



2010

Latin GA 3: Written examination

## GENERAL COMMENTS

A total of 187 students sat the Latin examination in 2010. The mean score was slightly higher than in 2009 and there were some outstanding performances. A small percentage of students scored less than half of the available marks. The mean score for the unseen passage was markedly higher than in 2009 and this is a very pleasing trend. Many students scored higher marks for the unseen passage than for the rest of the paper. However, the unseen passage presented major challenges to some students. It is hoped that the comments in this report might be helpful in overcoming some of those weaknesses.

Some students did not answer the shorter questions in complete sentences, despite the instruction to do so being on the front of the paper. Some students ignored the instructions to answer questions in ink or ball-point pen and answered in pencil. Pencil is acceptable only for the scansion in Section 2, Part B.

## SPECIFIC INFORMATION

**Note: Student responses reproduced herein have not been corrected for grammar, spelling or factual information.**

For each question, an outline answer (or answers) is provided. In some cases the answer given is not the only answer that could have been awarded marks.

### Section 1 – Translation of an unseen passage

#### Question 1

‘Crassus, when he was preparing to attack Leucaea and had need of a long, hard beam to make a battering ram with which to batter the walls of the town, wrote to the chief architect at Mylatta to tell him to send whichever was the bigger of the two masts which he had seen there. Then the chief architect, when he learnt why he wanted the mast, did not send the larger one, as he had been ordered, but the smaller one, which he thought was more suitable for making a battering ram. Crassus ordered him to be summoned and, when he had asked him why he had not sent the one ordered, ignored the reasons which he kept repeating, ordered his clothes to be torn off and beat him repeatedly with rods. He thought that all the authority of a person giving orders would be destroyed, if anyone did not respond with the obedience he should to what he had been ordered to do.’

There were many students who would benefit from using bracketing as suggested below. These students might then avoid some of the worst errors of syntax. The examination setting panel adapts the original text and adds punctuation to try to point the students in the right direction.

*(Crassus cum oppugnare Leucas pararet) (opusque esset firma atque procera trabe), (ut arietem faceret), (quo muros oppidi quateret), (scripsit [ad architectonem Mylattensium]), (ut [ex malis duobus], (quos [apud eos] vidisset), (uter maior esset), eum mitteret.) (tum architectonem, (ubi cognovit cur malum desideraret), non, (ut iussus erat), maiorem, sed minorem, (quem esse aptiorem faciendo arietem existimabat), misit). (Crassus eum vocari iussit et), (cum interrogavisset), (cur non, (quem iusserat), misisset), (causis, [quas dictitabat], spretis), (vestimenta detrahi imperavit) (virgisque multum cecidit). (dissolvi officium omne imperantis ratus est), (si quis [ad id, quod facere iussus est], non obsequio debito respondeat).*

The passage from Aulus Gellius begins comparatively simply, but increases in difficulty as it progresses. The dictionary appeared to hinder rather than to help most students. It is fair to expect students to be familiar with the majority of the words in this passage. The report contains examples of poor use of the dictionary.

Cases of nouns, adjectives and pronouns created considerable difficulties for some students.

For the purpose of assessment, the unseen passage is divided up into sections by the assessors and specific marks are given for these sections. The marks are shown alongside each section.

# 2010 Assessment Report



- *Crassus – pararet* (one mark)

Most students coped well with the first part of the sentence; however, some students wrote about '*Leucas*', despite the introduction to the passage.

- *Leucrae* (sic)
- *to fight in Leucaae*
- *at Leucaae*
- *when Leucaae prepared to attack*
- *to conquer the Leucans*
- *Lecuae* (sic)
- *he went to make*
- *so that he might be ready*
- *When Crassus needed to attack Leucas, he had prepared his strength and chief robe*
- *When he prepared that he needed to attack Leucaae firmly and with a long beam*

- *opusque – trabe* (two marks)

The meaning of *opus esse* was given on the exam paper. Many students had difficulty in finding the appropriate meaning of *trabe*, although the first meaning given in the dictionary for *trabs* is 'beam' and the rest of the sentence should have suggested that this was the correct meaning. 'Tree' and 'ship' were popular incorrect choices. Some students thought that *procera* came from *procer*, *proceris* = chief, prince; however, this was incorrect.

