the removal of Juno, with direct speech for dramatic effect, and alliteration and polysyllabic final verb for added emphasis;
- the use of poetic vocabulary;
- clear marking of the succession of events with adverbs.

Part (c)

Although most students showed that they had prepared this passage from Chapter 38 thoroughly, certain careless errors such as the following occurred, even in some of the best scripts:

- *extenuando*: translated as if from *extendere*;
- *maxime*: translated as 'positive degree';
- *ad id* (anticipating *ut*): omitted;
- *campi*: the relationship with *aequo* not recognised.

To avoid such slips and omissions, students are advised to retain the order of Livy's clauses wherever possible, and to check in a grammar or dictionary for meanings of words beyond the most basic and literal. For example, the correlatives *ut ... sic* ('as ... so') may also be rendered 'at once ... as well as', 'not only ... but also', 'both ... and', 'while ... yet'. Thoughtful students provided a wonderful variety of appropriate translations for *artem*, including 'strategy', 'tactic', 'ruse', 'guile', 'trick'.

Students are strongly reminded not to include alternative or literal translations in brackets.

Part (d)

Most students answered this question well. It was essential not only to identify Camillus' qualities, but also to show how they emerge in this particular passage and to provide some elaboration.

Students need to be reminded how to refer to a passage to back up their points. Appropriate quotation from the Latin is well worthwhile, but does not of itself make the point without some added explanation. To say that 'This passage reveals Camillus' *pietas*' and to follow it up simply with the Latin *qui maestior ibi fortuna publica quam sua* is not enough.

Among the excellent points raised were the following aspects of Camillus' character:

- the patriot, selfless, altruistic, totally committed and impassioned;
- the inspiring leader, able to unite others around a common cause;
- the man of action;
- the diplomat, statesmanlike and humble;

- the astute politician;
- the persuasive orator;
- the true warrior;
- the destined leader, touched by divine inspiration.

Part (e)

The majority of students translated this passage very well. The main areas where some experienced difficulty were in translating the phrase *nihil...motus*, in accounting for *eadem* as well as *similiter*, and in translating the clause *quorum...deseruisset*.

The numerous participles, and particularly the ablative absolutes with *seu...seu*, provided problems for some with the flow in translation and connection of clauses.

A small number of students were inclined to make *Gabino an agnomen* of Fabius.

Part (f)

Sub-section (i)

Nearly all students answered this question correctly.

Sub-section (ii)

Despite the wording of the question, too many students considered it unnecessary to discuss all four expressions. These poorer answers merely gave a general account, with some reference to the shame of the Romans. The best answers analysed each expression and its effect, and pointed out the accumulation of insults depicting the Romans at their lowest point. Good points raised included the following:

- *foedissimae* indicates the disgrace and cowardice of the Romans in trying to buy their way out of trouble, and the betrayal of Roman ideals;
- *indignitas* emphasises the added insult arising from the use of false weights by the Gauls;
- *insolente* shows one Gaul arrogantly revelling in the humiliation of the Romans;
- *Vae victis* is the final insult, a Roman phrase used against the Romans with bitter irony.

Sub-section (iii)

Better students perceived that Livy has rewritten the story to suit his didactic and moralistic purposes. Others had said that the Romans did pay the ransom, but Livy brings in the *fatalis dux* in time to redeem his people's honour. Livy's version implicitly upholds Roman values: when the Romans are about to conclude a shameful agreement, Camillus, the very model of *pietas*, comes with the aid of the gods to right the situation.

Section II — Virgil, *Aeneid XII* (30 marks)

Question 2

Part (a)

Sub-section (i)

This question was well answered, with the majority of students scoring more than half the marks, and many gaining full marks. The length of answers, however, varied considerably, from just a few lines to more than three pages. It should be noted that many students gained full marks by making their points succinctly in less than a page.

A variety of valid responses was offered. Nearly all students referred to Turnus' violent nature (though 'anger' was considered too weak for *violentia*). Other aspects discussed included Turnus' courage, his pride, his stubbornness, and his contempt for Aeneas.

