INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to examine how the works of the Latin poet Virgil were taught in the schools of New South Wales, Australia, throughout the twentieth century, and beyond, despite the enormous social and educational changes over that period which challenged the survival of Latin as a subject in the school curriculum.

To observe the teaching of Virgil’s poetry, in a time and place so removed from its origins, offers an opportunity to study the survival of an educational tradition of great antiquity, in a context never envisaged by students of Virgil in earlier centuries and seldom considered by scholars today. The teaching of Virgil in an Australian context has been overlooked in our own time, both by those writing on the reception of Virgil and by those investigating the place of Latin in modern education. A major work on the reception of Virgil in the twentieth century, Theodore Ziolkowski’s *Virgil and the Moderns* (Princeton 1993),\(^1\) illustrates the impact of Virgil on the twentieth century public with reference to the lavish celebrations held in many parts of the world in 1930 to mark two thousand years since the poet’s birth. He lists the outpouring of Virgil-centred publications and activities, including some by and for secondary school students, that took place in Italy, the United States, Mexico, Ecuador, France, Germany and South

---

\(^1\) described by Duncan Kennedy as “the point of departure for future studies of Virgil’s impact on the literature of the twentieth century” in his essay “Modern receptions and their interpretative implications”, *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 55.
Africa in that year. He makes no mention of Australia, although in fact a grand commemoration was held on October 15, 1930, at the University of Sydney, at which a presentation was made, by the Italian Consul-General on behalf of Mussolini, of a complete set of all publications issued in Italy for the occasion, including a facsimile reproduction of the Medicean Codex 39-1 of the Laurenziana of Florence. At this function the Professor of Latin and Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Sydney, F.A. Todd, gave an oration on the life and works of Virgil and his relevance to the contemporary world. In response, the Consul-General for Italy, Commendatore A. Grossardi, made reference to the exceptional context of this commemoration of Virgil:

I, as an Italian and the representative of a great Latin country, feel moved to express my special gratification, both personally and on behalf of the Italian Government, for this great commemoration, in this distant land. . .4

Not only is there no mention by Ziolkowski of this or any other Australian commemoration of Virgil’s bimillennium, but he also ignores Australia in the remainder of his book, in which he explores the influence of Virgil on the literature of “the Continent” (Europe), Britain, and “the New World” (America) in three separate chapters. Such influences arose, as might be expected, from the educational experiences of writers in those parts of the world in which Virgil featured significantly in the school curriculum.

In studies of the teaching of Latin and its place in the school curriculum, Australia has been similarly neglected. In a recent work, Françoise Waquet has collected a wide range

---

3 *The Celebration of the Two-Thousandth Anniversary of Virgil’s Birth*, a booklet produced to commemorate the function held by the University of Sydney in conjunction with The Societa Nazionale Dante Alighieri, The Classical, The Australian English, and The Modern Language Associations of New South Wales, 15th October, 1930. The booklet of 48 pages contains the texts of the speeches and of six articles on Virgil published in the Sydney Morning Herald in 1930.
4 *Celebration* booklet, p. 27.
of material to illustrate the dominant role of Latin in Western civilization for the last four hundred years,\textsuperscript{5} and its decline, especially in education, in more recent times. She cites evidence from several European countries and from the United States to document “the disappearance of Latin which . . . occurred everywhere in the Western world during the 1960s”\textsuperscript{6}. Despite such all-encompassing remarks, there is no mention of Australia in this book at all.

The teaching of Virgil, therefore, as a regular component of Latin within the school curriculum in an Australian context, is a subject yet to be documented and discussed. The present study deals specifically with the school system of the State of New South Wales. Despite some recent moves to establish a national curriculum, the structure and content of school education in Australia have been and are still managed autonomously by the six State governments. By the end of the twentieth century, only New South Wales and Victoria had significant numbers of students completing a Latin course to matriculation level.\textsuperscript{7} In New South Wales, because of the foundation of several academic government high schools in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, Latin had an established place in the state school system which has survived to some extent until the present day. In New South Wales, then, Virgil was being taught to senior Latin students in both government and non-government schools throughout the twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{6} F. Waquet, \textit{Latin or the Empire of a Sign}, p. 272.
Chapter One supplies a necessary context for the discussion of the teaching of Virgil by providing a historical survey of the changes in the position of Latin in the school curriculum in New South Wales. Little work has been done in this specific area, although general historical research into education in New South Wales, done notably by Alan Barcan, has proved invaluable as background. Two Master of Education theses on Latin teaching in the 1960s gave insights into the state of affairs shortly before the great changes that took place in the 1970s. Statistical information was derived from University of Sydney and Department of Education archives, and, for the second half of the twentieth century, from figures published on the Board of Studies website. As the resources for Latin teaching were almost all produced in Britain, reference is made to a number of studies done by British experts in Latin teaching, and to manuals produced in conjunction with courses developed in the 1970s. Chapter One also includes some personal experiences, as the present writer took an active part in the efforts of Latin teachers in New South Wales to modernize and preserve the subject and adapt it to the changed educational scene of the 1970s and thereafter. These efforts are documented in the records of the Classical Languages Teachers Association Inc. and the associations which preceded its formation in 1975.8

Chapter Two investigates the treatment of Virgil as the most commonly prescribed author for the final school Latin examination throughout the twentieth century. It is reasonable to assume that the demands of such examinations were a strong, perhaps even a dominating, influence over the approach taken by teachers. For this reason, Chapter Two

8 The Catholic Teachers Latin Association, also known as the Catholic Latin Teachers’ Association, was formed in 1961. It became a general professional body in 1972, known as the Latin Teachers’ Association.
is the longest section of this study, offering a comprehensive documentation, analysis and evaluation of syllabuses, text prescriptions, examination questions and reports on performance, and all the officially recommended secondary material on Virgil. Data for this Chapter were collected from the many official documents issued by the administrative bodies responsible for public examinations and courses of study in New South Wales. For the first decade of the century, the archives of the University of Sydney yielded information on the prescription of Virgil for its public examinations. On the establishment of the first state curriculum and examination system for secondary schools (1911), the Department of Education took over the function previously performed by the University of Sydney, and held this responsibility until the creation, in 1990, of the New South Wales Board of Studies. Administrative changes within these bodies produced a confusing array of variously-titled documents, held in the archives of the Board of Studies, the Department of Education and Training, the State Library of New South Wales and the State Records. Some information was found also in the publications and archives of the Classical Association of New South Wales and the Classical Languages Teachers Association Inc. This archival material is dispersed in random fashion among the libraries and depositories of the organizations mentioned, some of it in the possession of private individuals, and so far there is no catalogue of material pertinent to the teaching of Latin. It is hoped that the data collected in this study on the teaching of Virgil will prove a useful guide to researchers wishing to explore this or other aspects of Latin in the school curriculum of New South Wales. As stated above, a comprehensive study has been made of all the material relevant to the teaching of Virgil which was issued officially by the various examining bodies. These documents cannot be identified as the work of individuals. It was the practice during the era of the
in a separate section of the Bibliography. Substantial space is devoted to the analysis of examination questions on Virgil, on the assumption that much teaching would have been strongly influenced by questions in past papers. For similar reasons, all the commentaries and additional books that were officially recommended for the study of Virgil have been carefully reviewed in order to evaluate the various influences that affected the presentation of this Latin poetry in the classrooms of New South Wales during the course of the twentieth century.

Chapter Three explores the voluntary contribution of professional organizations and support groups to the teaching of Virgil to final-year students, especially in the last thirty years of the twentieth century, when there was no longer any government support for the maintenance and improvement of Latin teaching in schools. The activities listed not only helped to inspire students and prepare them for the examination requirements, but provided a channel through which advances in Virgilian scholarship could be transmitted to teachers. Data were collected from the archives of the Classical Association of New South Wales and of the Classical Languages Teachers Association, Inc. Oral evidence was sought from colleagues on events that took place in the 1960s and 1970s to supplement the experiences and recollections of the present writer. The role of volunteer effort in preserving and advancing the teaching of classical languages at all levels is itself a significant subject for study.

Leaving Certificate to print the name of the Chief Examiner (usually the current Professor of Latin at the University of Sydney) on the examination papers, but since the first Higher School Certificate in 1967 no individuals were identified. From the 1970s to the end of the century, syllabus and examination committees included both practising teachers and academics.
Chapter Four deals with the introduction of Virgil to younger students, and offers a detailed evaluation of the different types of transitional texts used as the century progressed. From the 1970s the style of the introductory texts was strongly influenced by the Latin reading courses now commonly used in the junior secondary years. Such introductory texts were usually produced by practising teachers, and so are a very good indication of the prevailing problems and pedagogical trends affecting the teaching of Virgil at their respective times of writing. From the 1970s the growth of literary criticism, the encouragement of students’ personal and creative responses to literature and the diminished time available for language instruction were all strong factors in determining how Virgil’s poetry could be introduced to students.

Chapter Five describes the teaching of the *Aeneid* in English to students of different ages, either through a re-telling or through the reading of a published translation. The absence of any official “classics in translation” syllabus in New South Wales at any time has resulted in a lack of documentation about any teaching of Virgil in English before the 1970s. Since that time, however, steps have been taken to incorporate the *Aeneid* in English both in courses for late beginners in Latin and in Classical Studies and Latin courses for junior secondary classes. The development of such courses from the 1970s reflects the insecurity of Latin in the last three decades of the twentieth century and the desire of classicists to disseminate one of the most memorable works of Latin literature beyond the small numbers of senior students who could hope to read it in the original. This method of transmission of Virgil may well have served to increase respect for
literature in Latin among a wider public, and deserves to be documented as an aspect of the teaching of Virgil in schools.

Chapter Six investigates the changes brought in to herald the twenty-first century. The present writer was one of the five members of the Latin Continuers Syllabus team who determined, among other aspects of the new course to be first examined in 2001, a permanent, uninterrupted place for Virgil’s *Aeneid* as a prescribed text. No other Latin author was accorded the same honour. The Syllabus team was also responsible for designing the objectives and outcomes for each component of the course, and thus was in a position to influence and even direct the teaching of Virgil in New South Wales for years to come. The demands of this Syllabus are discussed in this study. Evidence for current teaching practices has been collected through classroom observations in ten schools of different types and through a survey of practising teachers. The results are summarized and evaluated.

Although the secondary school curriculum in New South Wales can be seen to be derived from British models, from the first decade of the twentieth century a distinctly Australian ethos began to develop to suit a more egalitarian and more pragmatic society. Later influences, such as immigration from non-Anglo-Celtic countries, and increasing sensitivity to Aboriginal culture, contributed to the development of a distinctly Australian curriculum. The teaching of Latin, too, was affected by conditions increasingly different from those in Britain, although for most of the twentieth century nearly all the books and teaching resources were imported from that country. From the 1970s, however, more
initiatives were taken to produce resources and syllabuses that met local needs. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, the teaching of Virgil in New South Wales was being influenced by British, American and Australian scholarship, by trends in Australian school curriculum development, by initiatives taken by local academics and teachers to make Virgil accessible to young Australians, and by a strong determination on the part of teachers to ensure that Virgil continued to be taught in Latin to those school students who had the opportunity to read even a small portion of his work.
CHAPTER ONE

Background – Latin in New South Wales Schools

1900 to the 1950s

At the beginning of the twentieth century those children in New South Wales who were fortunate enough to complete a full secondary education studied Latin as a matter of course. The number of such students was small: in 1900 a total of 63 candidates successfully passed the Senior Public Examination which entitled them to enter the University of Sydney. Matriculation required Latin and one other foreign language.

Only eleven of the 63 successful candidates came from government schools, nearly all of them from the five state high schools in operation at that time which, in New South Wales alone, provided a pathway for bright working-class children to study for university entrance. The major discriminator between schools that led to higher education and those providing only basic education to the age of fourteen was the inclusion of Latin in the curriculum. Without Latin, entry to middle-class professions was impossible.

\[\text{---} \]

10 Alan Barcan, Two Centuries of Education in New South Wales, 1988, p. 165. See my table on page 41. The slight discrepancy in numbers for 1900 is because Barcan refers to those who matriculated, while the table show the numbers who sat for and who passed in Latin.

11 Barcan, Two Centuries, p. 338. The schools were the high schools, for boys and girls separately, in Sydney and Maitland (similar schools founded in Goulburn and Bathurst had not survived) and Fort Street Model Public School. The schools are identified in the 1902 Manual of Public Examinations, University of Sydney, pp. 36-38.

Opposition to compulsory Latin for matriculation to the University of Sydney began early in the twentieth century. A commission on “Primary, Secondary, Technical and Other Branches of Education” was established in 1902 by the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales to compare systems of education in a number of other countries with the purpose of devising an official curriculum for the schools of this State. The Report of the Commissioners, G.H. Knibbs and J.W. Turner, released on 13th October, 1904, dealt mainly with secondary education and contained a substantial chapter on the place of Latin and Greek. While acknowledging the cultural value of the classical languages, this section of the report (the work of G.H. Knibbs) pointed out that most of the world’s universities did not any longer insist on Latin for matriculation. The value of modern language study was strongly emphasised, and it was proposed that French and German be as acceptable for university entrance as Latin or Greek.

As might be expected, this Report caused controversy. Mungo MacCallum, Professor of Modern Languages and Literature, and Dean of the Faculty of Arts, strongly defended the special place of Latin:

---

15 Knibbs-Turner Report, Summarized Reports, p. 14: [The requirement of Latin for Matriculation] “is in conflict with the Reform movement which is taking, or has taken, place almost throughout the entire world”.
It is the value of Latin as a mental, and more especially as a linguistic training . . . and secondly Latin is very generally required in similar examinations elsewhere and were it not compulsory with us, our men would be at a disadvantage.17

Professor MacCallum’s views were discussed at a meeting of the Teachers’ Association of New South Wales.18 A Mr H.I. Carter complained that the new regulations “bore very heavily on girls, Latin being a subject which they found very difficult.”19 Professor Knibbs responded that “our University was almost unique in making it impossible to graduate without a knowledge of Latin.”

This controversy was not confined to New South Wales at this time. W.H.S. Jones, a teacher from the Perse School, Cambridge, began his handbook on Latin teaching by referring to the state of affairs current in England:

The recent attacks upon classical studies have been the result of a desire to make Latin and Greek optional instead of obligatory subjects for degree examinations . . . (The reformers) would banish classics altogether from the school curriculum or assign to them so meagre a portion of the time-table that no good results would be attainable.20

19 The courses of instruction at the Maitland High Schools (1884) listed Latin and optional Greek for boys, but only optional Latin for girls: *Sydney and the Bush – a pictorial history of education in New South Wales*, NSW Dept. of Ed. 1980, p.106. That girls could not cope with Latin was a widespread belief, which George Eliot, in her novel *The Mill on the Floss* (1860) made a chief object of satire: (Book 2, Chapter 1) “‘You help me, you silly little thing!’ said Tom . . . ‘Why I learn Latin too! Girls never learn such things. They’re too silly.’”
The requirement of Latin was very much in the mind of Peter Board, the revolutionary Director of Education in New South Wales at that time, who was working towards the provision of a standardized system of secondary education, regulated by State-run examinations, that would suit children of a wide range of aspirations and abilities. His work was very much in the spirit of the recommendations of the Knibbs-Turner Report of 1904. In an address to the Public School Teachers’ Association of New South Wales, in 1907, Peter Board first praised the contribution of the classics in education:

. . . the habits that are engendered by the careful study of Latin, habits that are formed through the necessity for the accurate weighing of the meaning of words and the accurate interpretation of language, are habits which are specially demanded in certain professions.

But he then went on to deliver a revolutionary message:

For those whose prospects will never lead them to the University. . . Latin should be relegated to an inferior place. We have boys (sic) who are leaving our schools at the age of 16. If after that age they are going into the ordinary work-a-day life of the world their study of Latin so far has been useless, for up to that stage they have not only reached no serviceable knowledge of the language, but they have spent time upon it which might have been much more profitably used.

Peter Board went on in his address to recommend a broad secondary curriculum, including Science and an extensive reading of English literature.