- *beams*
- *the support of a long tree*
- *a powerful ship*
- *long ship*
- *and needed power and using a tall tree*
- *and with a beam needing to be long and strong*
- *timbers*
- *and a tall and strong ship was needed*
- *a firm chief and so beam*
- *of support and a tall tree*

- *ut arietem faceret* (two marks)

Some students incorrectly chose the meaning 'beam used for a breakwater' for *arietem*, rather than the 'battering ram', which fitted in with the clause that followed *ut arietem faceret* in the passage.

- *rams*
- *battering rame* (sic)
- *as soon as the ram was made*
- *be able to use the ram*
- *he could make a violent attack*
- *a craft*
- *so that he could cause a blow*
- *in order to get this kind of beam*
- *as to make a beam used to break water*
- *a battering*

- *quo muros oppidi quateret* (two marks)

*quo* here replaces *ut*, and introduces purpose.

- *from which*
- *who would*
- *which he could attack four walls*
- *he striked*
- *which would strike the walls*
- *had shaken*

- *scripsit – Mylattensium* (one mark)

Few students had difficulty with this section, although some ignored the information given on the paper about Mylatta.

- *which he enlisted the Mylattan architects for*
- *he designated to*
- *of Mylattensius*

# 2010 Assessment Report



- architect Mylatta
- master of Mylatta
- described

- *ut – mitteret* (seven marks)

The meaning of *malis* caused significant problems for some students. There are five possible words given in the dictionary from which it might come and part of the students' task was to find the correct meaning by using the other information available. The numerical adjective *duobus* can be either masculine or neuter. This rules out *malus* (fem) = an apple tree. *quos, uter, eum* in this sentence and *maiolem, minorem, quem, aptiorem* in the following sentence indicate that it cannot be neuter. This rules out *malum* as either 'apple' or 'evil'. This leaves *malus* (mast, pole) and the adjective *malus* (bad, evil). Though the adjective can be used as a substantive (bad man), Crassus would not be looking for a bad man when he needs something to batter the walls of the town. If students had translated the passage correctly to this point, as so many did, 'mast' or 'pole' would have been an obvious choice. If students are not sure of a word, they must be prepared to check the dictionary carefully and follow the process described above. Translating *apud eos* as 'among them' is a little clumsy. 'There' is a much more appropriate meaning.

- apple trees
- beside each other
- he would send him for
- and he sent off to battle whichever one of the two was better
- from the two proferred (sic) from among those he had seen
- to send him two masts
- trees at his works
- to send the man from the two bad men who he had seen among them, who was the better of the two.
- who were the best two, which after he saw them, the one which was older, he sent for him
- which he had preferred
- to sent to him from two trees which he saw nearby the one that was older
- so that he could send him from the two misfortunes whom he had seen nearby whether it was big enough.
- as he was highly esteemed one of the two because he had seen with them he was sending him from evil.
- for four town walls were just as evil as two in the opinion of what he saw, which was the elder's, this he sent to him.
- the one from his evil two the one next to which he had seen, the one that was older.

- *tum architecton (...) non (...) maiolem, sed minorem (...) misit* (two marks)

Students who found an incorrect meaning for *malus* often gave incorrect meanings for *maiolem* and *minorem*. Some students did not give the correct meaning for *misit*.

- he scorned to do
- send it to the elder, but the younger
- instead he dismissed
- the other one as the order wasn't for the better mast but the worse one
- older but the minor
- better man, but the worst man
- he sent them without a better order, but less
- sent word that the older, not the younger
- because ancestor (sic) but descendant
- he stopped

- *ubi – desideraret* (three marks)

Most students translated this section correctly.

- investigated
- why the desire was evil
- why he wished the bad one
- that the pole deteriorated (sic)
- why the mast he desired was not the one he ordered, but the lesser, he sent those to be made for the battering ram
- wanted the bad man
- why he should desire misfortune
- why he had chosen the pole
- when he recognised why he was desiring evil
- why he was judging the tree
- Then he sent for the architect when he learned why he longed for evil not the older, but the younger so that he was sending the order.
- why he had desert the past

# 2010 Assessment Report



- *why he did not long for misfortune*
- *who he knew would desire a mast*
- *that what he desired was wrong*

- *ut iussus erat* (one mark)

Although *ut iussus erat* means ‘as he had been ordered’, other versions such as ‘as had been ordered’ or ‘as ordered’ were acceptable.