While most saw him as a typical Homeric hero concerned with personal honour and glory, many recognised an ambivalence of character here, referring to the formal and respectful framework of his address to Latinus. Some also saw the tragic nature of his character, citing the dramatic irony in the last four lines.

Sub-section (ii)

The scansion caused some problems for most students, and the average mark awarded was 1 out of 2. The most common error came in indicating the main caesura in the third foot, rather than the fourth, of line 52; one student even placed it in the middle of the word *mater*. Some were confused over the division of syllables, indicating the end of a foot after *sese* despite the elision, while a few, who obviously recognised the elision, did not indicate it by any mark on the letter. A few made things very difficult for themselves by incorrectly copying *feminea* as *femina* or *feminae*. Students were not penalised for marking the last syllable of *fugacem* as short, but were expected to know that the first declension ablative plural ending of *umbris* is long.

Part (b)

Sub-section (i)

This translation was done very well. Students were able to give an appropriate idiomatic rendering for *Iuppiter hac stat* ('Jupiter is on our side'), for the ethic dative *mihi* ('I urge you', 'I beg you'), and for *scilicet* ('I ask you', 'to be sure', 'really', 'evidently'), capturing, in the case of the latter, the tone of Aeneas' scornful, angry words. The words *proelia nostra pati* yielded a number of translations, reflecting a wide interpretation of the phrase; among these were 'to engage in combat with me', 'to endure combat with me'. Most students recognised the military connotations of *concurrere* and translated it appropriately as 'clash', 'join in battle'.

Line 572 was also interpreted in a number of ways; among the better renderings were 'source', 'capital', 'cause' for *caput* and 'centre', 'sum', 'focal point' for *summa*. Most students also recognised the stylistic importance of the repeated demonstrative, and their translations reflected this.

Sub-section (ii)

Students had little difficulty in identifying rage as the predominant emotion to emerge from these lines. Good answers expanded on this point by adding:

- that Aeneas 'is merciless, resolved to crush the Latins', 'is determined to carry out his threats and overtaken by a great sense of urgency';
- that Aeneas 'has contempt for the city', 'is vengeful, his thoughts full of revenge as he identifies the city as the main cause of the war';
- that Aeneas' threats to destroy and flatten the city are ruthless, and he is remorselessly imperialistic in his intention to see that the Latins submit to his control.

Good answers also revealed an understanding of the context of the passage by highlighting the change that has come over Aeneas. Students noted that 'Aeneas has lost the self-control which he normally exhibits; whereas he previously offered alliance, he is now resolved to subjugate the Latins totally', 'Aeneas' finer qualities have been suppressed, and he is dominated by the *furor* and impetuosity we normally associate with Turnus'.

It is important for students to read the question carefully and to refer specifically to the lines to which their attention has been directed.

Part (c)

This translation was generally done very well, with many students scoring full marks or making only slight errors. Nevertheless some errors worth noting did occur. Verbs were not always carefully translated, eg *instraverat* (as if from *instruo*), *eduxerat* and *superant* (wrong tense), *sequamur* (wrong mood), and the adverbial force of *ante* was not always recognised.

Some students omitted certain Latin words, such as *autem* and *quam*; more significantly, when the repeated words within the speech, such as *iam iam*, *quo ...quo* and *stat ...stat* were not fully accounted for, the translation lost force and could not convey the power of Turnus' realisation that his hour has come.

Part (d)

This question was not as well answered as might have been expected. A very great number of students saw it as an opportunity to relate everything they knew about the concept of destiny/fate, and impressive though this may have been, it did not address the question by referring to the passage.