In the setting aside of Latin from its present place, we must look to some other subject that has in it the educative influence that has been ascribed to Latin, and we have that in our English Literature. It may be so handled as to provide training both for the practical purpose of wage-earning and for the equally practical purpose of leisure-spending.

21 The Public Instruction Gazette, NSW, August 1907, pp. 26-27.
In these words, as well as in his earlier remarks quoted above, Peter Board fully acknowledged the “educative influence” of Latin.\textsuperscript{22} He simply felt that it was not a subject for the “ordinary work-a-day life of the world” for which the majority of children were headed. He could not, of course, be expected to conceive of ways of presenting Latin that would make it much more relevant and appealing to a wide range of children. That would come, about sixty years later, but first Latin as a school subject would come closer and closer to obliteration during the decades that followed the introduction of public examinations.

The first edition of \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools}, issued in 1911, contained a full introduction by Peter Board in which he described four types of secondary school course, of which the first (the “general” course) led to professional studies and the other three to commercial, technical and domestic vocations respectively. All courses shared a core curriculum of English Literature, History, Mathematics and Science. The subject matter was supposedly selected as being especially relevant and valuable to the young Australian:

\begin{quote}
The comparative isolation of the Australian pupil in itself suggests that he should be introduced to the best of the world’s literature, that he should be familiar with other lands through his language studies.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

The “general course” included two of the four available foreign languages (French, German, Latin, Greek) with the possibility of adding a third language to be commenced in the third year. The mandatory teaching time for the first and the second languages was

\textsuperscript{22} The arguments for Latin in education, according to Waquet, “have hardly changed form the eighteenth century for the present day” (\textit{Latin or the Empire of a Sign}, p. 184). She outlines the reasons in seven categories, in the section “The Arsenal of Arguments”, pp. 185-200.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools}, 1911, Government Printer, Sydney, p. 7.
laid down to be six 45-minute periods per week in the first two years and five per week in the remaining two years.\textsuperscript{24} This was a greater allocation than that given to English, which received five periods a week throughout the course. After the extension of the full secondary course to five years in 1918 (by adding a year to the junior course), the system remained in place until 1967, offering two public examinations, for the Intermediate and the Leaving Certificates respectively.\textsuperscript{25}

The first Leaving Certificate examination was held in 1913. Four languages were offered: French, German, Latin and (Classical) Greek. Three levels of papers were set: Pass (Lower Standard), Pass (Higher Standard) and Honours. The official booklet, \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools} was re-published every second year after 1911, and contained the subject matter to be covered in every course with some advice to teachers and lists of recommended books. As far as Latin and Greek were concerned, the syllabuses remained substantially the same with only very minor changes in the examination format for the next fifty years. Two World Wars, a major Depression, immigration, and other huge social, economic and political changes in Australia left no mark at all on the prescribed teaching content for the Classical languages.

Despite Peter Board’s remarks quoted above, the Latin course for the first Leaving Certificate made little attempt to acknowledge the specific interests of the Australian adolescents who were the target. Teachers were not advised as to why particular texts had

\textsuperscript{24} The time allocated for Latin in a junior year amounted to 180 hours, compared with the 100 hours accepted as the standard year of study by the end of the century.
\textsuperscript{25} See Table 2 on page 41 for candidate numbers.
been selected for study, nor about any themes, features or approaches which might be especially appealing or valuable to young Australians. The 1911 Course of Study recommended Caesar, Cicero and Virgil for the third year of high school, with Livy, Cicero and Horace for the fourth (final) year. These demands must have proved excessive, as indicated by a significant change within the next few years: the penultimate year was to be devoted to “wide reading” while in the final year only two authors were prescribed. Candidates for the 1916 Leaving Certificate in Latin\textsuperscript{26} were expected to have read about 1000 lines of prose and about 750 lines of verse in the pre-examination year, and, for the public examination, Sallust’s \textit{Catiline} and two Books of the Odes of Horace.

From 1911, “accurate, idiomatic” English translation had been emphasized. Allusions occurring in the text were to be explained, and reading aloud with “accurate and uniform pronunciation”, according to the rules adopted by the University of Sydney, was to be encouraged. It was also recommended that passages of prose and verse be recited from memory.\textsuperscript{27} The 1916 candidates for the Leaving Certificate were expected to write factual answers on points in the texts and on general questions concerning Latin literature and Roman life. A recommended reading list contained 13 books, including four grammars, one collection of “unseen” Latin passages, one Latin dictionary, two dictionaries of classical references, two atlases, two general surveys of Latin literature, and an unidentified book called \textit{Res Romanae}.\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} NSW Dept of Ed. \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools for years 1916 and 1917}, pp. 37-38.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools}, 1911, p. 60.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{Courses of Study for Public High Schools for years 1916 and 1917}, pp. 37-38.
\end{itemize}
Despite this solid diet, or perhaps because of it, not all the 1916 Leaving candidates did well in the exam: of the 548 Latin candidates, only 273 passed. The examiners’ report was scathing: “Quite a third of the candidates knew so little that the examiners are at a loss to understand why they were allowed to present themselves.”\(^{29}\) Clearly Peter Board’s opinion that many pupils would be better served studying other things was shared by the Latin examiners. Greek, taken then, as it is now, by a much more exclusive group, was passed by 15 of its 19 candidates.

As the Leaving Certificate became well established, the number of candidates increased. Most of them attempted Latin. There was a clear incentive for them to do so: in 1925 the Matriculation requirements for the University of Sydney stated that students had to pass at the “Higher” standard in at least three subjects, one of which had to be English, and one another language.\(^{30}\) (By 1925, Italian and Japanese had been added to the list.) In addition, Faculty requirements demanded Latin or Greek for Arts, and Latin and another language for Law, Medicine and Dentistry. That year 965 Latin candidates sat, and 649 passed.

Although both candidate numbers and pass rates in Latin were increasing, the examiners’ comments remained as negative as ever: “From this examination (1928) emerged the lamentable fact that of about 1300 candidates not more than 60 or 70 had acquired, in at least five years of study, a reasonably accurate knowledge of the elements of Latin.” With


\(^{30}\) University matriculation requirements stated in 1925 *Official Handbook for Leaving etc.*, p. 44.
this kind of encouragement it is hardly surprising that, once the university requirements changed, there was a dramatic drop in the popularity of Latin. In 1937 Sydney University abandoned compulsory Latin as a prerequisite for Medicine and Dentistry, specifying only “a language other than English”\textsuperscript{31}, and from 1945, no special requirements were laid down for entry to any Faculty of the University.\textsuperscript{32}

The effect on Latin numbers can be easily seen. In 1940, only 44.9\% of Leaving candidates took Latin, the first time the proportion had been less than half. After World War II, while numbers of Leaving candidates steadily increased, the percentage of Latin students showed a marked drop:\textsuperscript{33} to 18.6\% (1253) in 1946, and thence to 14.6\% (1949), 12.4\% (1955), 9\% (1960) and 6.05\% (1964).

Whether the decline in numbers for Latin caused a re-appraisal of the syllabus, or whether there was general dissatisfaction on the part of teachers and students with the content and emphasis of the course, the fact is that an Amended Syllabus appeared, to take effect from 1950.\textsuperscript{34} For the first time, it was explicitly stated that grammar should be taught, from the first, alongside the reading of Latin texts, “so that the pupil can see the forms and constructions in actual use by Latin writers”. However, the syllabus-writers still did not regard “unseen translation” so much as a testing method but as a goal.

\textsuperscript{32} Examinations Handbook for 1944, pp. 90-91. The death in 1944 of Professor F.A.Todd, Professor of Latin and Dean of the Faculty of Arts, may have expedited this reform. “With his death, Latin lost a great champion,” wrote the art historian Bernard Smith in his memoir, \textit{A Pavane for Another Time}, Macmillan, 2002, pp. 145-6.
\textsuperscript{33} “Foreign Language Students” \textit{inside education}, September 1971, pp. 840-850.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Education Gazette}, August 1949, pp. 300-301.
in itself. “Unseen translation is, perhaps, the *chief ultimate end of the study of Latin* (my italics). Therefore, regular and frequent training in it should be given from the first days of the course. Every effort should be made from the very beginning to prevent the pupil from falling into the habit of divination in place of translation.” All the same, with reference to the Leaving Certificate set books, a broader view emerges: “The books should be studied not only from the linguistic standpoint but with attention to matters of Roman history, literature and antiquities arising from the reading of the text.” Although the questions were still usually only of the Who? What? Where? type, in the 1953 Leaving Certificate Pass examination students were asked: “Name any incident in your book of the *Aeneid* which you admire as an example of vivid or affecting narrative, and give your reasons for admiring it.” This is the first examination question on Virgil to ask for the student’s personal response to the book that had been studied for the whole of the final year.

**1950s: transition to the comprehensive high school**

During the 1950s serious questions were being asked about school curriculum, both in Australia and in the rest of the English-speaking world. In Britain and in Australia, there was increasing dissatisfaction with the separation of children, at eleven or twelve, into academic and non-academic schools. In the United States, in contrast, a country long proud of its tradition of local community high schools catering for nearly all

---

students, there were worries about a “soft” curriculum and a demand for more rigorous standards.\textsuperscript{36}

In New South Wales, the secondary school population had almost doubled in the two decades between 1935 (82,685) and 1955 (152,548), but of this increased number of students a little fewer than half passed the Intermediate Certificate and only a small proportion (9\% in 1955) made a successful attempt at the Leaving Certificate.\textsuperscript{37} The Wyndham Report of 1957 expressed grave concern at the “wastage” of adolescents who left school early,\textsuperscript{38} and attributed this wastage in large part to the fact that the curriculum was not appropriate for a wide range of student ability. “Despite what has been done to provide a variety of courses of study . . . it is the pupil of high average ability who is most at home in the secondary school at present.”\textsuperscript{39}

The Wyndham Report made a number of recommendations, which, for our purposes, may be summarized as follows:\textsuperscript{40}

\begin{itemize}
  \item no more selection - all students to attend a comprehensive secondary school
  \item the secondary course to be extended to six years
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{36} Hollis L Caswell, Dean of the Teachers’ College, Columbia University, “The Great Reappraisal of Public Education”, lecture condensed and published in \textit{The Education Gazette} (NSW Dept of Ed.) August, 1954. In part of this article, Caswell denounces the belief that teaching Latin will endow students with transferable learning skills.
\textsuperscript{37} Wyndham Report, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{38} Wyndham Report, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{39} Wyndham Report, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{40} Wyndham Report, pp.72 ff.
• all students to be encouraged to obtain a School Certificate at the end of four years

• all students to follow a mandatory core curriculum for four years, aimed at artistic, social, physical and academic development

• after the first year, elective subjects, including languages (ancient and modern), to be offered for an increasing proportion of the timetable

• the final two years, leading to the Higher School Certificate, to prepare students for tertiary study.

The Wyndham Report was adopted, and New South Wales high schools embarked on the six-year course in 1962. The change had a very strong impact on the study of languages. Apart from a token introductory course in the first year, students, even those of high academic potential, could avoid or simply miss out on taking any languages at all right through high school. Although the number of students staying on to sit for the Higher School Certificate grew enormously beyond expectations, the numbers taking Latin dwindled almost to vanishing point.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL HSC CANDIDATES</th>
<th>HSC CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (rounded to one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Conditional Examinations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>25,143</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>28,973</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>31,280</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33,097</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>35,205</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see here a huge decline in the study of Latin. Whilst the declining percentages can partly be explained by the fact that many more students were staying at school to do the HSC, and that most of these additional students would not previously have been considered “academic” enough to study Latin, the decline in the actual number of Latin candidates shows that even able students were choosing to study other subjects, or were just not being offered Latin as an option.

How can we sum up the factors contributing to the unpopularity of Latin in the 1970s?

We have so far observed that it was no longer required for university entrance, and that the introduction of the comprehensive secondary curriculum had marginalized all languages, except in schools which had a strong traditional commitment to their study.

We must add to these factors the adoption by the Roman Catholic Church of the liturgy in English, in 1964, which led in turn to a sharp decrease in the number of Catholic schools teaching Latin.

42 The increase is probably due to the fact that the HSC was at first attempted only by more academic students who stayed on for the full six years of the new course, as the Wyndham Report envisaged. This situation changed as the HSC quickly gained popularity among a wider range of students.
A major, but unquantifiable, factor must have been the image and style of Latin teaching and the feeling that it was increasingly out of step with everything else in education. The buzz-words in teaching methods in the late 1960s and the 1970s were “child-centred” and “relevant”. Discovery-learning, group work, the “open classroom” and cross-curricular integration of subjects were IN. Rote-learning and formal grammar were OUT. Anything redolent of “elitism”, like streamed classes or selective schools (the natural habitat of Latin teachers and students) was widely unacceptable. The parents who thought back to their own days of compulsory Latin may very well have embraced the new education with enthusiasm and relief.

For teachers who were trying to keep Latin going in their schools, things were not easy. Regular teaching of languages was, in most schools, postponed till the second or even the third year of high school. Students who began Latin at fourteen without any background in formal grammar or any experience of memorization were unlikely to take to a succession of tables of declensions and conjugations. Accustomed to discovery-learning activities on topics designed to engage their interest, students would gaze incredulously at the random practice-sentences (“We have not walked into the wood because we fear wolves.”) which filled the pages of Latin textbooks. Some students persisted, either thanks to a teacher with a dynamic personality, or because they just liked doing exercises with words and could get most of them right. Few thought of Latin as a medium of communication or of the Romans as real people. In the 60s I tutored an intelligent girl of

---

44 An actual example from Exercise 32b in E. Bembrick., *A First Year Latin Book for Australian Schools*, Brooks Books, Sydney, undated, but commonly used in schools in the 50s and 60s. D. McKinnon, *A critical study of the assumptions underlying the teaching of Latin in NSW*, M.Ed. thesis, Uni. of Sydney, 1963, describes Bembrick’s coursebooks as “the only textbooks written with a view to local conditions”.
fifteen who came with the impression that all Latin words were spelled out aloud as separate letters and never pronounced as whole words. She had gained this impression from her Latin teacher at school. If she ever did think about the Romans as individuals, she must have imagined their conversation as an ongoing spelling bee.

Decline and Renaissance – an eye-witness account

In 1970, I entered the full-time teaching world with a part-Latin, part-English position in a large independent school for girls. Despite the school’s strong tradition of Latin, numbers were dwindling seriously. The senior Latin teacher was very despondent about the situation, which she blamed on a general decline in educational standards and a proliferation of soft options in the curriculum. She was hard-working and devoted to her students, and they in turn respected her. But fewer and fewer chose her subject, and sometimes only one or two wished to continue their studies into the senior years. The school authorities had begun to ask serious questions about the viability of maintaining Latin in the school. This depressing situation was being replicated in schools all over Australia and overseas.45

The large number of Catholic schools in New South Wales, especially the systemic schools, were experiencing a devastating decline in Latin, largely due to the adoption of the liturgy in English in 1964. Latin no longer needed to be a central feature of Catholic

45 F. Waquet, Latin or the Empire of a Sign, p. 272: “It seems appropriate . . . to examine the disappearance of Latin which . . . occurred everywhere in the Western world during the 1960s”.
education. It was possibly anxiety among Latin teachers in Catholic schools about the future of their subject that had led to the formation, in 1961, of a professional association “to foster the teaching of Latin in the Catholic schools.” It cannot have been entirely successful in stemming the decline, for in 1972, both the Latin staff at my school received a letter from Elizabeth Fitzpatrick, on behalf of the Catholic Latin Teachers’ Association, inviting teachers from non-Catholic schools to join with their colleagues to form a new professional organization to promote the study of Latin. Elizabeth Fitzpatrick, a most enterprising and energetic Sydney teacher from Bethlehem College, Ashfield, had taken this step as a result of declining support from Catholic schools. I went to the first meeting, on a Sunday morning in St Patrick’s in downtown Sydney, and joined about ten other worried people to become a foundation member of the new Latin Teachers’ Association.