- *when it had been ordered*
- *he ordered it not to be*
- *that having not been ordered*
- *because*

- *quem – existimabat* (four marks)

Most students encountered little difficulty with this section even though it contained a gerundive. Some failed to translate the comparative degree of *aptiorem* correctly.

- *others to be more useful*
- *when he made the judgments on equipping the ram*
- *what Crassus was thinking that it was*
- *the better fitted for the violent attack*
- *in making battering rams*
- *to be joined together having made the beam*
- *for making a ship*
- *who he though (sic) was more fitted for building*
- *which he valued suitable for making the beam*
- *whom he thought should be prepared for punishment*
- *which he was considering that the ram must be made suitably*
- *which was better value*
- *to be fitting to make beams*
- *which already put together by craft was existing to strike*
- *whom was considering to make a suitable ram*

- *Crassus – et* (two marks)

The majority of students translated this section correctly.

- *called and ordered him*
- *He ordered Crassus to be called to him.*
- *to speak to him*
- *having ordered him summoned him*
- *Crassus ordered him to say when asked*

- *cum – misisset* (five marks)

For most students this section caused few difficulties. Versions of *quem iusserat* that showed students understood the context were acceptable, even if they did not use the literal translation ‘which he had ordered’; for example, ‘as ordered’ or ‘as he had been ordered’.

- *why not when he was ordered he sent*
- *why he had not used the mast which had been sent and which he had been order (sic) to use*
- *when he asked him the man who he was ordering and had sent for why he was not calling the other with their cases rejected.*
- *When he had questioned him despising why he had not done what he had ordered and had sent which he kept saying.*
- *why when ordered he had not sent what was ordered*
- *whom he had ordered*
- *when he was interrogated for none had ordered for what he had sent, cause, which he said*
- *why he had ordered that one be sent*
- *whom he had ordered sent for*

- *causis – spretis* (two marks)



The ablative absolute caused problems for some students, partly because it is interrupted by a relative clause which refers to *causis*. Once again, a literal translation of the ablative absolute initially would have avoided such problems – ‘the reasons having been rejected’. Then the relative ‘which he repeated’ could have been inserted.

- *the lost cause*
- *the builder was pleading with reasons with rejections*
- *the rejected one which he was asserting not that which he had ordered*
- *and he had been told to use many times when the master builder had spurned his reasons*
- *the reason, that he was speaking, contempt*
- *which he dictated with rejected reasons*
- *the cause which he said why it had been rejected*
- *with the purpose of contempt which he was asserting*
- *which he asserted, the reasons having been rejected*
- *and saying this with scorn*
- *for the sake of what he (the engineer) maintained was (spretis) (sic)*
- *he said repeatedly the reason why he had rejected*
- *by what reason which was saying by what contempt*
- *having removed the reasons that he said*
- *he said what his reasons were for rejecting the order since by taking the lesser beam he had killed many men with the lesser beam*

- *vestimenta – cecidit* (three marks)

While it is true that *imperare* is usually followed by *ut/ne* + subjunctive, it is common for it to be found with an accusative and an infinitive. The assessors could have changed the text to a purpose clause, but they felt that the meaning was clear. Most students encountered no difficulty with the first part of this section. Difficulties were, however, encountered in the second part. Most of these difficulties were caused by poor use of the dictionary and by ignoring accident. *cecidit* can be the perfect active of either *cado* (I fall) or *caedo* (I beat, cut, kill). Here it is from *caedo*. The meaning of the adverb is given in the small Collins Pocket Dictionary (*much, very, frequently*). Unfortunately, too many students made *multum* agree with *virgis*. Many students who did find the correct meaning of *multum* used ‘killed’ rather than ‘beat’ as the meaning for *cecidit*. They should have thought that ‘he killed much’ was not an appropriate translation. Further problems were caused for those who thought that *virgis* came from *virgo, virginis* (virgin, maiden) rather than from *virga* (twig, rod, staff).