Many students focused almost solely on Turnus and his tragic fate, but in order to gain full marks it was essential to mention the destiny of Aeneas as the founder of the Roman race. The best responses made reference to the roles of Jupiter and Juno in Book XII. These two divinities share the greatest influence on destiny's fulfilment in this book, Jupiter by administering the operations of fate, and Juno by tampering with, resisting and delaying this. In this passage lies the beginning of the divine reconciliation which will put in train events leading to the successful outcome of Aeneas' mission. Jupiter reproaches Juno, questioning the correctness of her behaviour (*mortalin decuit ... victis?*) in attempting to delay the inevitable. The best responses noted the futility of Juno's opposition, and also her removal as the last obstacle to the fulfilment of Aeneas' destiny; further resistance would be pointless and should cease (*ventum ad supremum est*).

Part (e)

Nearly all students were able to identify several good examples of Virgil's use of language in this passage and link them to one of the effects being created. Most students also clearly identified examples of effective imagery, eg of physical destruction, paralysis of mind, the drug-like state of the struggling dreamer. Some students, however, in their eagerness to analyse the passage overlooked the most fundamental point, that here lies a simile, comparing Turnus to a person in a dream struggling in spellbound helplessness.

When dealing with the effects of the language and imagery, it was important to observe that the principal effect is to evoke our sympathy for Turnus. The very choice of the subject matter of the simile encourages the reader's empathy, since it details an almost universal human experience.

Very few students were unable to interpret the simile accurately. A few did, however, feel it represented one trying to resist overwhelming tiredness such as that experienced as a result of jet-lag.

Part (f)

Sub-section (i)

For most of the students this translation posed no problems and was handled very well. There was variety in the translations offered, many of them excellent in terms of capturing the 'spirit' of the lines without losing touch with the text. Probably the greatest error — from only a few students — was the omission of an occasional word, eg *exuviasque* (946), *hinc* (947).

Sub-section (ii)

This question on the whole was not well answered, perhaps because it was the very last question in Section II and students were anxious to move on through the paper. Quite a few either omitted to answer at all, or appear to have dashed off a hurried response. Examiners were looking for comments along the following lines:

- *fervidus*: a word usually associated with Turnus, indicates a change of character from the usual *pious* Aeneas, a loss of control; the emphasis given by its significant placement in enjambment; the somewhat unsettling image of Aeneas which, as the final adjective to describe him, it leaves for the reader at the end of the poem;
- *indignata*: a word depicting Turnus as complaining, indignant, resentful, because he had had no control over his fate and regarded his death as unfair; it also indicates a change of character, in that previously he had been prepared to die; its significant placement, as the final adjective for Turnus and almost the final word, arouses sympathy for Turnus at the end of the poem.

Credit was also given for reasoned discussion about why Virgil may have chosen to end Book XII on this ambivalent note, about the Homeric hero versus the 'new age' hero, and about the tragedy of Turnus. Far too many students, however, answered by relating in detail why Aeneas killed Turnus (including Pallas' death at Turnus' hand) and whether Turnus should have been killed. Many, not realising the implication of *fervidus* being a word usually associated with Turnus, said just that *fervidus* indicated that Aeneas was enraged and killed Turnus out of revenge.

Section III Accidence and Syntax OR Prose Composition (15 marks)

Question 3 — Part (a) — Accidence and Syntax

General Comments

Teachers should encourage their students to check carefully that they have answered every question. Several students omitted sub-section (xiii), apparently through misreading the Roman numerals.

Answers for this question do not need to be expressed in full sentences. Students familiar with the grammatical terminology employed in the syllabus and in standard reference books could answer more succinctly. Nevertheless, even those who struggled to use the correct terminology could often demonstrate sufficient understanding of the syntax to satisfy the examiners. It was disappointing, however, to see many common terms misspelt or carelessly abbreviated, even though these did not incur a penalty.

On the whole this question allowed students to display an impressive grammatical grasp of the set text.

Specific Comments

This question is designed to test students' understanding of the relationship between words and the underlying grammatical concepts. This year over 50 percent of the candidature scored 11 marks or more out of 15, and 20 percent scored 14 or more. Only 10 percent earned less than half, while nine students were awarded full marks.