In its early years, the Latin Teachers’ Association worked hard to brighten up the image of Latin through lively classroom activities. Through its bulletin, Culta, teachers exchanged tips on designing catchy posters, teaching grammar through songs and games, and encouraging an interest in Roman culture through projects and model-making. Some advocated trying a Direct Method approach adapted from modern languages, which were at that time experimenting with non-grammar-based courses centred on dialogues in the target language. Many teachers emphasized exercises in finding English derivatives

46 The minutes of the first meeting of the Catholic Latin Teachers’ Association, on 15th October, 1961 (Virgil’s birthday!), can be found in the archives of the Classical Languages Teachers’ Association Inc. 38 teachers attended that first meeting.
47 I was enthused by this approach, and took a class through Principia, C.W.E. Peckett and A.R. Munday, Wilding & Son, 1949, a textbook that introduced all new grammar through oral dialogues. The authors were disciples of W.H.D.Rouse, an English headmaster who had developed the Direct Method of teaching
from Latin roots, to demonstrate that learning Latin was indeed “relevant” and useful as a means of expanding a student’s English vocabulary. The general aim of all these teaching approaches was to show that Latin lessons could be as entertaining as those in any other subject in the contemporary school, even for students who were not particularly bookish in their tastes.

Enthusiastic teaching, however, was not enough in itself. There were important questions about Latin (and Greek) as school subjects that were not being answered:

1. Were only a few students really bright enough to learn Latin at all, let alone to HSC level? If so, had we nothing to offer the others?

2. What about the non-literary aspects of the Greek and Roman worlds: art, science, engineering, government, society, religion or sports? Did these deserve a major place in a classical education beyond the learning of some facts as “culture topics”?

3. Why did we spend so much time teaching students to translate paragraphs of tedious English prose into supposedly elegant Latin, a task very few could accomplish competently?

4. Why couldn’t even the most successful students at HSC level comprehend an authentic Latin text without a complex process of grammatical de-coding (known as “construing”)? Could anyone, student or teacher, read Latin fluently?48

Latin and Greek in 1910. This Method, while acknowledged as successful in the hands of skilled practitioners, was not recommended for general use in the Report of the Committee . . . on Classics . . . in the United Kingdom, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1923, pp. 144-147.

48 A senior Latin teacher assured me that even the Romans had difficulty understanding classical Latin. One wonders how Cicero ever won a case.
5. What was the aim of studying a work of Latin literature? Was it to translate it into (usually ponderous) English and to memorize all the baffling historical and mythological allusions explained in the notes at the back of the book?

In other words, we had to re-evaluate what we were teaching in classics in the modern school. It was not enough to make lessons more entertaining.

Enter the *Cambridge Latin Course*.

In the late 1960s, Classics teaching in Britain was experiencing a decline parallel to the one I have outlined above. Although firmly entrenched in the influential independent schools, Latin and, to a more serious extent, Greek were facing extinction in the state schools, as the academically-selective grammar schools were being phased out in favour of a comprehensive secondary system.\(^49\)

The *Cambridge Latin Course*, first published in 1970, was the creation of a team of academics and teachers who sought to present a way of learning Latin that reflected contemporary educational thought, was accessible to a wider ability range, and comprised subject matter that was both interesting to modern adolescents and based on sound and recent scholarship.\(^50\) Influenced by the theory of Noam Chomsky, who argued that children acquire a natural knowledge of linguistic structures by immersion in a language,

\(^{49}\) “Classics and the Reorganization of Secondary Schools”, 1965, Pamphlet #2 published by the Joint Association of Classical Teachers, U.K.

\(^{50}\) Discussions of the theory behind the *Cambridge Latin Course* and of the development of the *Course* can be found in J.E. Sharwood Smith, *On Teaching Classics*, 1977, pp. 38ff. and, from a recent perspective, in James Morwood, (ed.) *The Teaching of Classics*, 2003, chapters 9 and 10. Martin Forrest’s *Modernising the Classics*, University of Exeter, 1996, is a full account of the development of the *Cambridge Latin Course*. 
the *Cambridge Latin Course* involved its students, from the first lesson, in a continuous narrative about characters living in Pompeii in A.D. 79. The book had many illustrations, based on archaeological findings in Pompeii, and background essays in English on aspects of life in the town. These features underlined the factual basis of the fictitious story presented in simple, but idiomatic, Latin. The principal characters were family members, slaves and associates of one Caecilius, an affluent merchant in Pompeii, whose statue and house have been identified. The incidents depicted were believable, engaging and often humorous, and dealt with everyday situations - meals, markets, visits to the baths and the arena, local elections and so on. While reading about all these activities, students could not help being aware of the disaster that was about to happen to the town, and the growing suspense increased their desire to read ahead. In the final chapter of the first book, Vesuvius erupted. The second and third books followed the surviving main characters to faraway parts of the Roman world, Britain and Egypt, and thence to Rome itself to witness the building of the Colosseum.

Grammatical explanations and exercises were kept to a minimum. Students were encouraged to read and discuss the events and characters, to enact the dialogues and to translate, but generally, to approach the texts as intrinsically interesting and informative— in other words, as literature. This was the big difference: students were acquiring the language to enable them to read more of an interesting text, rather than working through a text of little interest except as practice in the structures of the language. Even students who never became proficient enough to read the original Roman writers introduced in the fourth book could treat their Latin lessons as literature lessons from the very beginning.
Language and culture were integrated, not taught as separate aspects of the course. Latin lessons were no longer a waste of time for those students who were not expected to master the language of Cicero and Virgil. Prose composition had no place in a course where the objective was fluent reading and comprehension of Latin text.

The *Cambridge Latin Course* was, overall, an immediate success. Never before had a Latin textbook appealed so much to teenage learners. Teachers told of classes moved to tears when their favourite characters died in the eruption of Vesuvius. Of course, there were disappointments. Some expectations proved over-optimistic. A complex written language like Latin is not so easily acquired merely by reading. Take away the familiar context, and the student is lost without a knowledge of grammar. So with each subsequent edition, grammatical explanations and terminology crept back, and more exercises were included. But the excellent reading text is essentially the same, now (in the Fourth Edition, 1998) presented in a glossy, full-colour, large-size format.

From the first, the *Course* employed technology, from slides and tapes in the 1970s to computer software and online learning in the 1990s and beyond. Latin could now be seen as being in step with other aspects of schooling, and not as an educational backwater. There is no question that, whatever its shortcomings, the *Cambridge Latin Course* saved the subject from extinction in schools.\(^5^1\)

---

\(^5^1\) A view recently endorsed by James Morwood with respect to Latin in British schools in his article “The pluperfect is doing nicely”, *The Spectator*, 17th April, 2004, p. 6.
In Sydney, the *Cambridge Latin Course* was first adopted by Dr I.G. Burnet of Cranbrook School, who gave a demonstration of the method to teachers in 1972. There was no doubt that, in terms of overall concept, professional research, quality of material and presentation, this Course made our local efforts to enliven Latin teaching at the time seem homespun and amateur in comparison. We were made aware that there were important developments in Classics taking place in Britain. In January 1974 I went to England to see some of these for myself.\(^{52}\)

For the next four months I visited twelve schools, of very different kinds, in various parts of the country. I found that, not only was the *Cambridge Latin Course* in widespread use, but that The Scottish Classics Group had produced another excellent reading course, *Ecce Romani* ("Look at the Romans!")", just as child-friendly but with a slightly more traditional approach to grammar. There was growing interest in Classical Studies, a course in Greek and Roman culture for junior secondary students, with the dual aim of providing a general background in the highlights of the Classical world and of stimulating interest in learning the Latin and Greek languages.\(^{53}\) Classical Studies made a central feature of storytelling, using myths and legends as material for exercises in listening, speaking, reading, creative writing, visual arts, and drama. It moved on to well-known aspects of ancient culture like the Olympic Games, the development of theatre, government, architecture and scientific thought.

---

\(^{52}\) The observations were presented to the NSW Classical Association in a lecture entitled “New Directions in Classics Teaching”, delivered on Sept. 23, 1974.

\(^{53}\) Winston Churchill would have approved. “Perhaps if I had been introduced to the ancients through their history and customs, instead of through their grammar and syntax, I might have had a better record.” *My Early Life*, 1930, Chapter 2.
I observed Greek classes in a comprehensive school in Sheffield, where Edwin Hunt enthralled large groups of children with a course of his own creation - the only Greek course that did not assume a prior knowledge of Latin grammar, or grammar of any kind.\textsuperscript{54} I listened in amazement as senior students applied quite sophisticated literary criticism to classical texts, using \textit{Aestimanda; practical criticism of Latin and Greek poetry and prose}, by Balme and Warman (1965), and responded with understanding and sensitivity to questions on the author’s intention, choice of words, creation of atmosphere and use of imagery. I was inspired to rough out a Classical Studies course for Australian twelve-year-olds\textsuperscript{55} and on my return to Sydney, I introduced Classical Studies in my own school and promoted it to others through in-service courses for teachers and articles in teaching journals.\textsuperscript{56}

Classical Studies, as an introductory cultural course, fitted in well with the current fashion for interdisciplinary courses and “discovery learning”. It enjoyed considerable popularity and a measure of official backing\textsuperscript{57} from about 1976 to the early 1980s, when such courses gave way to pressures for other inclusions in the junior high school curriculum. Classical Studies was still taught as such in some Sydney independent

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Westfield Greek Course}, J.E. Hunt, privately printed. My copy is undated. In 1979 Maurice Balme of Harrow School produced the first edition of \textit{Athenaze}; a Greek course that drew much inspiration from the \textit{Cambridge Latin Course. Athenaze}, now under the joint authorship of Balme and Gilbert Lawall, (OUP) has developed to become the most widely used Greek course in the English-speaking world.


\textsuperscript{57} In 1976 I was asked to write a Newsletter to be issued by the Curriculum Directorate of the New South Wales Department of Education called “Classical Studies - an Interdisciplinary Approach to Learning (Module 1) for History and Language Departments.”
schools until 2005. It had the lasting effect of showing teachers a variety of approaches to education in Classics and influenced teaching methods and content in Latin and Greek. Mythology, for example, is now a regular component of Classical language classes and provides students with important background for reading authors such as Virgil.

**The Survival of the Keenest**

The later 1970s and the 1980s were years of challenge, creativity and optimism for some, bitterness and defeat for others.\(^{58}\) In Sydney, in 1978, the Latin Teachers’ Association absorbed the Classical members from the Greek Teachers’ Association (which was more concerned with the recently-established subject, Modern Greek) and took on a new identity as the Classical Languages Teachers Association. Because of the much smaller numbers of Classics schools in other states, the CLTA soon became the national professional organization, and remains so today, although its activities are based in Sydney.\(^{59}\)

The CLTA launched an annual program of enrichment activities for schoolchildren which have continued and expanded to the present day. These were run by teachers of outstanding enthusiasm and generosity, and included a weekend camp, a competition in solo and class recitation in Latin, a student dinner, an HSC seminar, a junior quiz night, and, for a number of years, a primary schools activity day. What began as a small-scale

---


\(^{59}\) Its sister organization, the Classical Association of New South Wales, is attended by anyone interested in the Classics and offers a cultural program as well as support for Classics in education. The two organizations issue a joint publication, *Classicum*, first published in 1975. See Chapter 3 of this study.
Drama Night developed into a major production of a Greek or Latin play, organized as a Festival every ten years. The first production, of Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Aulis*, took place in 1982, with a cast drawn from five schools. For this initiative, the CLTA took the bold step of inviting a distinguished English classicist and educator, David Raeburn, to direct the play, which was performed first in English and then in Classical Greek. It was a sensational success, in terms of both quality and popularity. The 1992 Festival, with the same director, offered Sophocles’ *Antigone*, and *Dido*, a dramatic adaptation from Virgil’s *Aeneid*, both performed in the original languages by students from twelve schools. In 2002, the style changed to a light musical, *I Clodia*, based on the works of Cicero and Catullus, which was performed entirely in Latin and Greek to six packed houses at The Conservatorium High School in Sydney. These drama festivals, as well as the annual reading competitions which have been expanded to include choral performances of Latin verse, have had a great influence on the teaching of classical literature, allowing works to be appreciated as an aural experience as well as a written one.

What was the effect of this period of unprecedented initiative and creative endeavour on the popularity of Latin and Greek? One answer seems to be to polarize the situation. With official support hard to find, the keen, energetic, determined or lucky flourished; the meek, apathetic or inflexible faded away. In 1975-6 there were about 140 NSW schools teaching Latin, including a number of systemic Catholic and state comprehensive schools. Now the number of schools is about 40, nearly all of them either traditional independent schools or well-established state selective schools. It is notable that several independent schools have introduced or re-introduced Latin within the last twenty years,
perhaps to meet parental expectations, and that one recently-established selective high school, at Baulkham Hills in north-western Sydney, has introduced Latin.

A small number of schools continue to offer Classical Greek. It can be argued convincingly that Greek offers far more in the way of literature, art and intellectual ideas than Latin, as the pragmatic Romans themselves recognized. Yet Greek remains the privilege of a very few. The reason for this is partly traditional (Greek was usually learned after significant progress in Latin), and partly due to the shortage of qualified teachers. There has not, so far as I know, ever been an attempt in Australia to do what Edwin Hunt did in Sheffield, that is, to introduce Classical Greek to a broad range of school students. Greater success has been experienced at the adult level at a popular annual Summer School run at Macquarie University, so perhaps there is a possibility of a similar initiative for junior secondary students.

The scarcity of Latin teachers in New South Wales with even a basic knowledge of Greek limits the range of information that can be presented to students of Latin literature. When presenting an author such as Virgil, it is difficult for those teachers to explain the many idioms based on Greek usage, or to interpret the notes given in the commentaries on Greek sources and parallels. An increase in the availability of Classical Greek in schools would enrich the study of Latin, but before this is feasibly attempted, the Higher School Certificate requirements for Greek, which have scarcely changed since 1913, will need re-shaping to suit the modern student.
From 1978, the actual numbers of HSC candidates in Latin and Classical Greek have shown little change, but as more and more people now stay at school till Year 12, the percentage of the total candidature is now minuscule. The Classical languages remain strong where they are strong, but are simply not available to students in “ordinary schools”. This sad situation seems to be the result of economic pressures and official indifference. Outside New South Wales, things are far worse: I am informed of only three government schools teaching Latin. 60 One hundred years ago, Classics was the badge of the university-bound elite. Today in Australia it is again the privilege of the affluent or the fortunate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>No. of LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>% of HSC CANDIDATURE</th>
<th>No. of CL GREEK CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justifying Classics in the secondary school

The benefits of Classics in education have been argued about right through the twentieth century. These arguments, as applied in France particularly, have been admirably

60 In Victoria, Dandenong High School, a school with a large percentage of non-English background students; also Norwood Secondary College and University High School.
classified by Françoise Waquet under seven headings.\footnote{Latin or the Empire of a Sign, pp. 185-200. Waquet is skeptical about the justification for Latin. “The reasoning used was not, it seems, much affected by the realities of life.” (p. 200).} In New South Wales, as elsewhere, the social benefits were once indisputable, but what about the educational benefits? Peter Board had said in 1907 that Latin was intrinsically valuable, but only for “boys” destined for the learned professions. H.K. Hunt, Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Melbourne, argued strongly and quite convincingly that learning the Classics gave a student not only knowledge and insights into literature and culture, but transferable mental skills and habits, such as critical use of sources, logical arrangement of information and the ability to generalize and make inferences.\footnote{Training through Latin, 1948, Melbourne University Press, especially Chapter IV: “Mental Training”.}

All sorts of benefits, from good citizenship to basic learning skills have been claimed to result from the learning of Classics, especially Latin.\footnote{K.F. Kitchell, “The Great Latin Debate: the Futility of Utility”, in Latin for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century, ed. R.A. LaFleur, New York, 1998.} In the United States, the National Committee for Latin and Greek has published every conceivable benefit on its website,\footnote{www.promotelatin.org/latin.htm} with particular emphasis on the higher test scores achieved by Latin students than by others. The benefits cited may be summarized as

- breadth and depth of cultural and historical awareness
- improvement in English skills
- advantages when learning other languages
- acquaintance with great literature
- general development of learning skills.
It is not the purpose of this study to endorse the value of learning Latin. However, it is important to keep in mind the aims and objectives of the Latin courses in which the teaching of Virgil plays a significant part. By the start of the twenty-first century, it was possible to offer the following summary of the knowledge and skills to be acquired as the culmination of the study of Latin in school.\textsuperscript{65}

- to read in the original language a substantial selection of prose and poetry from at least two very famous Roman authors, one of them being Virgil
- to discuss the main themes, structure and purpose of the texts
- to analyse the composition of the literature with respect to the stylistic features, word order and sound effects
- to compare classical texts with modern ones and discuss the influences of ancient writers on later literature, art and ideas
- to render in English as well as possible the tone and meaning of the original
- to show a sound understanding of the culture and institutions of the ancient society and of the origins of many modern ideas and traditions
- to acquire strong skills in analysis, accuracy and a retentive memory for detail.