- *and he be beaten*
- *and flogged many times*
- *he killed many maids*
- *threw much of his clothes to the sticks*
- *him to take away his clothes and he was killed by many twigs*
- *he be killed with large rods*
- *dragged by his clothes and killed with many twigs*
- *and to cut many sticks*
- *be seized and cut his cane into many pieces*
- *withdrawing his anger he ordered for twigs and killed many and that many virgins be killed*
- *killed many men with staves*
- *and the many twigs to have broken off*
- *and he sacrificed many young girls*
- *he ordered the blanket to be taken away and many maids killed*
- *and cut his walking stick into many pieces*

- *dissolvi – ratus est* (three marks)

The last sentence proved to be difficult for most students. It was especially important for students to divide the sentence into its component parts and to keep words within their correct part. Many students struggled to identify *ratus est*, the perfect of the common deponent verb *reor*. It is followed by an accusative (*officium omne*) and an infinitive (*dissolvi*). Many students did not recognise that *omne* agreed with the neuter noun *officium*. The word *imperantis* is the genitive singular of the present participle of *imperare* and means literally ‘of a man giving an order’.

- *the subordinate should destroyed (sic)*
- *emperor*
- *it was thought*
- *by all of the demanding*
- *Everyone thought to destroy authority of orders*
- *by all the people he was ordering*
- *It was thought that his authority would be destroyed by all requests*



- *he thought his authority should be ordered to be dissolved by everyone*
- *It was settled by the order of all*

- *si quis (...) non (...) respondeat* (one mark)

The conditional clause has its verb in the subjunctive to show that it is an ideal condition. *Respondeat* should have been translated as 'was to reply'. *Quis* after *si* means 'anyone'.

- *ad id quod facere iussus est* (three marks)

As in previous years, students struggled to cope with the use of the demonstrative (*is, ea, id*) followed by the relative (*qui, quae, quod*), even though it is a very common usage in Latin. Literally, the words mean 'to that thing which he was ordered to do'. ('Make' was not an appropriate meaning of *facere* in this instance.)

- *he (Crassus) had been charged with*

- *obsequio debito* (one mark)

Students found it difficult to give the correct meanings for this noun and its adjective. Some students did not see them as a noun and an adjective.

The following are examples of the many incorrect translations of the last sentence.

*All authority is destroyed when a sure order, if which to him, when he makes the order is not replied to with compliance as it ought.*

*He destroyed authority with all the ordering was settled with how it stands because he was ordered to do something he would not reply with compulsory compliance.*

*It is certain that he destroyed the authority of all by his command, if what he had taken to there because it was his order to do so, he hadn't responded with compliance nor with duty.*

*Having been destroyed, all authority ordering is valid if being ordered to do anything he must comply to it and doesn't reply.*

*All having been ordered to be destroy by the authority was fixed if those to him because he was ordered to make he did not responded (sic) the debt with compliance.*

*He had destroyed all authority of commands for he supposed what to do because he is to perform orders, not give a reply of complacency.*

*It was thought that authority destroyed by all ruling if anyone replies to it because he was ordered to do it without owing allegiance.*

*The master builder thought that authority was destroyed by all of Crassus' ruling if anyone responded to his plan which they were ordered to do so, they would not out of allegiance but by being forced to comply.*

*The emperor was sure all wished to destroy authority if this was it because he ordered this to be done, not all who respond to his debt are complaisant (sic).*

*It is valid that ordering the destroyed office of anyone if anyone to that who were ordered to do, to not correspond with owing compliance.*

## Section 2 – Comprehension, interpretation and analysis of the prescribed seen text

### Part A – Comprehension and analysis of the prescribed seen text

The majority of students did quite well in the section on context and content. The mean mark was almost identical to last year. Some students did not answer in complete sentences, despite the instruction on the front cover of the exam paper. Others wrote lengthy responses when generally these questions could have been answered in one or two sentences. Some students translated the necessary lines rather than answering the question specifically.

#### Question 2

*Ille* is Pallas. He is pulling out the spear with which Turnus has struck him.