The highest proportion of errors was to be found in the questions involving manipulation, in particular sub-sections (v) and (xv), and what appeared to be the easiest sub-sections for the students were those requiring only one piece of information, as in sub-sections (i), (xiv) and (xvi). A question-by-question analysis follows.

Sub-section (i)

Nearly all students were able to link this phrase satisfactorily to the participle *infractos*.

Sub-section (ii)

Nearly all students recognised the tense (perfect), but fewer provided all the detail required (ie *active* infinitive) to identify the form without ambiguity.

Sub-section (iii)

Many students appear to have automatically assumed that the mood was subjunctive because of the word *ut*. It was important to recognise the temporal use of *ut* followed by the indicative.

Sub-section (iv)

The vast majority of students recognised the case.

Sub-section (v)

This proved to be the most challenging question. Two thirds of the students answered the question unsatisfactorily, either by not recognising that *implacabilis* is nominative singular masculine, or by assuming that the superlative was formed in *-illimus* like those of the special group *facilis*, *difficilis*, *similis*, *dissimilis*, *humilis* and *gracilis* (but not, it should be noted, of *amabilis*, *nobilis*, *mutabilis*, *utilis* and others). It was pleasing to see, nevertheless, that one third of the students produced *implacabilissimus*, following the rules for formation of superlatives which are presented in Latin course books and standard grammars. One student particularly impressed the examiners by producing a very acceptable alternative, namely *maxime implacabilis*.

Sub-section (vi)

Just over half of the students correctly identified this part of the verb as a present participle. It was disappointing that many incorrectly called it a perfect participle, and that some confused it with a gerundive.

Sub-section (vii)

A pleasing proportion of the candidature correctly identified *pectus* as an accusative of respect, though some, relying on their memory of the English translation ('in the chest'), assumed that it was ablative.

Sub-section (viii)

Two thirds of the students were able to identify the case of *comantis* and link it with *toros*.

Sub-section (ix)

This was one question requiring manipulation which was very well handled.

Sub-section (x)

A substantial majority of the students correctly identified the adverb. However it was clear that some did not know the meaning of the word, and that others apparently knew the meaning but could not name the part of speech correctly.

Sub-section (xi)

Almost two thirds of the students were able to identify the mood of retractent as subjunctive and to link this with the expression *nihil est quod*. Considerable variety — and some creativity — were evident in the explanations of the mood which were offered, not only by the students but also by the range of authorities consulted by the examiners. Answers judged to be acceptable included generic subjunctive, indirect question and deliberative subjunctive. Teachers are referred to, *inter alia*, Gould and Whitely, *Aeneid XII*, page 45, Gildersleeve and Lodge, *Latin Grammar*, Section 525 note 2 and Lewis and Short, *nihil* I. (λ).

Sub-section (xii)

It was pleasing to see that few students mistook *quae* for the feminine form, with more than half answering the question correctly.

Sub-section (xiii)

Most students were able to give *pepigerunt*.

Sub-section (xiv)

This was one of the questions answered best. Some, however, wrote *ferte*, perhaps mistakenly reading the following question.

Sub-section (xv)

Many supplied the correct neuter plural ending but attached it to an incorrect stem, producing *foeda*. A few gave *foedi*, as if from the second declension adjective.

Sub-section (xvi)

Nearly all students correctly identified the ablative case.

Sub-section (xvii)

Over three quarters of the students correctly identified the mood and its use.

Sub-section (xviii)

Seventy percent of the students recognised the adjective.

Sub-section (xix)

Eighty percent of the students correctly identified the relationship between *coniunx* and *Lavinia*. Use of the term ‘apposition’ was preferred, but adequate alternative explanations were accepted. It should be noted that this use of the nominative case is not a complement.

Question 3 — Part (b) — Prose Composition

General Comments

Once again this section was attempted by only a small number of students. The answers however were excellent attempts and all scored very highly. It was pleasing to see such skill in attempting this very difficult area.