The teaching of Virgil, the subject of this study, needs to be evaluated against the background of trends and developments in the teaching of Latin and other Classical

\textsuperscript{65} This is my own list, based on the Objectives and Outcomes of the \textit{Latin Continuers Stage 6 Syllabus}, Board of Studies, NSW, 2001, p. 12.
subjects over the course of the twentieth century. As an aspect of Latin teaching, it has been influenced considerably by public and official attitudes towards the teaching of Classics in schools, by the characteristics of the students at different periods, by different methods and priorities in teaching the language, by the changing demands of the various examination systems, and by various fashions and pressures in education generally. It has also been greatly influenced by twentieth-century scholarship on the study of literature in general and of Virgil in particular. It is the purpose of this study to document and analyse these influences on the teaching of Virgil throughout the twentieth century and beyond.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL S.P.E CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80 (66 passed)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>97 (82 passed)</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sydney University Senior Public Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL L.C. CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120 (92 passed)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>548 (273 passed)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>965 (649 passed)</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>2629 (1583 passed)</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4181</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6717</td>
<td>1253 (949 passed)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>6003</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>8032</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>10,229</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>18,552</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>28,742</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Department of Education Leaving Certificate Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL HSC CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (rounded to one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>8.7&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>25,143</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>28,973</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>31,280</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33,097</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>35,205</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>35,292</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>31,788</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.6&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>37,208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>44,075</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>59,186</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>62,883</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>65,311</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66,279</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Higher School Certificate Examination

<sup>66</sup> The Senior Public Examination continued for a few years after the introduction of the Leaving Certificate.

<sup>67</sup> The increase is probably due to the fact that the HSC was at first attempted only by more academic students who stayed on for the full six years of the new course, as the Wyndham Report envisaged. This situation changed as the HSC quickly gained popularity among a wider range of students.

<sup>68</sup> There was a drop in HSC candidature in the early 80s.
CHAPTER TWO

The Influence of Public Examinations

Latin Examinations in the 20th Century (and beyond)

During the course of the twentieth century there were, broadly speaking, three successive systems of public examinations for secondary school students. These are outlined below, together with the most significant of the changes that occurred within the existing structures. Regardless of the system in place, Virgil was the author most often prescribed for the final school examination in Latin. It is reasonable to assume that preparation for these important examinations was a major consideration for teachers in deciding what aspects of Virgil were to be emphasised. For this reason, a detailed study has been made of the examination prescriptions, of the questions set on those prescriptions and of the examiners’ reports on the performances of the candidates. Most of the material relating to examinations since 1911 was found in the library of the NSW Board of Studies, but this collection was occasionally incomplete.69 Some missing documents were found in the Mitchell Collection of the NSW State Library, and some were tracked down through teaching colleagues who found them in their school files. Material related to the Sydney University Senior Public Examinations was found in the Rare Book Collection of Fisher Library and in the University Archives.

69 The Board of Studies Librarian, Denise Lamond, explained that this library had taken possession of the examination records of the Department of Education in the last decade of the 20th century, and that not all material had survived the transition.
From the first prescriptions set down for the Leaving Certificate, students were expected, if not actually required, to read Virgil from a recommended edition. For most of the twentieth century they were expected to be familiar with the introduction and notes in that edition, and this expectation can be observed in the questions that were set. Additional guidance for teachers was provided by means of a recommended reading list, either contained in the syllabus itself or appended to the official notice of prescribed texts. It is reasonable to assume that conscientious teachers would have prepared their students for the examinations by emphasizing the content and approach presented in these recommended books. On this assumption, all the recommended editions and secondary works on Virgil officially listed for public examinations since 1900 have received careful review in this chapter. Their contents and approaches have been analysed with the aim of assessing, not their intrinsic qualities, but their influence on the teaching of Virgil in the secondary schools of New South Wales.

**Examination Structure in New South Wales**

**1901-1912**

There was no general-purpose final examination for school leavers. Examinations were set independently by the University of Sydney, by the Department of Education for certification as a teacher, and for entry to the Public Service. This situation was deplored by the Director of Education, Peter Board, in 1909.70 For the purposes of this study, the University Public Examination at Senior level is regarded as the final school examination

---

70 *Public Instruction Gazette*, Vol. iii, No. 9, 30th October, 1909.
at this period. Latin was examined at two standards, known as “Latin” and “Higher Latin”.

**1913-1965**

State-wide examinations for Intermediate and Leaving Certificates supplanted the University Public Junior and Senior Examinations (though the latter continued to be offered until 1916). The University of Sydney continued to offer its own Matriculation Examination until 1979 but, as these papers were not generally the focus of school preparation, they are not included in this study.

The Leaving Certificate Examinations offered three papers in Latin, known as “Pass Lower Standard”, “Pass” and “Honours”. Candidates for Honours were expected to sit for both Pass and Honours papers and to attain an “A” grade in the Pass paper before being considered for the award of Honours. While greater depth and breadth of knowledge were expected of Honours candidates, no additional texts were prescribed. Candidates for Pass Lower Standard were not examined on the verse author.

**1967-2000**

The six-year Higher School Certificate course replaced the five-year Leaving Certificate course.

**1967-1975**
During this period Latin was examined at three levels, known as First, Second and Third Levels, in decreasing order of difficulty. The Second Level course was regarded as the standard course. Third Level candidates read a smaller amount of the books prescribed for Second Level, while First Level candidates were expected to read additional prescribed texts in Latin, related in subject matter to the Second Level texts.

1976-2000

In the restructured Higher School Certificate, Latin was at first offered at three levels, known as 2 Unit (the standard course), 3 Unit (the highest level) and 2 Unit A. The last was conceived as an easier course, but from 1976 was also aimed at late beginners in Latin. A separate course for late beginners, known as 2 Unit Z, was introduced in 1979. The 2 Unit A course was discontinued after 1980, and the 2 Unit Z was also discontinued after 1993.

The 3 Unit course was seen as more challenging than the 2 Unit course and required the study of additional text, but initially no separate texts were prescribed, and 3 Unit candidates were expected to read more of the same books as were prescribed for 2 Unit.

From 1986 an additional text, not necessarily related in content or genre to the 2 Unit texts, was prescribed for 3 Unit candidates. 3 Unit candidates sat for two papers, but the format of these papers and their relationship to the 2 Unit paper was altered several times during the lifetime of these courses. Reference to these changes will be made if and when they are seen as relevant to the teaching of Virgil.

---

71 Education Gazette, 1st October, 1965.
The “new” Higher School Certificate course offered two courses in Latin. The standard course, in which Virgil’s *Aeneid* was consistently prescribed for study, was known as Latin Continuers (a term used for all languages to distinguish “continuing” courses from those designed for “beginners”). The additional higher course was now known as Latin Extension. This course was structured around prescribed “genres” of literature, none of which included the study of Virgil.

For the purposes of this study, the term “junior level” refers in general to the Junior, Intermediate and School Certificate courses, and “final level” to the Senior, Leaving and Higher School Certificate courses. “Standard course” refers to the Latin course taken by most final level candidates, i.e “Pass”, “Second Level”, “2 Unit” or “Continuers”, in contrast to either “higher” (Honours, First Level, 3 Unit or Extension) or “modified” (Third Level or 2 Unit A) courses.

Tables showing the numbers of Latin candidates at different points from 1900 on are shown on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL S.P.E CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80 (66 passed)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>97 (82 passed)</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sydney University Senior Public Examination\(^\text{72}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL L.C. CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120 (92 passed)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>548 (273 passed)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>965 (649 passed)</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>2629 (1583 passed)</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4181</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6717</td>
<td>1253 (949 passed)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{72}\) The Senior Public Examination continued for a few years after the introduction of the Leaving Certificate.
Table 2: Department of Education Leaving Certificate Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL HSC CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (rounded to one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>6003</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>8032</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>10,229</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>18,552</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>28,742</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Higher School Certificate Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL HSC CANDIDATES</th>
<th>LATIN CANDIDATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE TAKING LATIN (rounded to one decimal place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>8.7(^{73})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>25,143</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>28,973</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>31,280</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33,097</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>35,205</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>35,292</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>31,788</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.6(^{74})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>37,208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>44,075</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>59,186</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>62,883</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>65,311</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66,279</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virgil as Prescribed Text: choice and length**

An important goal of the study of Latin has always been the reading of authentic Latin literature. To ensure that students achieve this goal at a level appropriate to their age and years of study, it has been the practice of examination authorities to prescribe texts to be read through the year and to test candidates’ comprehension and appreciation of these texts in the public examinations. It has been assumed that the study of prescribed texts forms the major part of the student’s workload in the examination year, and that this

\(^{73}\) The increase is probably due to the fact that the HSC was at first attempted only by more academic students who stayed on for the full six years of the new course, as the Wyndham Report envisaged. This situation changed as the HSC quickly gained popularity among a wider range of students.

\(^{74}\) There was a drop in HSC candidature in the early 80s.
study underlies and supports other requirements such as acquisition of vocabulary, prose composition and unseen translation.

For most of the century, texts were prescribed for study at junior level, often selections from Caesar and Ovid, but it seems that not all students were capable of reading authentic Latin at this stage. The Intermediate Certificate offered an alternative examination without prescribed texts - an option that was taken up by only 7.4 % of candidates in 1960. The School Certificate, in its early years, continued the tradition of prescribed texts, but when a change in policy brought about an end to external examinations in 1975, this requirement disappeared.

At all final public examinations throughout the twentieth century, Latin papers were substantially based on the study of prescribed texts. It was always the practice to prescribe one prose and one verse text for study and examination in the standard Latin course. For much of the HSC period (1967-2000) additional texts, often by different authors, were prescribed for the higher courses.

Throughout the twentieth century, the most commonly prescribed verse author for standard level Latin examinations was Virgil. From 1901 to 1957, a Book from either the Aeneid or the Georgics was prescribed almost every alternate year; from 1957 to 1971 a more erratic pattern can be observed; from 1971 to 1980 the alternate-year pattern

---

76 e.g. in 1975 selections were prescribed from (adapted) Pliny, Livy, Martial and Ovid
77 A. Barcan, Two Centuries of Education in New South Wales, 1988, p. 284.
78 See table of Virgil prescriptions on page 42.
79 Usually alternating with Horace
was reinstated; finally, from 1981 to the end of the century, Virgil was prescribed every single year.\textsuperscript{80}

In total, Virgil appeared 60 times as the prescribed verse author for final examination in the twentieth century in the standard Latin course. (He appeared a few times as an additional text for higher level during the 70s and 80s as well.) This frequency must reflect a belief that Virgil’s works were both especially worth reading and especially suitable for students at this level\textsuperscript{81}.

Not all the works of Virgil appeared as prescribed texts. The \textit{Eclogues} made only one brief appearance, as a short additional extract to be read by higher level students in 1970.\textsuperscript{82} The \textit{Georgics} were unevenly represented: \textit{Georgics} 1 appeared as the standard text in 1967, and as an additional reading for higher level in 1982; \textit{Georgics} 2 was represented only by an extract (lines 490-542) for higher level in 1970; \textit{Georgics} 3 was never set; \textit{Georgics} 4, however, was prescribed seven times as the standard text\textsuperscript{83} and also appeared as a higher level reading to supplement the reading of \textit{Aeneid} 6 in 1975.\textsuperscript{84} The inclusion of the Orpheus and Eurydice epyllion presumably made \textit{Georgics} 4 more attractive than the other books. There was the additional convenience of an available school edition\textsuperscript{85} in which the well-respected editor expressed his view that this Book was ideal for reading in “comparatively low forms” because of its linguistic simplicity and its

\textsuperscript{80} The “new” HSC syllabus prescribes Virgil every year from 2001 to 2005.
\textsuperscript{81} The separate Lower Standard paper in 1916 contained only the prose author; in 1945, when separate papers were no longer set, candidates for Lower Standard were directed to omit Part B (poetry).
\textsuperscript{82} HSC First Level: \textit{Ecl.} 6.31-42. The standard verse prescription that year was from Lucretius.
\textsuperscript{83} In 1917, 1920, 1930, 1947, 1955, 1962 and 1982
\textsuperscript{84} lines 425-547
\textsuperscript{85} T.E. Page, 1897, Macmillan, (reprinted many times). In 1982 the Huxley edition of \textit{Georgics} I and IV (1963) was the prescribed edition for the reading of \textit{Georgic} IV.
brevity (566 lines). “It would be impossible to find a better subject for those who already know a little Latin”, he stated emphatically in the Preface. Whatever the attainments were of Page’s students at Charterhouse School in the nineteenth century, *Georgics* 4 was deemed suitable for final examination candidates in twentieth-century New South Wales.

The *Aeneid* appeared most often in the prescription lists. Book 2 was the most popular (sixteen appearances throughout the century), followed by Book 6 (eleven appearances, though none in the 1940s or 1950s). Books 4 and 12 both appeared seven times, but with different distributions. Book 4 appeared only once before 1943 and not again after 1983. Book 12 was first set in 1968, and thereafter only in the 1980s and 1990s. Other books of the *Aeneid* were far less popular, with three or fewer appearances, while Books 3, 7 and 11 were never prescribed at all.

It is not hard to see why *Aeneid* 2 was most frequently prescribed. The catastrophic events of Troy’s last hours, the Wooden Horse and the perfidy of Sinon, the graphic description of the sea-serpents and the death of Laocoon, the revelations to Aeneas both from Hector’s ghost and the apparition of Creusa, the desperate street-fighting and the horrific killing of Priam, all told as first-person narrative, make this Book a gripping, fast-moving adventure. It does not include any political or philosophical digressions or any Olympian plotting to interrupt the flow of events: it is action from first to last, made poignant by our empathy for the narrator.

*Aeneid* 6 offers the unforgettable scenes of the Underworld. It is, however, more difficult to follow than Book 2, for it is lengthy (901 lines) with several different sections or
episodes: the arrival in Italy, Aeneas’ visit to the Sibyl, the death and funeral of Misenus, the quest for the Golden Bough, the journey through the Underworld and encounters with characters from Aeneas’ past, the descriptions of Tartarus and Elysium, the reunion with Anchises, his explanation of reincarnation, the parade of prominent Romans, including a laudatory passage on Augustus, the affirmation of Roman destiny to rule, and finally, the mysterious Gates of Horn and Ivory. The content of this Book is more complex and abstract than that of any other, and it is not surprising that when it was set in 1961 after a long interval, the prescription took the form of selections: lines 268-444, 450-718 and 752-901. The students omitted all the events leading up to the actual descent into the Underworld and the section on reincarnation, while still experiencing the spine-chilling, grisly atmosphere, the pathos of Aeneas’ encounters with the dead, and the grandeur of the parade of Rome’s great men of the future. This selection indicates which aspects of Book 6 were thought to be most appealing, most significant, or both. It also served to reduce the prescription to what had come to be considered an acceptable length.