Almost all students answered this question correctly.

- *Pallas, son of Evander ruler of the Etruscans*
- *Mezentius' spear*
- *is supposed to be Pallas*
- *Turnas(sic)*
- *sword*
- *ille is Paris*
- *Turnus as he tries to pull out the warm spear from Pallas' body.*
- *who is trying to slay Turnus in a duel*
- *Lausus*
- *he is trying to kill Turnus with his spear*
- *in vein (sic)*
- *He is trying to injure Turnus by throwing the spear at him.*

### Question 3

His life-blood flowed from the wound, he fell onto his wound with a crash of his armour and bit the hostile ground with his bloody mouth.

The majority of students answered this question well. Some students discussed lines other than lines 2–4.

- *how the blood came out through the same whole (sic)*
- *blood and wind following the same road*
- *raising his armour above him*
- *with arm raised*
- *his mouth begs the ground*
- *The spear does not hit Turnus, but only touches the edge of his shield.*
- *with his hands clattering around him*

### Question 4

Pallas' belt is engraved with pictures that show the 50 Danaids (except Hypermestra) killing their husbands on their wedding night – a dreadful crime.

Most students were able to identify that *impressumque nefas* referred to the story of the daughters of Danaus, although many wrote that all 50 had been killed. Had this been the case, the oracle that Danaus would be killed by a son-in-law would not have been fulfilled. Some students thought that it referred to the actions of Turnus.

- *Pallas stepping on*
- *the Daunus brothers*
- *the events of Clonus*
- *the picture painted*
- *to the sin and arrogant act that Turnus is committing*
- *It depicts Clonus, one of the daughter's fiancé.*
- *forty daughters*
- *being sleyed (sic)*
- *the crime of Turnus and the future event of Turnis (sic) being killed*
- *Turnus snatching the belt*
- *It refers to the scene which is depicted on Pallas' swordbelt.*
- *to Pallas belt which was impressed with a great sin*
- *The baldric was present at the murders of many young men on a wedding night.*
- *It refers to the hurried and rapid death of Pallas and how quickly Turnus kills him.*
- *the appropriation of Pallas' belt, depicting the nefas of the Danaids (sic) crime, by Turnus*
- *It refers to Turnus taking the belt which he did not dedicate to the gods.*

### Question 5

At the very end of the epic, Aeneas is hesitating over the fallen Turnus when he sees Pallas' belt. This causes him to kill Turnus in the name of Pallas.

Merely translating did not answer the question; students needed to say why Turnus would regret his action.

- *with regard to the slaughtered youths it bares (sic) omen to the fates of both Pallas and Lausus*
- *Aeneas kills a merciful Turnus*
- *This is because, later in the epic, Aeneas avenges Pallas' death by killing Lausus.*



### Question 6

Virgil is saying that what Pallas has achieved in the fighting will bring honour to his father, but his death will bring him sadness.

Several students failed to identify the importance of the word *parenti*. Some wrote much longer answers than necessary and others did not say why there is *decus* or *dolor*.

- *before he faced Lausus*
- *sweet (dolor) and great pain (decus magnum)*
- *It contrasts the beauty and worth of the exalted (sic) baldrick with the pain contained in it.*
- *The dolor of Lausus contrasted with the decus magnum of Turnus.*
- *between misery and grief*
- *By killing Pallas, Turnus has secured himself glory earned from battle 'decus magnum', yet this action will ironically lead to his death 'dolor'.*
- *Pallas obviously is the recipient of great pain in his death, and Turnus walks away feeling great glory in his spoil.*

### Question 7

There is arrogance in the way in which Turnus addresses the fallen body of Pallas and treats it. By contrast, Aeneas' 'battle-fury gives way to sorrow and revulsion' (Williams). He is remorseful for what he had to do, does not despoil the body and returns it to Lausus' companions.

There were some very good answers to this question.

- *Aeneas is moved by the sight of Pallas.*
- *Turnus does not taunt Pallas.*
- *fights solely for 'time' and 'gera' (sic)*
- *In contrast Turnus fights Pallas in fairness, with both having agreed to a formal duel.*
- *Lasus*
- *unlike Pallas's portentous theft of the belt*
- *Aeneas confronts Lausus, but responds to his victory over Pallas in a different manner – that is one of pietas.*

## Part B – Interpretation of the prescribed seen text

The mean mark for this section was lower than that in 2009.