Section IV — Unseen Translation (25 marks)

Question 4 — Part (a) — Unseen Verse

Most students translated the first two couplets of the unseen verse competently. In the translation of *diffugiunt*, the examiners were looking for a recognition of the prefix *diff-*, ie ‘scatter’, ‘disperse’ rather than merely ‘flee’. About half the candidature took *inhonesta* to mean ‘dishonest’, ignoring the context. The second line (*Tusco ... rubet*) presented few problems. Common errors in the second couplet included interpretation of *sic* as *sicut*, *cadunt* as *caedunt* and *iterum* as *iter*. Most also translated *tecta* as ‘roofs’, sometimes even arriving at ‘arms and roofs’ for *armaque tecta*.

The third couplet proved very difficult for all but a few students, requiring as it did a close analysis of case endings and a careful understanding of the syntax. Often the vocabulary was quite well understood, but the translation still went astray. Many assumed, without considering other possibilities, that *campi* was the subject of *claudabant*, despite the fact that the previous clause (*campus erat*) makes reference to only one plain. Consequently, these students failed to observe the relationship between *campi* and *ultima*. Many also thought that *colles* was in the accusative case, thereby overlooking its link with *silva*. Some took *occulere* as an historic infinitive, while a significant number translated it as an expression of purpose. The relationship between *silva*, *apta* and *occulere* was clearly expressed by very few.

For this question the median was close to 7 marks out of 10. The best student made only one error, and the lowest mark awarded was 3.

On a lighter note, can anyone explain how ‘fierce Montanas’ or ‘wild animals from Montana’ came to be encountered by the Romans and Etruscans?

Question 4 — Part (b) — Unseen Prose

The majority of students displayed a clear grasp of the general sense of the passage. Some produced fine translations which contained a polished turn of phrase and use of idiom. It was pleasing to see some students use words which were not derivatives of the Latin in order to find the appropriate nuance. The passage was a relatively simple one, although, being from an author of the 4th Century AD, the Latin contains a number of features different from those encountered in Livy Book V.

The following comments are offered on specific words or phrases in the passage:

- *Post viginti annos*: some translated as if it were *viginti post annis*;
- *Veientani*: though Livy in Book V uses this adjective only in reference to the citadel or territory of Veii, and calls the people *Veientes*, most students realised that Eutropius here means the people of Veii;
- *rebellaverunt*: better students gave not ‘rebelled’ but, appreciating the significance of the prefix, ‘started the war again’ or ‘resumed hostilities’;
- *missus est*: sometimes not recognised as a perfect passive;
- *Dictator*: in apposition to *Furius Camillus*, and best rendered ‘as dictator’;
- *contra*: often not recognised to be a preposition; consequently many were led to link *ipsos* (as if *ipse*) to *Camillus*;
- *diu obsidens*: a range of versions for the imprecise present participle was deemed acceptable, including ‘after besieging for a long time’, ‘after a long siege’;
- *ditissimam*: though generally recognised as a superlative adjective, its meaning was not often known; recollection of Livy’s frequent references to *urbs opulentissima* would have helped;
- *Post eam cepit et Faliscos*: *post* was widely treated as a conjunction and its link to *eam* not recognised, and *et* was often not recognised as ‘also’;
- *Faliscos*: for Livy this word means the people of the town which he calls *Falerii*; for

Eutropius, with *civitatem* in apposition, it appears to mean the town. Consequently *civitatem* produced a range of translations, deemed acceptable if they demonstrated an understanding of the underlying political connotations of the term;

- *Sed commota est ei invidia*: This clause caused widespread confusion, often arising from a failure to recognise the passive verb and the dative singular pronoun; *ei* was often translated as ‘that’ and *commota* as ‘commotion’;
- *apud*: a few students settled for the common meaning ‘among’, which clearly did not fit this context;
- *victos Romanos*: most students successfully linked *victos* to the local ablative *miliario*, but fewer recognised that *Romanos*, as well as being linked to *victos*, is also the direct object of *secuti*;
- *quod*: many took this to be a conjunction rather than a connecting relative pronoun. The best translations began a new sentence and rendered *quod* as ‘it’;
- *exulabat*: some thought that this meant ‘exult’ or ‘exalt’, though many, despite the spelling, were able to recall Livy’s *exsulabat*;
- *superventum est*: many students recognised the link between this impersonal verb, the ablative of agent *a Camillo* and the dative *Gallis*, and translated in a variety of acceptable ways (eg ‘came upon’, ‘came upon unexpectedly’). ‘Overcame’ was a common but not an acceptable rendering;
- *victi sunt*: most students successfully made the link to *a Camillo*.