Two other books of the Aeneid were prescribed more than three times: Book 4 and Book 12. Book 4, the tragic passion of Dido, offers an engrossing but straightforward storyline, and invites discussion of the conflicts between duty and desire, free-will and destiny, and male and female roles. It is surprising, then, that Book 4 was not prescribed for the Leaving Certificate until 1943. It did not appear after 1983, largely because of the fact that substantial selections were included in both the Cambridge and Oxford Latin Courses, and thus could have been studied by many candidates prior to their final year.86

86 This point was discussed at meetings of the Latin Syllabus Committee at the time, at which I was present.
Book 12 was first prescribed in 1968 and not again until 1986. Generally speaking, prescriptions from the second half of the *Aeneid* made only rare appearances until the last two decades of the century. It is interesting to note that a Memo to Principals on the Book’s first appearance in 1968 included the following:

(First Level) candidates should also consider Book XII of the *Aeneid* in relation to the *Iliad* of Homer and are particularly urged to read, at least in an English translation, Book XXII of the *Iliad*.

The dramatic tension of Book 12 and the moral ambiguity of its ending sustain interest and provide plenty of discussion material. However, the repeated prescription of this Book over four years, 1996-1999, was not due to its intrinsic qualities, but to an administrative decision to “freeze” the HSC prescriptions at the time.

---

87 As there were only 22 candidates in Greek in that year, very few of the 1333 Latin candidates would be able to read Homer in Greek!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>+G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>+extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>+extra lines &amp; other author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>+extra lines &amp; other author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>+extra lines &amp; other author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>+ extra lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Other author from now on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>+extra lines &amp; Catullus 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLETE LIST OF VIRGIL PRESCRIPTIONS IN THE 20\textsuperscript{TH} CENTURY

Length of Prescription

For almost half the century, the Virgil prescription consisted of a whole Book, despite the fact that the Books differ significantly in length, as can be seen by comparing those most commonly prescribed:

\textit{Aeneid} 2 – 804 lines

\textit{Aeneid} 6 – 901 lines

\textit{Aeneid} 4 – 705 lines

\textit{Georgics} 4 – 566 lines

In 1949, sections of \textit{Aeneid} 9 amounting to 588 lines were prescribed for “intensive reading”, but a notice in a 1948 \textit{Education Gazette} stated: “The portions of Virgil set for extensive reading are to be removed from the work prescribed in this subject for 1949.”\textsuperscript{88} This amendment may have resulted from complaints by teachers about the length of the prescription. When \textit{Aeneid} 4 was set for 1957, lines 90-172 were excluded for either translation or comment, leaving a prescription of 522 lines. This prescription, however, was accompanied by the following instruction: “Teachers are advised. . . to acquaint pupils with and comment upon these (omitted) lines.” This was the first recommendation of this kind. Acquaintance with lines not prescribed for translation (presumably through a published English version) was to be explicitly required for examination from 1977, when the following “Note” was appended to the list of prescriptions:

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Education Gazette}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} August, 1948, p. 264.
Where only a part of *Aeneid* IV is prescribed, candidates are expected to be aware both of the structure of the book as a whole and the content of those parts not prescribed for examination.89

In 1958 there was a return to a longer prescription: 616 lines of *Aeneid* 2 were prescribed, and in 1961, 596 lines of *Aeneid* 6. Thus there was no regulation defining the length of the prescription, a strange omission when one considers the difference in teaching time required. If twenty lines are taken as an average portion for the forty-minute lesson that was standard for most of the century, then an extra hundred lines must have required an additional five lessons or their equivalent. And of course there was a prose text to be read as well.

The introduction of the Higher School Certificate in 1967 with its three levels of study brought about a differentiation in the length of text prescribed for each level. For example, in 1971 modified level students (“Third Level”) read 361 lines of *Aeneid* 4, standard level students read 523 lines, while those at the higher level read the same 523 lines, supplemented by 52 lines from *Aeneid* 6 and the 196 lines of Ovid’s *Heroides* 7- a total of 801 lines. Higher level students were accorded extra teaching time.

One may contrast the next occasion on which *Aeneid* 4 was prescribed, following the restructuring of HSC courses in 1976. In 1977, students at modified level (“2 Unit A”) read 222 lines, those at standard level 473 lines, while those at the higher level read an additional 158 lines of the same Book for “extensive reading” (i.e. not for translation).

---

89 *Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.*, 1977, NSW Dept. of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, p. 22.
A similar amount was prescribed for 1986, when the standard course required 472 lines from *Aeneid* 12, while higher candidates read an additional 191 lines.

In 1988 there occurred a further modification of the requirements: at standard level, 337 lines of *Aeneid* 6 were prescribed for “translation and comment” while another 140 lines were to be known for “translation only”. At the higher level an additional 194 lines were to be read for comment only (as well as an additional prose text). In 1989, the amount was reduced further: 380 lines of *Aeneid* 6 were set for standard level, while higher level candidates read the remaining 521 lines of the same Book as their *only* additional text.

From 1990 to the end of the century, Virgil was prescribed only as a standard level text, higher candidates being required to study an additional text by another author, either prose or verse. The 1990 prescription from *Aeneid* 2 was 392 lines. The Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus, issued by the Board of Studies in 1992, gave the length of each prescribed text for the standard course as “about 450 lines”. In addition, there was the stated expectation that “students will be aware of the content of the rest of the section from which these excerpts are taken and how the prescribed lines fit into it”. The recommendation as to length was only loosely followed, and there must have been some feeling that the shorter prescriptions did not give students enough experience of Virgil, for in 1995, when only 401 lines of *Aeneid* 10 were prescribed, the following was added: “It is expected that candidates will be acquainted with the rest of *Aeneid* 10 in translation.” This new requirement continued till the end of the century, and represents official recognition of

---

90 *Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus*, Board of Studies, 1992, p.18.
the use of published English translations in the classroom, a procedure that would have been regarded with abhorrence earlier in the century.91

Questions on Virgil

The questions set on Virgil in public examinations can be classified as requiring the following types of responses:

Prescribed Text

a. Translation of an extract or extracts. The length of extract has varied greatly, from substantial (more than 15 lines) to scanty (6 lines or less).

b. Short answers on extracts (whether also to be translated or not):
   i. factual answers on context, identification of characters, places, or events
   ii. explanation of allusions to myths, legends, contemporary or historical events, usually provided in the notes in the prescribed edition
   iii. analytical, critical, responsive or interpretive answers

c. Scansion of one or two lines, with or without comment on features of the metre..

d. Details of language, particularly points of grammar; such questions became more common after the removal of compulsory prose composition

e. Extended answer or essay. Before the introduction of prescribed “themes” in the last few years of the century, topics commonly addressed were:

---

91 An attitude criticised by D. McKinnon (M.Ed thesis 1963), p.148: “... it appears that teachers who discourage or prohibit the use of translations do so because of a narrow view of the purpose of studying Latin literature.” One may note that the “new” HSC Latin Syllabus, first examined in 2001, actually prescribed a published translation for use, and assigned 10% of the internal assessment mark to knowledge of the whole Book in English translation. (Board Bulletin, June 2000 and Latin Continuers Syllabus p. 44) This issue is discussed further below with reference to translation questions in examinations.
• Virgil’s place in Latin literature, or his debt to earlier writers, Greek or Latin,
• Virgil’s role as patriotic or imperialistic poet, or Augustan propagandist,
• The character of the hero, Aeneas,
• General questions on Virgil as master poet, story-teller, (or similar),
• Specific questions on topics like the role of the gods,
• Literary Criticism of a given passage,

When the *Georgics* were prescribed, there were questions on:

• Virgil as didactic poet
• Virgil’s love of nature and the countryside.

**Unseen Translation**

A passage from Virgil was often set. As the century progressed, shorter passages were selected and assistance to candidates increased, in the form of English titles and vocabulary lists. It was very common for the unseen translations to be taken from the same authors as the prescribed texts, and an assumption developed among teachers and students that this was to be the usual practice. Custom became mandate when a new syllabus was produced at the very end of the twentieth century, to be first examined in 2001:

> Section III is designed primarily to assess the students’ understanding of unseen extracts of original text taken from the authors of the works prescribed for study.  

The intention of the syllabus writing team, which included the present writer, was to encourage students to read more from the works of the prescribed authors, with the

---

92 *Latin Continuers Stage 6 Syllabus*, Board of Studies, 2001, p. 46.
incentive of possibly encountering a familiar “unseen” in the examination. In this can be seen an expanded purpose in setting unseen translation: it was to be a means of encouraging more reading as well as a means of testing competence in Latin.

**Translation of extracts from prescribed text**

In every Latin examination at standard level, candidates were required to translate extracts from the prescribed texts. The passages set from Virgil could be as long as 25 lines, as was more common early in the century, or as short as six lines. In the latter case, the practice was to select more than one passage for translation and others again for comment, so testing the candidates’ familiarity with all parts of the prescription.

The assumption behind the translation requirement was, of course, that the candidates were well-prepared and thus able to render any extract accurately into fluent English. Such preparation, if done thoroughly, would have to dominate the teaching time for Latin during the examination year. It usually involved home preparation by the student, oral translation in class with support from the teacher, and finally, the creation of an English version considered to be both stylistically suitable and accurate. If done well, this process was assumed to ensure that the student knew the Book thoroughly, both in terms of its content and of its Latin structures and vocabulary. The fact that this part of the examination was so completely predictable and could be prepared to perfection gave many students a sense of confidence, even if their competence in Latin was quite modest, and even if the translation they studied for the examination could not have been produced by their own efforts.
Nevertheless, despite the predictability of such translation questions, the performance of many candidates was poorer than expected. The Examiners’ Comments on the 1940 Leaving Certificate were particularly biting:

\[
\ldots \text{there were clear traces, in many papers, of translation which were not those of the candidates themselves. These are evils which are likely to persist as long as ‘set books’ are retained in the examination, but the Examiners hope that all teachers will do their best to mitigate them by insisting on grammatical study as the necessary basis of all learning of Latin, by actively discouraging the use of ‘cribs’, and by abstinence from all forms of ‘spoon-feeding’}. 93
\]

The reliance on prepared translation clearly allowed some candidates to gain better results than the examiners thought they deserved. We can observe the following, which must be seen as a reaction on the part of the authorities to this belief:

As from the Leaving Certificate Examination, 1958, candidates seeking a pass in Latin will be required to do satisfactory work in both sections of the paper. This requirement has been reintroduced with special reference to the “unseen” section of the paper . . . The true state of a candidate’s knowledge of the language is more surely revealed in this section than in the “prepared” section (prescribed books) where mere rote learning can gain marks.94

The situation was apparently still bad in 1964, when the Examiners’ Comments again contained a diatribe against poor teaching of the prescribed texts, evidenced by whole groups who mistranslated the same words. “I do wish candidates could be weaned from ‘translatese’” was another lament on the quality.

The poor preparation of prescribed texts and reliance on memorized translations were discussed at length in two Master of Education theses by practising teachers, by D.G. McKinnon in 1963,\textsuperscript{95} and M.E. Kaye in 1968. The latter summed up the problem thus:

\begin{quote}
Without doubt the greatest danger in translation lies in the possibility that pupils may come to think that all that is required for passing an examination is the learning by heart of the version in English. Public or external examinations, in fact, have indirectly influenced this practice.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

It is thus interesting to observe that the quality of prepared translation in examinations seems to have improved significantly by the early 1980s. The Examination Report for 1984 says the prepared translation was “generally well done” and that for 1985 refers to “some excellent responses with flawless and stylish translations”, while remarking that “most candidates handled this section adequately”. Throughout the 1990s the Examination Reports commend the standard of the prepared translations.\textsuperscript{97}

What could account for this remarkable improvement in the quality of candidates’ preparation of the Virgil text? An obvious answer could be the declining numbers for Latin, and the consequent restriction of this subject to the most committed and able sector of the general candidature. It has been observed earlier in this study that the dramatic drop in Latin numbers stabilized in the late 1970s, from which time to the end of the century the number of candidates averaged about 180. The fact that senior Latin came to be available only in “elite” (i.e. government selective and traditional independent)
schools by the 1980s suggests that the subject was now being taught mostly, if not exclusively, to able students by committed teachers in supportive surroundings. It would not be surprising if the general quality of work was high. The preparation of prescribed text, a process requiring steady effort on the part of both student and teacher over a long period, would show the effect of a superior learning environment.

Another strong influence for improved quality could be simply the decrease in the number of lines prescribed for translation. As shown above, the number of lines to be translated and then revised for examination dropped by as much as half. Candidates simply did not have as much translation to learn.

Changes in teaching methods may have had an effect, too. The study by McKinnon in 1963 refers to the then widespread use of “cribs” in preparation. Although generally discouraged by teachers, “cribs” were allowed by some on the grounds of saving time. And indeed the usual procedure for translating the text was very time-consuming, if done properly. Students were required, as home preparation, to look up and list all unknown vocabulary, and then to attempt a “rough” translation of perhaps twenty lines for a lesson. The rough translations were brought to class, where students were called upon in turn to offer an oral rendering of a line or two. During this process, they would amend their rough translations- or, in many cases, change them completely- and later write up a “correct” version to be learned for the examinations. Some teachers might dictate a

---

version, or hand out a “fair copy” to be learned. As coming to class “unprepared” was severely censured, many students would shorten their preparation time by consulting either “cribs” or literary translations.\textsuperscript{99}

During the 1970s attitudes to the use of English translations began to change. Rather than contraband items, they became a learning tool. The first official hint of this new attitude can be seen in the prescriptions for 1977, which contained the following note:

Where only a part of \textit{Aeneid} 4 is prescribed, candidates are expected to be aware both of the structure of the book as a whole and the content of those parts not prescribed for examination.\textsuperscript{100}

Candidates would become “aware” of these requirements by reading an English translation. By 1995 the directive was much more explicit:

It is expected that candidates will be acquainted with the rest of \textit{Aeneid} 10 in translation.\textsuperscript{101}

The acceptance of published translations in the classroom left students free to use these as aids to their own work. Simply reproducing them would be foolishly obvious and, anyway, in most cases they were too “free” to be offered as examination translations. Their function was rather to illuminate the general sense of a passage, and to provide the student with a model of good English style. The use of such translations could very well have the effect of producing fluent examination translations (free from “translatese”), even from students with less detailed knowledge of Latin grammar than had been expected of students thirty years before.

\textsuperscript{99} See a 1940 advertisement for published “cribs” in Appendix 5.
\textsuperscript{100} 1977 edition of \textit{Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.}, NSW Dept of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{101} 1995 Higher School Certificate Examination \textit{Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.} Board of Studies, p. 83.
The improvement in examination translations could also be attributed in part to the widespread adoption of Latin courses based on continuous reading. The publication of the Cambridge Latin Course and of the Scottish Classics Group’s Ecce Romani in the early 1970s changed the approach of students and teachers to continuous text. By the time students were advanced enough to read Virgil, they had read several volumes of prose and even some verse in Latin, assisted generously by vocabulary glosses on the same or facing page. The context was familiar, either because the narrative was continuous or because explanation was supplied in English. The structures of the language were taught alongside the text, with examples drawn from the passage being read.

In Unit 5 of the first edition of the Cambridge Latin Course, a pamphlet entitled Dido et Aeneas offered 255 lines of Aeneid 4. The extracts were linked by short English headings and one long passage of translation (lines 362-392). Most conveniently for the students, the text was printed on the left-hand pages, leaving the right-hand pages for a running vocabulary that contained almost every word in the text, listed in the form in which it appeared:

venis: vena f. vein, life-blood
successit: succedere arrive, enter

A fuller discussion of the Cambridge Latin Course and the Scottish Classics Group publications, as transitional texts for students beginning the reading of Virgil, is included in Chapter 4 of this study. Ecce Romani took the bold step of introducing verse to beginning students in a separate booklet, “Versiculi”, published in 1975. It began with synthetic Latin poems and moved on to Ovid, Phaedrus, Martial and Catullus. The booklet was not widely used, and did not survive beyond the first edition of the Ecce Romani course.
This would not only save the time and effort involved in consulting an alphabetical vocabulary (or dictionary, when the prescribed edition contained no vocabulary list) but also gave the student much more help in identifying inflected forms. More difficult phrases or constructions were translated:

\[ \text{si non pertaesum . . . fuisset} \quad \text{if I had not grown weary . . .} \]

The assumption was not that the student ought to have mastered the language before attempting to read Virgil, but that the reading of Virgil, with help, was an enriching literary experience that would also improve the student’s knowledge of Latin.