### Question 8

āggērī|būs mū|rōr(um) ēt // īn|ūndānt| sānguīnē| fōssāē (7)

quīd rēpē|t(am) ēxū|stās // Ērȳ|cīn(o) īn| lītōrē| clāssēs (19)

Common mistakes in line 7 were to miss the first elision and to make the first foot a spondee with the second a dactyl. This ignores the fact that the final 's' of *aggeribus* and the first 'm' of *murorum* make the 'u' of *aggeribus* long. It was acceptable to place the caesura in the second foot. It was incorrect to mark the final syllable as short or doubtful as the diphthong must be long. Some students missed the first elision in line 19. Commonly, students failed to scan the 'y' in *Erycino*, which is short. The final syllable is long, not doubtful.

Students should show elision by the method shown above. The syllable that is not elided (the first one of the following word) should be shown as either long or short. A caesura must be shown as being between two words. Some students did the following:- *exusta//s*.

### Question 9

There is hiatus between *o* and *hominum* rather than the usual elision.

Very few students answered this question correctly. Answers that suggested there was no elision between those two words were accepted.

- *spondaic*
- *highly dactylic*
- *double elision*
- *no caesura*
- *There is not six feet.*
- *unusual elisions particularly o hominum*





- *several elisions and many spondees*
- *hypermetric –que*
- *no alision (sic)*
- *heavily sopdaic (sic)*
- *too many syllables*
- *it does not work, a sign of the incompleteness of the Aeneid*

## Question 10

The metaphor concerns the actions of Turnus. *Feratur*, *tumidus*, *secundo*, *ruat* are all words that can be used to describe the behaviour of a river. *Feror* can also be used to indicate uncontrollable mental passion; *tumidus* for excessive pride; *ruat* can suggest Turnus' lack of control (Harrison).

Some students missed the river imagery in the metaphors.

- *linked to Dionysian behavior*
- *as a raging river (sic)*
- *feratur means 'wild'*

## Question 11

The frequent change of subject reflects the agitated nature of Venus' speech. Short sentences and a rhetorical question were acceptable.

Many students did not understand what the term 'structure' required them to discuss. There was much discussion of techniques, use of words and metre.

## Question 12

Tyndes is enjambment in line 12. This places emphasis on the fact that Diomedes, a fierce enemy of Troy during the Trojan War, may return as an enemy.

Students needed to state what the effect of enjambling *Tyndes* was, not simply give an explanation of enjambment. It may be a patronymic, but that is not a technique.

- *It is metonymy with father Tydeus used for his son Diomedes.*
- *Tyndes shows Aeneas' lineage*
- *The Trojans are descendants of Diomedes.*
- *allusion*
- *It highlights Diomedes' strength as he is too massive to be contained by the preceding line.*
- *transferred epithet*

## Question 13

There is bitterness in the tone of Venus' speech (with sarcasm and irony).

Other versions of tone, such as anger, were allowed.

- *affection*

## Question 14

There is exaggeration/hyperbole because Aeneas only lost four ships to the fire in Sicily, not fleets. Exaggeration is a common feature of rhetoric. Venus uses the exaggeration to try to strengthen her case for the mistreatment of Aeneas by Juno. Students had to identify the exaggeration and this required a correct understanding of the word 'classes'. Students did not necessarily have to say that only four ships were destroyed as long as they said that he did not lose fleets to the fire.

- *He lost only one fleet, not fleets.*
- *The rhetorical question is hyperbole.*
- *the destructive power of fire*
- *after they were turned into nymphs*
- *the burning of the fleet by Turnus and the Rutulians*
- *the fleet was washed on the shore*
- *the women were incited by Allecto*
- *exhausted (for exustas)*



### Question 15

Students could choose either *iterum ... iterum* (9/11), which emphasises the fact that Aeneas again faces the threat of war, or the anaphora *quid ... quid* (19/20), which represents Venus' indignation.

