



2010 HSC Latin Continuers Sample Answers — Written Examination

This document contains ‘sample answers’, or, in the case of some questions, ‘answers could include’. These are developed by the examination committee for two purposes. The committee does this:

- (a) as part of the development of the examination paper to ensure the questions will effectively assess students’ knowledge and skills, and
- (b) in order to provide some advice to the Supervisor of Marking about the nature and scope of the responses expected of students.

The ‘sample answers’ or similar advice are not intended to be exemplary or even complete answers or responses. As they are part of the examination committee’s ‘working document’, they may contain typographical errors, omissions, or only some of the possible correct answers.

Section I — Prescribed Text

Question 3 (a) (i)

Sample answer:

The slave used a weapon and it was illegal for a slave to carry a weapon.

Question 3 (a) (ii)

Answer could include:

- Included because:
 - provides example of a law-enforcing governor/praetor
 - shows up inadequacies of Verres as a governor/praetor
 - refutes Verres claim that a slave revolt was impending

Question 3 (b)

Answer could include:

Content:

- Verres' greed
- his ruthlessness in pursuing his objectives (eg misusing naval ships)
- lack of concern for Roman values
- poor governorship – lack of concern for defence of Sicily
- lascivious and predatory nature

Word choice:

- *mulierculis* – diminutive – the company Verres keeps
- *tamen ... statim quam primum* – even the advocates condemn his excessive haste and greed
- *formosissimae* – superlative – predatory personal values
- *ebrius* – his personal conduct
- *integra* – shows the obsessive nature of Verres

Question 4

Answers could include:

Rhetorical methods to persuade the audience of Verres' guilt

First extract:

- rhetorical questions
- anaphora – *quam ob rem, cum, de*
- choice of language – *iste, nefas, unum, unius*
- position of words – *exemplum*

- alliteration, assonance – direct address to Verres – *profer fecisti, sumpsisti, reservasti, supplicium non sumpsisti* – indignant sibilants

Second extract:

- long rhetorical question
- answers personally – *opinor*
- istius* repeated – indignant sibilance
- position of words – *nefaria crudelitate* – emotive language
- alliteration – *vim verborum* – acknowledging the power of his own words to convince
- hyperbole in last sentence suggests no rhetoric is even needed to persuade the audience

Section II — Prescribed Text

Question 7(a)

Sample answer:

stāre p̄f̄c̄ul cāmp̄is mēdītāntem) in | p̄oel̄iā | taur̄um,
ādvōlāt, hāud ālī(a) est Tūrnī v̄enīēntis īmāgō.

Alternate foot-division may be acceptable, eg:

ādvōlāt, | hāud

Prodelision is also acceptable:

ālīā (e)st

Question 7(b)

Answers could include:

- Comparison of Turnus to a lion suggests unrestrained ferocity in battle and superior fighting skills
- Pallas as bull preparing for war (*meditantem in proelia*) underlines his prior lack of experience in battle as well as his brave and warlike spirit
- Lion vs. bull implies that Turnus will win, since lions were the rulers of the animal world, while bulls were sacrificial animals in ancient Rome
- Description of the lion seeing the bull from afar reflects the deliberation with which Turnus seeks Pallas out on the battlefield
- Turnus's deliberation and superiority suggested by *specula*

Question 7(c)***Answers could include:***

Pallas:

- brave but doomed young hero;
- son of the Arcadian Evander;
- symbol of *pietas*

First speech:

- mention of the *spolia opima* a link to Augustan Rome and a foreshadowing of the spoils that Turnus will take from Pallas, which eventually will provoke his own death;
- heroic desire for praise evoked in *laudabor* and *insigni*;
- brief speech suggests a direct and manly nature, and eagerness to move forward to the fight (especially the imperative *tolle minas*);
- mention of his father (responding to Turnus' earlier, cruel wish that Evander were present to see his son's death) – bravado of warrior
- *pietas* and concern for his reputation in his father's eyes

Second speech:

- changed tone — *pietas* in address to the divine before battle;
- family connection to Hercules underscores the motifs both of father-son relationships and the obligations of *hospitium*;
- *coeptis ingentibus* recognises the inequality of Pallas' fight with Turnus already clear in the simile and mention of *viribus imparibus* in line 459;
- repetition of desire to snatch spoils from Turnus (already seen in line 449) heightens the irony of these speeches, which prefigure Turnus snatching spoils from Pallas;
- evocation of the shame of defeat in *victoremque ferant*;
- *furor* in last two lines – bloodthirstiness rather than confidence or bravado;
- no mention of his possible death in this speech, just desperate hope of winning; prayerful acknowledgement of his need for divine help (subjunctives revealing lack of confidence)

Question 8

Answers could include:

- Mezentius, previously an unsympathetic character (Aeneas acknowledges him as *acer* and the possessor of *effera vis animi*, and Mezentius later acknowledges the hatred his Etruscans feel for him), now evokes pathos in his willingness to die (note especially *haud inscius* ...)
- From Mezentius' point of view, Aeneas' taunts are pointless, as he sees no shame in death – importance of heroic reputation and visible bravery
- Final word of Book 10 is *cruor* – appropriate for this most gory of books of the *Aeneid*, underlines the loss of life and ferocity that attend heroism on the battlefield
- Mezentius' refusal to beg for his life in contrast with other heroes who do ask Aeneas for mercy (in vain) earlier in Book 10
- Mezentius hopes for just treatment of the valiantly slain, i.e. he appeals to be buried with his son (heroic ideal)
- Forthright and direct speech by Mezentius (note vocatives, imperatives, forceful direct statements)
- Mezentius displays dignity in defeat
- Mezentius is a savage warrior — his cruelty and lack of restraint (evoked by *acer*, *effera vis animi*, and his own claim, *nulla in caeda nefas*, where *caedes* is a strong and more violent word for 'death' than *mors*) are unheroic
- The hatred Mezentius' people feel for him (*acerba meorum... odia*) shows that he has not acted for the good of his community, as a hero should
- His claim that there is no sin in slaughter (*nullum in caede nefas*) is a reminder of the impious attitude to the gods that differentiates him from the hero Aeneas.

Section III — Unseen Texts

Question 9 (a)

Sample answer:

Teucros and manum

Question 9 (b)

Sample answer:

animi, pectora, irae

Question 10 (a)

Sample answer:

me

Question 10 (b)

Sample answer:

(in) auribus (vestris) and (in) oculis (omnium)

Question 10 (c)

Sample answer:

ab (amicissimis) civitatibus and cum (publicis) auctoritatibus