For this question the median was close to 12 marks out of 15. The three best students each made three errors, and only five earned less than half marks.

Teachers should encourage their students to produce translations which are in clear, idiomatic English, avoiding clumsy literal renderings such as ‘having been conquered’ for *victos*. Students should also be discouraged from writing alternative translations; one rendering only is sought. Sometimes the alternative contradicted the first translation. Students were not penalised in these cases, but the practice is poor examination technique. Students should assume that the first rendering only would be considered.

3 Unit (Additional)

Written Examination

Section I — Catullus (30 marks)

Question 1

Part (a)

Sub-section (i)

This question was very well done, with students having a lot of fun in translating the first and last lines of the poem. Most students gained full marks or almost full marks for their translation.

In line 10, while it was permissible to translate *hoc* as either ablative or accusative, *pessima* was required to agree with *puella*, and it was necessary to bring out the force of the superlative in the translation. Place names were expected to be given in the correct nominative form.

Sub-section (ii)

This year students had learned to scan the hendecasyllabic line and were prepared for the question. When mistakes occurred, they were often related to incorrect handling of elisions. A few students chose to scan lines other than those stipulated.

Part (b)

The best answers here were considered, analytical and coherent responses to the actual question asked. Their discussions of the ways in which the three poems contributed to an appreciation of Catullus' depiction of the **anguish** of love were supported with precise, relevant quotes from the Latin, or references to specific lines in the text. They also discussed the changing nature of Catullus' depiction of the anguish of love, as it is revealed in this selection of his poems.

Too many students merely gave separate summaries, or even quite good appraisals, of the poems without relating these specifically to the question. Many who did actually discuss the poems' contributions wrote much more about poem 85 than about the other two poems. Others failed to make any connections between the poems.

Students would be well advised to think first about what is required in a discussion of a selection of poems, and in this way avoid an outpouring of irrelevant comments, a practice which often seems to leave little time for significant analysis.

Part (c)

Sub-section (i)

The majority of students merely stated that the purpose of the poem was to satirize Egnatius because of his inappropriate smiling. Better answers elaborated on this point and brought in the fact that it was really about Egnatius' lack of *urbanitas*. An additional valid reason given for Catullus' invective towards Egnatius was that he may have been a rival for Lesbia's affection.

Sub-section (ii)

The standard of answers to this question was somewhat disappointing, with a surprising number of students displaying no real skill in analysing the stylistic devices used by Catullus, but merely recounting what the poem says. For example, students would state that Catullus shows that Egnatius smiles inappropriately by describing two occasions where he does it, ie at a trial and at a funeral. Sometimes the whole Latin sentence was quoted, but all too often there was no further comment.

Those who gained good marks for their answers quoted relevant Latin words or phrases and also discussed their effectiveness; mentioned, for example, were the repetition of *flet*, the emotive use of *lugetur* and the contrast of these with the repeated *renidet ille*. This point was sometimes further extended by discussing the exaggeration in the use of the words *pii*, *orba* and *unicum*.

Many students incorrectly treated the list of other tribes as an example of Catullus' *doctrina*, rather than as a mock-heroic list of peoples (to which Egnatius does not belong) who wash their teeth 'in a pure manner', leading to the climax of Egnatius' habit of washing them with urine. Many also missed the opportunity to discuss the play of words in *expolitor*: 'polished' teeth, but in Neoteric circles 'lacking social polish'. Quite a few students even omitted any discussion of the poem's punchline, or failed to note the significance of the placement of the word *loti*.