The repetition of *o* in line 1 was accepted, although students then had to identify that Venus was addressing Jupiter first as her father, then as the king of the gods. The repetition of *cur* in lines 17/18, which as well as *quid* helps to represent indignation, was also accepted.

## Part C – Analysis of themes and ideas from the prescribed seen text

### Question 16

Stephen Harrison, in his commentary on Book 10 states:

*On Turnus' disappearance, Mezentius takes over the chief role on the Latin side, a neat narrative transition, and the long final episode of the book (689-908) centres on him and Lausus, showing a Roman and Vergilian interest in the relationship of father and son, a theme crucial elsewhere in the Aeneid.*

The first half of the *Aeneid* is full of the father/son relationships of Aeneas with his father Anchises and his son Iulus/Ascanius. In Book 10, there is again a concentration on this theme. Students were asked to consider the importance of these relationships to the book, with special reference to the passage given on the paper. The question focused on this book specifically. Nearly a quarter of the book focuses on the Lausus/Mezentius episode, and it is this episode that is the major example of the father/son relationship.

Virgil introduces Lausus and Mezentius to the reader in Book 7 (647–54), where Mezentius is described as cruel and a scorner of the Gods. In comparison, Lausus is said to be second only to Turnus in beauty. Virgil tells us that he deserved a father whom it would have been more of a joy to obey. Virgil has Evander tell the readers of Mezentius' unpleasant background in Book 8 (478–495). In spite of this background, Lausus remains loyal to his father. Mezentius shows his fondness for his son when he gives him Palmus' armour (10.701–2).

When Mezentius comes face-to-face with Aeneas, he hopes to kill Aeneas so that he can strip the armour from the brigand (*praedonis*) and dress Lausus in it so that he becomes a living trophy of his victory (769–776). When he casts his spear at Aeneas, it bounces off Aeneas' divine shield and kills Antiores. Aeneas casts his spear at Mezentius and wounds him. Lausus, seeing his father in distress and being threatened by Aeneas, with tears streaming down his face, groans deeply because of his love of his dear father (789–90), and leaps in with his shield to protect his father from Aeneas' sword. With the help of his companions, who pelt Aeneas with weapons, he rescues his father from danger. This leaves Lausus to face Aeneas, who asks him why he is in such a hurry to die and is taking on a task beyond his capacity. He tells him that his *pietas* (love for his father) is leading him to make a fatal mistake. The words have no effect on Lausus, whose anger at the injury to his father takes away his reasoning (*demens*), and he becomes too self-confident (*exsultat*). The death of Lausus is quick, as his death is not as important as Aeneas' reaction to it. He immediately regrets that he has had to kill such a noble young man, as he is reminded of the father/son relationship that he had with Anchises (824). He recognises Lausus' *pietas* to Mezentius. The use of the patronymic (*Anchisiades* 822), *pietatis* (824) and the epithet *pius* (826) emphasises the father/son relationship.

Meanwhile, the injured Mezentius (*genitor* – father) repeatedly asks for news of his son and sends men to recall him from the fight. He is already sad (*maestus*), a word that looks forward to the weeping of the companions who are bringing back the body of Lausus. Mezentius recognises the sounds of mourning, heaps dust on his grey hair and falls upon his son's body. Mezentius addresses the corpse with words of self-reproach. He cannot bear the thought that his son has paid with his life for saving his father's life and that he is alive, when his crimes against his fellow countrymen should have seen him lose his life. He calls for his horse so that he can mount it and attack Aeneas. He tells the horse that he will either avenge Lausus by killing Aeneas or die in the process. When he comes face-to-face with Aeneas again, he tells him that he is a savage for killing Lausus and that by killing him he has found the one way to hurt him. In his last words, he admits that he is ready to die and that Lausus made no attempt to beg for his life to be spared. He merely asks Aeneas to ensure that he is buried alongside his son. Even in death the son will protect the father.

Students who merely retold the episode scored lower marks than those who explained how the passage was an example of the father/son theme and its importance. They needed to make clear the way Lausus feels for his father and vice versa. Whatever Mezentius' crimes have been, Lausus' love for him is unwavering – a fine example of Roman *pietas*.