The Scottish Classics Group, in its turn, produced a reader to follow the *Ecce Romani* course. Entitled *Ecce Aeneas*,\(^{104}\) it contained 516 lines from the first two Books of the *Aeneid*. The text was printed on the right-hand pages, with explanatory notes on language and allusions on the facing pages. The introduction to the teacher suggests three levels of study:

(a) a very swift translation, skimming over the most difficult Latin by using the glosses provided;
(b) a careful study of the literal translation to see how the idiomatic translation was arrived at; and
(c) an in-depth study, involving figures of speech and a study of the Language Notes.

Students who approached the HSC prescribed text after exposure to either of the courses described above would not expect to have to do the laborious spadework of vocabulary preparation. They would expect to read quite quickly, with the support of easily accessible notes, to grasp the essentials of the narrative. Their aim would be fluent understanding rather than literal correctness. The result could well be a

translation in idiomatic English, rather than the stilted English produced by construing the Latin.

**Short-answer questions on extracts**

The University Senior Public Examination requirements specified “translation from specified books, with questions on language and subject matter.”\(^{105}\) The format of such questions varied, as these examples will show:

- Write short notes on the grammar of the following . . . (1903)
- Translate with brief notes on the words underlined. (1905)
- Translate and comment briefly on
  
  nec non Threicius longa cum veste sacerdos
  obloquitur numeris septem discrimina vocum (1907).

The words “short” and “brief” usually occur in questions of this type, but the expected length is never defined. It was assumed that candidates had been trained in this style of answer, as they were seldom given any specific guidance as to what aspects of an extract –literary, grammatical, cultural or historical – they were expected to comment on.

This type of question was adopted as a regular feature of the Leaving Certificate Latin examination at standard level, as shown below:

- Write brief explanatory notes on each of the following passages. Do not translate. (1922)
- Write short explanatory notes on the words underlined in the following passages. (1932)
- Without translating, write short explanatory notes on . . . (1940).

The Examiners’ Comments on the 1940 paper indicated that, in fact, many candidates did not fully understand what kind of “notes” they were expected to produce:

---

\(^{105}\) *University Manual of Public Examinations* issues of 1903, 1905, 1907.
most candidates confined their attention to the proper names occurring in each passage, regardless of any other matters that required explanation . . . they wrote of Priam and Andromache and Astyanax, but offered no explanation of grammatical or other difficulties, no indication that they really understood the passage. This is no new phenomenon. Year after year it recurs . . .

Evidently the candidates were expected to identify what, in the examiners’ eyes, were regarded as “grammatical or other difficulties”. Presumably the notes in their edition would be a guide.

The standard level paper of 1945 showed a change in format, with more specific questions. Two extracts from Aeneid 2, each of about ten lines, were set for translation, and three unnumbered questions were appended to each extract. One of these will suffice as an example:

ecce, manus iuvenem interea post terga revinctum pastores magno ad regem clamore trahebant Dardanidae, qui se ignotum venientibus ultro, hoc ipsum ut strueret Troiamque aperiret Achivis, obtulerat, fidens animi, atque in utrumque paratus, seu versare dolos, seu certe occumbere morti. undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus circumfusa ruit, certantque inludere capto. accipe nunc Danaum insidias, et crimine ab uno discere omnes.

Comment briefly on the grammar of the underlined words. To whom does this passage refer? Why has it so important a place in the book?

---

107 After the death of F. A. Todd in 1944, A.H. McDonald took over as Chief Examiner in Latin.
Two grammatical “difficulties” were selected, one an example of the “retained accusative”\(^\text{108}\), the other a locative usage. These were followed by a one-word identification of a character (Sinon), followed in turn by a question suggesting a lengthy explanation. The second extract (lines 515-525) was followed by a requirement to scan three lines, identify Hecuba and Priam, and fit the passage into the story of the fall of Troy. It appears that technical knowledge of grammar and scansion was required alongside a very basic knowledge of the content.

In the same examination, the rest of the Virgil section (25%) consisted of three extracts of three or four lines each. Candidates were directed to “write short explanatory notes upon the subject-matter of two of the following passages” (original italics).\(^\text{109}\) It is hard to see what exactly was expected: a paraphrase of the content, a resumé of the context, an explanation of the proper names, a discussion of the significance of the passage in the Book, or all of the above?

The 1947 examination attempted to be much more specific. Two passages (of Georgic 4) for translation made up a separate question, the only appendage being an instruction to scan four lines. There followed the first separate grammatical question to be asked on Virgil since 1903:

Write short grammatical notes on the words underlined:-

(a) quo magis exhaustae fuerint, hoc acrius omnes
    incumbent generis lapsi sar\text{cire} ruinas.

\(^\text{108}\) A favourite of examiners. See further discussion of this feature on page 80 of this study.

\(^\text{109}\) The passages were lines 115-119, 228-231 and 780-782 from Aen. 2.
(b) at fessae multa referunt se nocte minores, 
crura thymo plenae.110

(c) simul alta iubet discedere late 
flumina, qua iuvenis gressus inferret.

This question was followed by a short-answer question of the familiar type:

Answer briefly, without translation, the questions asked below on two of the following passages:

(a) hoc tu iussos asperge sapores, 
trita melisphilla et cerinthae ignobile gramen, 
tinnitus cie et Matris quate cymbala circum.

Why does Virgil speak of Matris cymbala? What is this operation intended to deal with?

(b) nunc age, naturas apibus quas Iuppiter ipse 
addidit, expediam, pro qua mercede canoros 
Curetum sonitus crepantiaque aera secutae 
Dictaeo caeli regem pavere sub antro.

Tell briefly in your own words the legend to which Virgil is here referring.

(c) haec super arvorum cultu pecorumque canebam 
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum 
fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes 
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.

Explain the historical allusions.

The answers to all these questions are found in the notes to Page’s edition of Georgic 4.111

110 Another example of the Greek accusative. See discussion on page 80.
An amended Latin syllabus appeared in 1949, to take effect in the examinations of 1950 and subsequent years. With reference to the Leaving Certificate prescribed books, it stated the following:

The books should be studied, not only from the linguistic standpoint but with attention to matters of Roman history, literature and antiquities arising from the reading of the text. In order to test the interest and knowledge of pupils in such matters, the examination will include general questions based on the set books and on the reading done in the fourth [penultimate] year.

“History, literature and antiquities” continued to dominate the short-answer questions, which continued with little change in style throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Candidates were asked to explain proper names and events and were sometimes required to give an account of the context of the extract. A concept such as pietas would demand a more profound explanation.

The first Higher School Certificate examination in 1967 preserved the same short-answer format in its standard (“Second Level”) paper. Candidates still had to select two out of three extracts and answer the three or four attached questions. The focus of the questions remained familiar: mythological and historical allusions, and knowledge of context. There is a hint of the wish to test candidates’ general understanding of the ideas in the text (Georgic 1) in this question:

What kind of help had Virgil in mind when he used the word succurrere?

---

111 pp. 29, 42 and 80 of the “Macmillan Blue” edition of Elementary Classics, first published in 1897.
112 Education Gazette, 1st August, 1949, pp. 300-1.
116 Geo. 1.500.
The most significant change in format occurred in 1976, when, for the first time, translation and comment questions were fully integrated. The nature of some of the questions reflected new emphases in the teaching of Latin literature, as illustrated by the examples given below. The format was defined in the “Special Subject Rules” circulated to schools for the 1976 Higher School Certificate Examination. All three levels, higher (3 Unit), standard (2 Unit) and modified (2 Unit A) were issued the same directive:

Not more than six extracts from the verse author prescribed for study, with questions for comment on each, including scansion, and some translation.

The 1977 examination questions on *Aeneid* 4 followed the new format. At the modified level the extracts were generally shorter (3-6 lines) and the questions related to factual references and context. Two of the six passages were to be translated. At standard level the questions required knowledge of context, language, style, mood and allusions. Two of the six extracts were to be translated. Some questions required literary analysis:

How is the above simile appropriate to Dido?

How do the sounds in these lines help to convey the appropriate atmosphere?

and some required interpretation and personal response:

Contrast the mood of this scene with that of the events which follow immediately upon it.

What does this passage reveal about the character and feeling of the speaker?
The higher level examination set out slightly longer (5-8 lines) extracts, two of which had to be translated. Many of the questions were broad rather than specific, and allowed candidates to answer quite expansively:

Comment on Virgil’s descriptive style in this passage.

Referring to the theme of the *Aeneid* as a whole, comment on the importance of these lines.

Comment on the effectiveness of this simile in its context.

None of the questions quoted could be answered by memorizing the notes in any of the recommended editions.\(^{117}\) It is indicative of the change in emphasis that a new reading list was issued for the 1977 prescribed books, which included eight critical works on Virgil, such as Brooks Otis’ *Virgil-a study in civilized poetry* (1964) and Michael Putnam’s *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (1965).\(^{118}\)

The three levels of Latin examinations were very clearly distinguished by the practice of setting parallel papers in which the Virgil questions required three distinct levels of sophistication. Overall there was less emphasis on translation, which no longer occupied a separate section of the examination. Except for the modified level, questions on Virgil were directed at literary appreciation rather than at factual responses.

Only three years later, however, this threefold distinction was dropped when, in 1979, identical questions were asked on the prescribed texts for both the standard and the higher

---

\(^{117}\) Gould and Whiteley (1943), Austin (1955), Page (1894). The examination text was to be that of Williams (1972).

\(^{118}\) *1977 Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.*, NSW Dept. of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, p. 22.
levels. The Virgil questions (on *Aen.* 2) related to context, identification of characters, grammar (particularly tenses of verbs) and one example of figurative language. Many of the questions were simplistic:

Who is *ille*?
By whom are these words spoken?

The standard of questioning was not markedly different in the modified level paper, although different extracts were selected:

Describe what later happened to Laocoon.
Comment on the sound effects in these lines.
Who was Sinon and why is he remembered here?

Since there were now common questions for both standard and higher levels, the higher level candidates were meant to be challenged by their Second Paper, which included questions on the additional lines of *Aeneid* 2 prescribed for this level only. The questions in the 1979 Second Paper, however, do not seem particularly taxing:

Who is speaking, and to whom?
Under what circumstances does Venus say these words to Aeneas?

No questions were asked on literary features, interpretation, language or metre. No translation was required.

Literary features, however, did appear in the Virgil section of the common questions in 1982. While there were several questions requiring explanation of events, there were two on similes, e.g:

How appropriate is the comparison expressed by the simile?
In 1983 the setting of common questions for standard and higher levels was formalised when the First Paper for higher level and the standard level paper became a Common Paper for both groups. While most of the Virgil questions in 1983 (Aen 4) were simplistic, there was a gradation of difficulty, and the last question (on lines 441-449) contained the following:

(i) ‘lacrimae volvuntur inanes’. Why are these words left ambiguous?
(ii) How is the simile in the first six lines appropriate to Aeneas, and how does it contribute to the pathos of the situation?

Higher level candidates were required to sit an Additional Paper, in which short-answer questions were set on the extra lines of Virgil prescribed. In the 1983 Additional Paper there was one question which required more than a brief factual answer:

Show how Virgil employs stylistic and metrical devices to reinforce his meaning.

From 1984, the questions on Virgil became more challenging. One obvious change was in the length of the extracts chosen: in 1979 the average length was 4.6 lines; in 1984 the length varied from five to seven lines; in 1988 the average length was just over seven lines; in 1990 the average was 10. The questions too became more substantial:

What attitude to the gods is revealed in these lines? (1984 – Aeneid 2.424-30)
What rhetorical figure does Virgil use in the last two lines, and what is its effect? (1984 – Aeneid 2.429-30)
Why is Brutus described as infelix? (1988 – Aeneid 6.822)
Briefly discuss Virgil’s use of language in the first two lines to set the scene for Aeneas’ account (1990 – Aeneid 2.1-8)
Examine Virgil’s technique in representing the anxiety and grief of Mezentius. (1994 – Aeneid 10.838-45)
With reference to both passages, discuss the concept of ‘pietas’ for both Aeneas and Turnus. (1997
—Aeneid 12. 930-7 and 945-91)

By the closing years of the century, the short-answer “comment” question had evolved into a test of the candidate’s ability to analyse, interpret and respond to the text with far greater sophistication and depth than had ever been required before. Translation of the set text, while still examined, was not presented as a separate section. The Examination Reports for the years 1992-1996 indicate that the standard of translations was generally good, but that the literary analysis questions proved difficult for many candidates.

Questions on scansion and metre

Throughout the century questions on metre or “scansion” featured every year in all examination papers on Virgil.

The University Senior Public Examination required scansion only in its higher level Latin papers; the requirement was not confined to the dactylic hexameter, even when the prescribed verse text was Virgil. The 1905 higher paper contained the instruction:

Scan the following lines, with any comments you think called for:

The “following lines” comprised two from the prescribed text and two (unexplained) elegiac couplets. This style of question continued unchanged during the lifetime of the Senior Public Examination. The nature of the “comments” can only be a subject for speculation. It is clear, however, that metrical knowledge was considered a worthwhile
requirement in its own right, rather than as a means to an appreciation of the particular
text being read, since elegiac couplets featured regularly in examinations on Virgil.

Questions on scansion continued to be asked in the Leaving Certificate papers, at first
only at the higher (Honours) level. The 1922 paper simply directed candidates to “scan,
without comment, the seven lines of Question 3(a)” [*Aeneid* 6.847ff]. More
expansiveness was somewhat grudgingly encouraged in 1924:

Scan the following lines, with remark if needed.

The instruction was more positively expressed in 1926:

Scan the following lines, noting any peculiarities.

and expanded in 1930:

Scan the following lines, noting any peculiarities of metre that you may observe.

It would appear from all the questions quoted so far that the only comments candidates
were expected to make were those relating to unusual features of prosody. There was no
requirement to relate Virgil’s use of metre to his subject-matter.

In 1931 there was a change in the examination requirements. While the higher (Honours)
paper could include “questions on metre”, it was now expressly stated that standard level
(Pass) candidates would be tested on scansion.

In the Pass paper questions on scansion will be set. Knowledge of the following metres will be
required: (1) Dactylic hexameter; (2) Elegiac couplet; (3) Sapphic; (4) Alcaic; (5) Asclepiads.

Examples of the last three of these will be set only if they occur in the prescribed author.\(^{119}\)

Candidates studying Virgil, therefore, were required to know both the dactylic hexameter,
as one would expect, and the elegiac couplet, which they could be presumed to have

---

\(^{119}\) *Courses of Study for High Schools, Secondary Schools etc.*, 11\(^{th}\) ed. 1929, Dept of Ed., p. 42.
encountered in their earlier reading. There was clearly little connection, in terms of the examination, between knowledge of scansion and interpretation of the literature being read, but these were treated as discrete tasks.

Perhaps to emphasize the inclusion of scansion at standard level, the 1932 paper contained a very explicit question:

Scan the following lines, taking care to mark in each the chief caesura and the correct quantity of the last syllable.

By 1934, however, the question had dwindled:

Scan, without comment, the following lines. (Original italics).

Higher level candidates that year were required to scan the first four lines of their unseen, a passage in elegiac couplets.

In the year 1938, the Examiners made a second attempt to offer to higher level candidates a question that had made its first appearance in the previous year. While standard level candidates were still required to “scan, without comment”, the Honours students of that year were offered an unusual choice:

5. Write out from memory twelve lines of classical Latin poetry

OR

Scan, with brief comment on any peculiarity of the verse, the following Vergilian hexameters:

(6 lines).