Students would be well advised, in answering a question of this kind, **not** to write long introductions and conclusions listing what the poet will do / has done. If no stylistic devices are actually discussed at these points, they gain no marks and waste valuable time.

Section II — Unseen Verse Translation (20 marks)

Question 2

It might have been supposed that 3 Unit students who have read Catullus were well prepared to read the love poems of other poets, yet this passage from Propertius presented a number of difficulties for even the best students. Those who recognised the meaning of certain key words, and kept their heads in analysing the syntactical relationships, were generally able to translate most of the passage well, or at least adequately. Nearly half the students were awarded marks in the range of 15 to 18 out of 20, and one gained full marks, while the lowest mark awarded was 8. Some very basic errors, however, detracted from the quality of many translations.

The first couplet was translated confidently and accurately by many students, but a disturbing number, who knew that *discedis* means 'you leave', managed to render the first line as 'although you unwillingly leave me in Rome, Cynthia'. Some made *invito* a verb, and *laetor* a comparative adjective.

The second couplet contains three words whose meaning was not well known: *castis*, *blanditiis* and, to a lesser extent, *probam*. Many attempted to link *castis* with *iuvenis*, hazarding ‘ill-principled’, ‘energetic’, ‘evil-minded’, even ‘castrated’. Others, linking it correctly to *agris*, made it ‘open’, ‘ploughed’, ‘faraway’ or, less happily, ‘camp-like’. ‘Blandness’ would not do for *blanditiis*, nor would ‘boredom’, ‘normalcy’ or ‘insults’, but a small number were able to give ‘blandishments’ or ‘flatteries’. ‘Honest’ was acceptable for *probam*, but ‘a problem’ was not. The words *nullus iuvenis corruptor* were not always properly linked, and *corruptor* also became a comparative adjective, even once a passive verb.

Many did not perceive, in the third couplet, that the words *neque ... nec* continue, rather than cancel, the negative in *nulla*. *Fenestras* was not well known; it became ‘gaze’, ‘shadow’, ‘wild beasts’ (*feras?*), ‘femininity’ and even, from one student anxious not to be misunderstood, ‘departure (lit. hastening away)’. The examiners understood the reasoning (*festinare*), but did not accept it. Line 6 was seen by many to be continuing the theme of a brawl, so that *clamatae somnus* became ‘the sound of shouting’. Only one or two students properly understood the function of *clamatae* and gave a correct, if clumsy, translation of this line: ‘nor will sleep be bitter to you shouted at’. Even the Loeb translation of Propertius needs to expand: ‘nor will your slumbers be made bitter by voices clamouring your name’.

The fourth couplet was translated competently by the majority, though a few did offer ‘suns’ or ‘soils’ for *solos*, and *pecus* was at times confused with *pectus*. ‘Ends’ was not acceptable for *fines* in this context.

The final couplet contains a straightforward hexameter and a near-impossible pentameter. Only those who read *poterunt* as *potuerunt* had trouble with line 9, but there were as many renderings of the last line as there were students. The examiners, themselves at a loss to explain the case of *peccatis*, gave as much credit as possible for reasonable guesses. ‘For the sake of’, however, was not acceptable for *causa*, which is nominative, as scansion of the line reveals, and ‘very many temples’ does not fit the context of *devia rura*. The very few who knew the meaning of *peccatis* were better off than those who saw the word as a variant of *pecus* or *pectus*. One student was on the right track with ‘impeccableness’, but the negative prefix spoiled the attempt. The Loeb edition gives ‘nor temples, the commonest birthplace of your sins’, implying either that *fanaque* is more closely linked with *ludi* than the punctuation of the text suggests, or that *-que* should be understood as *neque*. Many of the students could derive no sensible meaning of this line.

In summary, the examiners, though disappointed with the frequency with which basic errors were made, were impressed by the intelligent reasoning evident in the better translations.

ISBN 0 7313 4272 0



9 780731 342723