The more successful students explored other father/son relationships within Book 10. Although Evander is not present in Book 10, there are several references to his father/son relationship with Pallas. As Pallas rallies his fleeing troops



(369ff), he hopes to win the same glory that his father has. When Turnus comes to meet him, he tells his men that Pallas is his victim and wishes that Evander was there to witness the event (443). Pallas replies that his father will bear one fate as easily as the other (450). As Turnus stands over Pallas' body, he tells the Arcadians to tell Evander that Pallas got what he deserved for fighting with Aeneas (491–2). Virgil, in an authorial comment, says that he will bring both honour and grief to his father by his death (508).

Strangely there is no reunion and meeting of Aeneas and Ascanius in Book 10. Ascanius is like a shining jewel among the defenders of the camp (134–5). Aeneas is a tongue of fire with flashing shield coming to the rescue in the ships (260–275). His aristeia upon landing drives the Rutulians from the camp and lifts the siege. We have to wait, however, until Book 11 for father and son to be together again. Yet Aeneas is clearly concerned for his son and keen to rescue him, especially after the warning of Cymodocea (236–40).

Some students discussed the quasi father/son relationship of Aeneas and Pallas. Pallas on his first expedition clearly looks to Aeneas as a father figure for advice; Aeneas' reaction to Pallas' death is akin to that of a father for a son. Magus pleads to Aeneas (524–5) through the ghost of his father and the hopes that he has for Ascanius as he grows to manhood to spare his life and take pity on him. Aeneas replies that Turnus put an end to such bargaining by murdering Pallas and says that Anchises and Iulus would agree with this sentiment (532–4). Liger too pleads unsuccessfully for his life through an appeal to Aeneas' parents (597–8).

Father Jupiter says comforting words to Hercules when he realises that he cannot save Pallas (466ff). Juno tells Jupiter that he should be able to rescue Turnus and keep him safe for his father Daunus (615–6). When she is allowed to take him by ship from the battlefield, he comes to shore at the ancient city of his father Daunus (688). Larides and Thymber, identical twin sons of Daucus, were a source of confusion and delight to their parents, but Pallas creates a grim difference by cutting off Thymber's head and Larides' hand with the sword of his father, Evander. Helaesus' father had hidden him in the woods as he foresaw his death, but, once his father had died, Helaesus met his death on Evander's spear, which was wielded by Pallas. The father/son relationships of these victims add to the pathos of their deaths.

While the mean mark for the essay was higher than in 2009, there were few very good essays. The majority of essays did not address the question directly; many students wrote prepared answers. Essays written on topics such as the characterisation of Mezentius, a comparison of Aeneas and Mezentius, *mors immatura*, Augustan virtues, or *pietas/furor* may provide some relevant material for an answer to the question set, but much of what was written strayed from the topic.

Students were asked to discuss the question with reference to the passage given on the paper. However, many students said very little about the passage or did not discuss the passage at all. The more successful answers quoted the passage and related the quotations to their answer. Some students quoted (in Latin) more from other parts of the Aeneid than from the passage itself. The majority of students quoted in parenthesis as directed. Students are reminded, however, that the quotation should be explained by what is written in their answer.

Some students discussed other books, especially Books 1, 2 and 6, the foundation of Rome, Aeneas' mission, Augustus and Marcellus, and compared the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad*. It was not relevant to discuss mother/son relationships within the scope of the essay as some students did.

- *to illicit pathos*
- *Lausus steps in and saves his father Mezentius from being killed by Mezentius (sic).*
- *Through the uses of diatesis Virgil alludes to this fact in Jupiter's speech.*
- *contemptus deorum*
- *The fallability of father is a metaphor for the fallability of the fatherland, Rome.*
- *whom he fathered (paterer)*
- *despite the nefastic character he may be*
- *Hercules who sees his prodigy (referring to Pallas).*
- *However once Aeneas has fallen Lausus,*
- *Anchises' words to spear (sic) the innocent*
- *subiectos superbos*
- *Aeneas and his own father Anchilles*
- *Mezentius disregards the fact that he is mortally wounded*
- *curses himself for abandoning (sic) his son (crimine)*