The offering of these questions as alternatives suggests that the Examiners regarded both tasks as relating to the same skill, that of correct recitation of poetry. This impression is strengthened by the Examiners’ Comments on the 1938 examinations, which are worth quoting at length, as they give evidence of an emphasis on the importance of metrical
knowledge in increasing comprehension and appreciation of Latin poetry. In this view, scansion was not solely a mechanical exercise, as this complaint on the standard of the higher level unseen translation made clear:

. . . the neglect of quantity is a fruitful source of error in the “unseen” translation of Latin verse; far worse, it means that teachers are not training the ears of their pupils to an appreciation of the sound and rhythms of verse.120

This is the first directive of this kind to teachers. The conviction that aural appreciation of Latin verse was essential appears to have prompted the setting of the memorization question.121 The furore that this question evidently aroused when it first appeared in the 1937 paper caused the Examiners to defend its inclusion in 1938:

In 1937, when for the first time candidates were asked to quote from memory a few lines of Latin poetry, very few could make the attempt. One official (but anonymous) critic of the paper said that this would be an excellent type of question if notice were given – the idea being, apparently, that nothing should be taught or asked which is not set down in a printed syllabus. This seems to be a suitable place in which to protest against so illiberal a view of the teacher’s function, and against what had evidently been the almost universal neglect of one of the most valuable aids to the appreciation of Latin poetry.122

The Examiners went on to complain that candidates in 1938, forewarned of this memorization question, showed “evidence of special ‘cram’ for the question”!

121 The Knibbs-Turner Report (1904) had made unfavourable comparison of local students with those in Germany with regard to this very practice: “At the schools of this State less is learnt by heart; at many of them practically none at all . . . One of the results of this is . . . that . . . students rarely read a passage of Latin, whether prose or verse, intelligently. Not only do they read the text before them as though it were a string of words having no connection with one another . . . but false quantities are by no means rare, and but few scan the simplest of metres with any certainty.” (Interim Report, Chapter III, p. 29.)
On the alternative question, the scansion, the Examiners’ Comments demonstrated their very high expectations of the candidates, none of whom obtained full marks, “though some scanned all the lines correctly”. In addition to showing a correct understanding of elision and caesura, candidates were expected to remark on the Greek quadrisyllable *elephanto* at the end of one line, the clash of ictus and accent and preponderance of spondees in another line, and to observe the effectiveness of metrical effects “in the context”- although no context existed as the lines were a random selection\(^\text{123}\) chosen for their metrical features. To present these lines, rather than an extract from the prescribed Book (*Aen* 6), surely did not test whether candidates had been trained in the sounds and appreciation of the verse they had read!

The prescribed text for 1942 departed from the usual custom, in that it was an anthology, *Four Latin Authors*, by E.C. Kennedy, published in 1940, and thus a novelty at the time. Candidates were required to study the Virgil extracts, comprising 450 lines taken from *Aeneid* 9 and *Georgics* 4. Kennedy included a chapter entitled “Hints on Scansion”, the opening sentence to which is worth quoting:

> The reason why you should be able to ‘scan’ a line, i.e. mark the long and short syllables, is partly to know what the poet is trying to do, and partly because some words e.g. the nom. and abl. sing. of the 1st decl., can sometimes only be distinguished by the metre.

Nowhere in this book does Kennedy discuss the relationship of scansion to “what the poet is trying to do”. His notes on the Virgil contain three references to metre, in regard to the irregularities found in *Aen* 9.196 and in *Geo* 4.461 and 463.

---

\(^{123}\) *Geo.*3.26; *Geo.* 3.242-3; *Geo.* 4.270; *Aen.* 1.117-8.
In 1945 for the first time, the higher level paper offered candidates an opportunity to show their knowledge if they had made a special study of the hexameter. In the essay section (worth 40%) in which candidates had to answer three of the available questions, Question 3 presented three extracts from Latin poetry, one from Ennius, one from Catullus, and one from the prescribed Book of Virgil (Aen.2). This last extract was to be scanned. The candidates then had to comply with the following instruction:

Comparing the versification of the three passages, write an appreciation of Vergil’s use of the hexameter.

Not surprisingly, this question proved too hard. The Examiners’ Report, while uncomplimentary about the standard of answers, yet defended the setting of such challenging questions:

Q3 on comparative versification was badly done. Many who attempted it did not even scan the lines in (c) correctly, and most did not read the other passages carefully enough to notice the obvious metrical differences. In an Honours paper the examiner aims at testing the candidate’s genuine ability and promise: he will therefore ask questions which do not encourage “set answers” prepared by teachers.124

In contrast, the Honours paper of 1947 offered no question at all on metre. The Examiners’ Comment on the scansion in the standard level paper was not complimentary:

The scansion was, on the whole, badly done . . . It is felt that pupils do not read Latin aloud; if all pupils had to read a few lines aloud in class, they would quickly pick up the rhythm of the metre.125

---

124 Examiners’ Reports, 1945, p. cxvi.
125 Education Gazette, 1st April, 1948, p.132.
Here we find a reiteration of the connection between reading aloud and the exercise of scansion, making it clear that in many cases scansion was being practised only as a mechanical exercise on paper.

The 1949 Amended Latin Syllabus\textsuperscript{126} made a strong statement about pronunciation and oral reading in the second paragraph of its “Course for First, Second and Third Years”:

> From the beginning attention should be given to pronunciation, quantity and accent. The teacher should make a habit of reading the Latin text to the class and of giving the pupils practice in reading aloud. When Latin verse is read, there should be instruction and training in scansion.

No such general directive appears for the senior years of school, but the Honours (higher) course was to include “the study of metre and Roman literature broadly defined” (original italics). This rather vague requirement may have prompted this 1955 higher level essay question:

> “Wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man” (Tennyson). Discuss this judgement on Virgil.

The Honours candidates of 1957 were asked more directly:

> Discuss and illustrate Virgil’s mastery of the Latin hexameter.

This type of question became routine:

> Discuss and illustrate with quotations Virgil’s use of the hexameter. (1958)
> Discuss and illustrate Virgil’s use of the hexameter. (1961)
> Discuss and illustrate Virgil’s mastery of the Latin hexameter. (1964)

As these questions did not specify illustrations from the prescribed text, it would be easy for candidates to prepare such essays, using example and general statements taken from

\textsuperscript{126} Education Gazette, 1\textsuperscript{st} August, 1949, p. 300.
handbooks such as those of J. Wight Duff\textsuperscript{127} and Mackail,\textsuperscript{128} both of which were listed as suggested reference books in the 1949 Amended Syllabus.

Meanwhile, standard level candidates in the 1950s and 1960s were still required to scan two lines of their prescribed text in each examination. They were not asked to comment on these lines. Their performance appeared to be poor. The 1964 Examiners’ Comment on the scansion remarked trenchantly on the general lack of emphasis on this skill:

As usual very bad. In some centres not even attempted by candidates, surely not indicating that it had not been taught?

Although it was not customary at that time to show mark-values for individual questions on the examination paper, it would not be hard for students and teachers to realize that the scansion of two lines must be worth so few marks that it was hardly worth spending the necessary class time to master the technique. A practising teacher of the time, D. McKinnon, wrote critically:

Too often the approach of teachers to prosody seems to be purely mechanical.\textsuperscript{129}

Higher level candidates could easily avoid the essay questions on metre if they were unprepared in this area.

The introduction of the Higher School Certificate changed little. Candidates in the standard and modified courses were still required to scan two lines from the prescribed text in the examination, although in theory metrical knowledge was an integral part of

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age}, 1st ed. 1909, e.g. p. 349.

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Latin Literature}, 1895, e.g. p. 102.

literary study. The prescription of texts in 1971, 1973 and 1975 included a directive to teachers on aspects of Virgil to be studied. While the topics included varied slightly, the injunction to pay attention to “Virgil’s poetic art and hexameter technique” remained constant through this period. In reality not enough attention was paid to please the Examiners, whose 1971 report remarked:

The scansion was, on the whole, appallingly badly done.

A new HSC Latin Syllabus, approved in 1974, to take effect in the examinations of 1976, made no reference to the study of metre or scansion. It did, however, include the following:

Throughout the courses attention must be given to correct pronunciation in the reading aloud of Latin, a practice which is essential for the full appreciation of literary effects.

The pamphlet issued to accompany this Syllabus, entitled “Recommended Reading and Reference Material”, listed two books on Latin metre. This was the first appearance of specialist works on metre in any such reading list for teachers.

The examination format adopted in 1976, as described earlier in this study, presented six extracts from each prescribed text for either translation, or comment, or both. The practice of selecting two lines to be scanned continued, but a differentiation of levels can be noted. While standard level candidates in 1977 were told to “scan the lines marked *

---

131 Latin Syllabus, (3 Unit, 2 Unit and 2 Unit A courses), NSW Dept. of Education for the Board of Senior School Studies, 1974.
and name the metre”, higher level candidates were required to “comment on any unusual metrical features.”

In 1979, when the same questions on prescribed books were set for both standard and higher levels, the scansion question reverted to basics:

Scan the first two lines, marking the caesura, and name the metre.

A question like this became usual in the Common Paper for standard and higher levels, and it continued to attract censure in the Examiners’ Reports. Higher level candidates were sometimes given the opportunity to apply their knowledge of metre, as in this question in the 1983 Additional Paper:

Show how Virgil employs stylistic and metrical devices to reinforce his meaning.

In the same year, the Common Paper required candidates to scan, and comment “on any unusual metrical feature” of, a line containing hiatus:

quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur? (Aeneid 4.235)

A very detailed discussion on this point is offered by Austin.

The 1986 standard paper for the first time related the scansion exercise to the expression of “mood” in the extract (Aen. 12.18-25):

What is the mood of Latinus as he speaks?

Scan the line (18).

What metrical feature of this line reflects this mood of Latinus?

---

133 Presumably on the preponderance of spondees in the lines selected: Aen. 4.404-5.
134 e.g. 1984: “The scansion caused difficulties. . .”
No comments were required in the scansion questions of 1987 and 1988, but in 1989 the following appeared:

Scan lines 868 and 869 and comment on the appropriateness of the rhythm. *(Aen. 6)*.

The 1989 Examination Report, after saying that the scansion was “handled better this year”, took the unprecedented step of offering advice to candidates on how to approach such a question on “rhythm”, since “the second half of the . . question was omitted by at least 30% of candidates”:

i) state what type of rhythm it was e.g. spondaic

ii) state what the effect of the use of the rhythm was e.g. to express sadness, sombreness, solemnity

iii) state what the occasion was which was being described e.g. a funeral, the grief of the Roman nation at the death of Marcellus.  

This is the first instruction from any official source on how connections could be drawn from the practice of scansion to the content of the passage. But if candidates had now been encouraged to pay serious attention to this aspect of poetry, they would have been disappointed in the 1990 paper, which simply demanded:

Scan line 202. *(Aeneid  2)*

If they were particularly perceptive candidates, however, they might have applied their knowledge of metre in the next question, which read:

By using one example from the above passage explain how Virgil uses sound to reinforce sense.

Otherwise the questions on scansion remained at a very basic level each year, in spite of the sentiments expressed in the 1992 Syllabus for Latin which encouraged the teaching

---

136 published 1990, by the Board of Secondary Education, pp. 5-6.
of “the use of metre to reinforce ideas expressed in the language.” 138 The latter directive was at last heeded in the Common Paper of 1999:

2 (e)ii. Scan line 822. (Aen 12)

iii. How does the metre contribute to the meaning of the first four lines (819-822)?

In summary, it can be observed that, for the whole century, candidates reading Virgil as prescribed text were required to demonstrate knowledge of the dactylic hexameter by scanning a small amount (usually two lines) of the text. From time to time they were required to “comment” on the lines they had scanned. In earlier years this requirement seemed to test their ability to identify unusual metrical features whereas only since 1989 was there any attempt to encourage students to relate the use of metre to the content or the effectiveness of the poetry. In 1999, for the first time, students were asked directly about the contribution of the metre to the meaning.

Essay questions on the hexameter were regularly set for higher level candidates in the 1950s and 1960s, but were so general in nature that candidates could prepare an all-purpose essay on this topic, regardless of the Book studied in a particular year.

This discussion of the place of scansion in the teaching of Virgil would be incomplete without acknowledging the influence, in 1997, of an audiotape of the prescribed portions of Aeneid 12, read by senior school students under the direction of David Raeburn. 139 Side Two of this tape contained an introduction by Raeburn himself on “Virgil’s metrical

138 Syllabus Years 11-12, 2/3 unit Latin, Board of Studies, NSW, 1992, p. 17.
139 “The Sound of Virgil”, read by students from North Sydney Boys and Sydney Girls High Schools, recorded at the Performing Arts Unit, NSW Dept of Education, 1997, and marketed by the schools involved.
technique and artistic use of sound in poetry”. In this lecture Raeburn explains the structure of the hexameter while emphasizing the ways in which the technical aspects relate to Virgil’s meaning. Students were urged not to treat scansion as a “mathematical exercise” but to practise oral reading to focus on the enhancement of the poetry by means of metrical techniques. Raeburn included not only dactyls, spondees, caesura and elision (all traditionally required for examinations) but also discussed the relationship between stress accent and metrical pulse (ictus) to produce either a sense of “unimpeded advance” or a sense of “conflict”. The use of enjambment was explained and sound-effects such as alliteration and assonance, while not metrical, were also identified as part of the aural impact of the verse.

This tape was purchased by nearly all the schools with candidates for HSC Latin and by a considerable number of individual students. It certainly raised the level of general awareness of the importance of metrical study as a means of appreciating the poetry. It provided a model for students in oral recitation of Virgil. The examination of 1999 reflected this increased interest in an approach to the study of Virgil that had been encouraged by the Examiners of 1938 and reinforced by those of 1949, but not incorporated as a significant feature in the teaching and examining of Virgil until the close of the century. The 2000 Common Paper reinforced this approach to the study of Virgil’s metre with this question on Aeneid 12:

140 The first impression of 100 tapes sold out within weeks.
141 The “new” HSC, first examined in 2001, expected candidates to apply their metrical knowledge to the appreciation of Virgil’s poetry.
Questions on grammar in the Virgil text

Questions on grammar in Virgil fall into two distinct types, separated in time as well as in purpose. The first type of question, which appeared in 1903 and then in the 1940s, asked candidates to explain points of grammar considered unusual or peculiar to Virgil’s poetry. The second type of grammar question, which became a regular part of the standard level Latin examination in the last decade of the century, required candidates to explain or identify points of accidence and syntax in the text. As the focus of Latin teaching had shifted from composing to reading Latin text, this type of grammar question was developed as an alternative to prose composition to maintain the teaching of Latin grammar, and to ensure that candidates understood the structure of the text they were reading.

The 1903 Senior Public Examination asked candidates this question:

Write short notes on the grammar of the following:

Aeneas maesto defixus lumina vultu

ingreditur.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{142} Aeneid. 6.156-7.
T.E. Page’s commentary\(^{143}\) directs the reader to his Appendix, in which the phrase *maesto defixus lumina vultu* is listed among 26 examples in which “the participle is really used as a middle form and directly governs the accusative.”\(^{144}\) He seems to be differing from the accepted explanation of such expressions as “accusative of respect”, as he states in the first sentence of this Appendix. Page’s contemporary, J.B. Allen, also calls such examples “not Accusatives of Respect, but . . . the Direct Object of the Verb or Participle, which is to be regarded either as retaining its Transitive force in the Passive Voice, or as being Reflexive”.\(^{145}\) This type of expression was evidently considered a point for discussion at the time, and candidates were being asked to demonstrate familiarity with this point of grammatical interest. Grammar questions on Virgil were not otherwise a regular part of the examinations at this period.

The next appearance of specific grammatical questions on Virgil was in 1945, when a change to the format of the standard level paper allowed this question to be appended to one of the translation passages:

Comment briefly on the grammar of the underlined words.

The passage was *Aeneid* 2.57-66, and the two underlined words were *revinctum* (57) and *animi* (61). The former was an example of the passive participle with the accusative *manus*, and the latter is explained as a “locative” by Page.\(^{146}\) It is not clear whether candidates were expected to discuss different views of these points of grammar.

---


\(^{144}\) p. 505.


\(^{146}\) Page, *Aeneid* I-VI, p. 212. Austin (ed. *Aeneid* 2, Oxford, 1964) says the former is a “true accusative of respect” after a passive participle, . . . and calls *animi* in the latter example “more probably a true genitive of reference”. S.J. Harrison, in his 1991 edition of *Aeneid* X (Oxford), discusses the ‘Greek accusative’ in an Appendix (pp. 290ff.) and differentiates between four types of usage.
The 1947 standard level paper on *Georgic* 4 continued the practice of asking for grammatical explanations, this time on separate passages, quoted earlier in this study.^{147}

Write short grammatical notes on the words underlined.

The words selected were *sarcire* (249), *crura* (181) and *inferret* (360). The first exemplified the infinitive after *incumbent*, a construction not usual in prose; the second is described in Page’s note as “accusative of respect”; the third is subjunctive in a clause of purpose introduced by *qua* instead of the more common *ut*.

Thus far, the grammatical questions appear to test the candidates’ ability to notice and explain constructions not commonly used in prose: in other words, constructions not to be imitated in prose compositions. With the exception of *inferret* above, all the examples are of this nature.

The introduction of the Higher School Certificate produced a short-lived interest in grammar questions in 1968, the second year of that examination. Standard level candidates were asked:

Comment on the grammatical structure of the phrases *per has ego te lacrimas* and *qui te cunque manent*

This question singles out two examples of peculiarly Virgilian structure: namely, a petitionary formula and an occurrence of tmesis. In contrast to this specialised question, the higher level candidates were asked the following rather oddly phrased question:

---

^{147} See discussion on short-answer questions, p. 59ff. above.
Explain the syntax of the following verbs: *audiat, averet, effundat.* *(Aeneid 12.200-211)*

In 1979 candidates at both standard and higher levels were asked two grammatical questions on Virgil passages:

- Explain the mood of *impulerat.* *(Aeneid 2.55)*
- Comment on the use of the imperfect tense in the verbs *solebat* and *trahebat* *(Aeneid 2.456-7).*

Both questions tested the candidates’ sensitivity to shades of meaning expressed by variation in tense, and indicated an important component of their skills in literary appreciation. Such questions were different in purpose from questions on grammatical peculiarities or those requiring candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of Latin constructions. The Examination Committee Report remarked:

> Terms like *mood, voice, tense* need to be known . . . What was required was a comment on the vivid use of the indicative in *impulerat* . . .

Grammatical questions on Virgil do not appear in examinations again until 1983, when changes in the teaching and examining of Latin revived such questions, albeit with a different purpose. From 1976, probably to reflect the new emphases in Latin teaching, prose composition was no longer compulsory in Latin examinations at any level. As an alternative, candidates were offered an additional unseen translation in both the standard and higher papers.\(^{148}\) When, in 1983, a Common Paper for both these levels was introduced, the alternative to the prose composition was no longer an unseen translation, but a passage from one of the prescribed texts with questions requiring “detailed

---

\(^{148}\) 1976 Special Subject Rules – Latin.
understanding of the structure and content".\textsuperscript{149} These were grammar questions, designed to ensure that candidates who did not do prose composition were still obliged to pay attention to Latin accidence and syntax.

The 1983 Common Paper presented an extract from \textit{Aeneid} 4, with ten grammatical questions:

heu quid agat? quo nunc reginam ambire furentem  
audeat adfatu? quae prima exordia sumat?  
atque animum nunc hue celerem nunc dividit illuc  
in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat.  
haec \textit{alternantipotior} sententia visa est:  
\textit{Mnesthea} Sergestumque vocat fortemque Serestum,  
classem \textit{aptent} taicit sociosque ad litora \textit{cogant},  
arma \textit{parent} et quae rebus sit causa \textit{novandis}  
\textit{dissimulent} sese interea, quando optima Dido  
\textit{nesciat} et tantos \textit{rumpi} non speret amores,  
\textit{temptaturum} aditus et quae mollissima fandi  
tempora, quis rebus dexter modus. ocius omnes  
\textit{imperio} laeti parent \textit{et iussa} facessunt.

(i) What use of the subjunctive is \textit{agat}?  
(ii) Give the case and gender of \textit{quae}. What would be the corresponding singular form?  
(iii) What case is \textit{alternanti}?  
(iv) Explain the form of \textit{Mnesthea}.  
(v) What mood are \textit{aptent}, \textit{cogant}, \textit{parent} and \textit{dissimulent} and why?  
(vi) What part of the verb is \textit{novandis}?

\textsuperscript{149} 1983 Special Subject Rules – Latin.
(vii) Why is nesciat subjunctive?
(viii) What part of the verb is rumpi and why is this part of the verb used here?
(ix) What case is imperio and why?
(x) From what verb does iussa come?

All these questions were designed to find out whether candidates understood the language of the passage and could explain the use of inflected forms to convey the meaning. Only one manipulation question was included, (ii), and that example would indicate whether the candidates realized that exordia was a neuter plural form.

From 1989, the prose composition was removed from the Common Paper and was offered only to higher level candidates in their Additional Paper. Nonetheless, the grammar questions remained as a regular feature of the Common Paper. The aim of the section was now to test whether candidates understood the Latin constructions in their set texts, in other words, to show that they had not merely memorized a translation. There remained, however, a vestige of the tradition of prose composition: candidates were also, increasingly, asked to manipulate inflected forms of words, a skill that had no bearing on their comprehension of the Latin text they were reading. After 1983 and until 1991, grammatical questions were asked only on extracts from the prescribed prose text.

The Latin Syllabus issued in 1992 gave the following as one of the “Skills Outcomes”:

(Students will be able to)

- analyse the grammatical features of the texts read
- manipulate the features of accidence and syntax in the texts being read and as prescribed in the syllabus.150

150 Syllabus Years 11-12, Latin 2/3 unit, Board of Studies, 1992, p. 8.
Perhaps the word “texts” in the above suggested that the grammar questions should be asked on the standard level verse text as well; in any event, the 1992 Common Paper contained grammar questions on each text, a format that persisted until 1995. The 1992 grammar questions on Virgil were:

\[
\text{tum rex Euandrus Romanae conditor arcis:}
\]

\[
\text{‘haec nemora indigenae Fauni Nymphaeque tenebant}
\]

\[
gensque virum truncis et duro robose nata,
\]

\[
\text{quis neque mos neque cultus erat, nec iungere tauros}
\]

\[
\text{aut componere opes norant aut parcer parto,}
\]

\[
\text{sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat. (Aeneid 8.313-8)}
\]

(i) conditor: why is this noun nominative?
(ii) arcis: identify the gender of this noun.
(iii) nemora: identify the case of this noun.
(iv) virum: how else might this noun be written?
(v) robose: why is this noun in the ablative case?
(vi) quis: identify the case of this pronoun.
(vii) iungere: identify the form of the verb.
(viii) norant: write this word in its uncontracted form.
(ix) atque: which two words does this conjunction join?
(x) alebat: give the equivalent subjunctive form.

Of the ten questions, four asked for the identification of a form (gender, case etc.). The only possible difficulty lay in the word quis, a less familiar form of quibus. A translation of quis . . . erat as “who had . . .”, while acceptable, might mislead some candidates into giving the wrong case for quis. Two questions (iv and viii) required candidates to rewrite words in their uncontracted forms; two others (i and v) asked candidates to demonstrate knowledge of some functions of the cases. Question ix tested the candidates’
understanding of a line which is unlike English in its use of a singular verb with a double subject. The last question (x) simply tested the candidates’ knowledge of Latin verb forms and revealed nothing about their understanding of the Virgil.

Here we observe the combination of dissimilar questions: those that tested candidates’ ability to analyse the Virgil text and those that required them to produce forms Virgil had not written. Similar questions appeared again in the 1993 standard level paper. Of the eleven questions, five required manipulation of a word from the Virgil extract, two required grammatical labelling of words, three asked for explanations of ablative usage, and one asked for evidence from the text to show the person of a relative pronoun. Again there seems to be a conflation of aims in this exercise.

This format appeared twice more, in 1994 and 1995. The 1994 questions selected eleven words from the Virgil extract: four verbs to be rewritten in a different tense, four verb forms from the text to be “explained”, and three cases to be identified. In 1995 the Virgil extract was longer (10 lines as compared to 6-7), while the number of questions fell to seven. Of these, three required the production of Latin forms that did not appear in the passage (including the “principal parts” of one verb); two asked for cases to be identified and explained; two asked candidates to identify the agreement of adjectives.

From 1996 to the end of the century, prose composition was re-assigned to the standard level (Common) paper.151 Again, grammatical questions were offered as an alternative to

---

the prose composition, but the practice of asking these questions on the verse text was usually continued, indicating that the implied connection between the skill of prose composition and that of analysis of a (prose) text was no longer assumed.

In 1996, ten questions were appended to a Virgil extract, five of them requiring explanation of cases etc. and the other five requiring manipulation of words from the passage. In 1997, a prose extract only was selected for this question, and in 1998 a verse extract only: seventeen lines from the opening of *Aeneid* 12, to which 19 questions were appended. Only four required manipulation of words; the rest asked for identification of forms and parts of speech, and sometimes also for explanations. A few examples will suffice:

pectus: What is the case of this noun? Why is this case used here? (accusative of respect)

coniunx: What is the case of this word? Why is this case used here? (nominative, complement of Lavinia)

These questions indicate a stronger unity of purpose: to test the candidates’ ability to explain how the Latin words are used to construct the sense of the passage. The manipulation questions – still required by the 1992 Syllabus – seem gratuitous: e.g.:

implacabilis: Give the equivalent superlative degree of this adjective

No superlative of this adjective is attested!

Manipulation questions were not asked in 1999 or 2000. In both these examinations, candidates were asked to pick out the nouns with which five listed adjectives agreed.
This exercise addressed one of the most common difficulties faced by students in translating verse, and could be considered a valuable training process. The 1999 candidates were, in addition, asked to pick out examples of the following:

- a verb in the pluperfect tense
- a present participle
- an imperative
- a future participle
- an adverb.

Such a question, asked of Higher School Certificate candidates reading Virgil, betrays a belief that, at the end of the twentieth century, Latin students needed to be tested in their knowledge of the most basic grammatical terms. In 2000, likewise, candidates were asked to identify forms, such as cases, tenses and moods, but were not asked to explain their use.

In summary, most grammatical questions on Virgil which appeared before 1983 focussed on peculiarities of syntax, such as those rarely found in prose. The grammatical questions from 1983 on were designed first to maintain the teaching of Latin grammar in the absence of compulsory prose composition and secondly to ensure that candidates understood the construction of the Latin text of Virgil and were not reliant solely on a memorized translation.

**Essay questions**

The writing of a formal essay on the prescribed books was, for most of the century, a requirement of the higher level papers. There were periods, however, when (shorter)
essays were required at standard level as well: 1951 to 1975 (one essay on either prescribed text or on a more general topic) and 1993 to 1995 (two essays, one on each prescribed text). Except for the years 1993 to 1995, there were no formal essay questions on Virgil after 1989, as the higher level course from 1990 featured another author for study and no longer included the study of Virgil in its examination.

The requirements of the Leaving Certificate were originally expressed in very general terms:

The Honours Paper in Latin . . . may also include questions on Metre and on Roman History, Literature and Private and Public Antiquities . . . (with) special reference to the Latin texts prescribed for the examination.  

The Amended Syllabus for 1950 stated:

The books should be studied not only from the linguistic standpoint but with attention to matters of Roman history, literature and antiquities arising from the reading of the text . . . The Honours Course will include . . . the study of metre and Roman literature *broadly defined* . . .

It was not the practice to issue specific advice relating to particular prescribed texts. With the introduction of the Higher School Certificate, however, a significant change in approach can be observed:

---


153 *Education Gazette*, 1st August, 1949, p. 301.
Candidates should pay particular attention to . . . the nature of Roman didactic poetry and the Roman attitude thereto, Virgil’s poetic art and hexameter technique and the Roman interest in agriculture.  

The prescribed texts for the first HSC in 1967 were *Georgics* 1, and, for higher level candidates, selections from Lucretius. The following year, when *Aeneid* 12, supplemented by Catullus 64, was prescribed, the accompanying advice read as follows:

Candidates should pay particular attention to such topics as the tradition of Roman epic, the influence of the Alexandrian Greek poets on their Latin imitators, Virgil’s poetic art and hexameter technique, and his place as the poet of imperial Rome. Candidates should also consider Book XII of the *Aeneid* in relation to the *Iliad* of Homer and are particularly urged to read, at least in an English translation, Book XXII of the *Iliad*.  

The practice of giving specific advice on areas of study must have helped teachers to prepare candidates for the essay questions. From 1976, however, when the courses were renamed and the examination papers restructured, no advice of this type was proffered any longer. The reading list appended to the prescriptions was greatly increased in 1979, and teachers were presumably meant to derive guidance from this source.  

A new Latin syllabus, issued in 1992, stated in reference to the HSC prescriptions:

---

155 1967 and 1968 *Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works*, NSW Dept of Education for the Board of Senior School Studies, p. 9. The final sentence was added when the prescription was repeated in a Memo to Principals re Additional Background Reading.  
156 1979 *Prescribed Texts etc.* pp. 32-33. (12 titles listed for Virgil)
Topics germane to each text will also be prescribed.\textsuperscript{157}

It was evidently felt that specific guidance on topics to be studied would be helpful to teachers and candidates. The first appearance of such “prescribed themes and topics” was in 1993, when the Virgil topics (on \textit{Aeneid 8}) were given as:

- The interweaving of time
- The role of religion
- The relationship of Aeneas and Evander\textsuperscript{158}

The prescription of themes coincided with the re-introduction of essay questions into the standard level paper. Naturally, the questions reflected the themes. The prescription of themes continued even after the essay questions disappeared from the format of the standard level paper. From 1996 some of the questions appended to the extracts were based on these themes and topics\textsuperscript{159}.

Some general trends can be observed during the passage of the twentieth century. There was a move from general academic questions on Virgil, requiring information derived from handbooks on Latin literature, to more specific questions requiring candidates to show that they had given thought to significant issues in the Book they had studied. From time to time, candidates were asked for their own opinion or responses to the text. Literary analysis or appreciation of a given extract, first introduced in 1953, became a regular feature of higher level examinations until 1989, the last year in which Virgil appeared as a prescription at this level.

\textsuperscript{157} \textit{Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus}, Board of Studies, NSW, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{158} 1993 \textit{Prescribed Texts etc.} p. 155.
The different styles of essay questions may be observed in the examples which follow, grouped loosely according to topic. The *Georgics* are treated first, separately from the *Aeneid*, as few of the questions asked could apply to both works.

To reiterate, *Georgics* 1 was prescribed only in 1967 as the standard level text, while an extract from the same book was prescribed for additional higher level reading in 1982. *Georgics* 4, in contrast, appeared as the standard level text seven times, or eight, if we include the 1942 prescription, which contained a substantial extract (lines 387-558) published in the prescribed anthology.160

The essay questions on the *Georgics* fell into two main types: either they focussed on specific issues, such as didactic poetry or the use of episodes, or, in the majority of questions, they asked for discussion of general issues such as Virgil’s “love of nature”, “powers of description” or “imaginative faculty”.

On didactic poetry, the questions became increasingly concerned with Virgil’s philosophical purpose in adopting this genre, as we can observe from the following:

Consider, with respect to the Fourth Georgic . . . (Virgil’s) aims and achievements as a didactic poet. (1947)

Write an appreciation of Virgil as a didactic poet. (1955)

Do you consider the *Georgics* a successful didactic poem? Give your reasons. (1962)

“The *Georgics* is didactic only in the most superficial sense. It is different indeed from the philosophical didactic of Lucretius” – Brooks Otis. Discuss (1967)

---

160 E.C. Kennedy, *Four Latin Authors*, Cambridge, 1940.
“The aim of the Georgics is to teach, but not to teach farming.” With what values are the Georgics concerned? (1982)

While the first three examples were similar in nature, and straightforward, the last two required a more sophisticated response.

The treatment of episodes (in Georgics 4) showed a corresponding progression in sophistication:

Discuss Virgil’s powers of story-telling with reference to the story of Aristaeus. (1947)

“The greatness of the Georgics lies in the episodes”. Discuss this with reference to the Fourth Book. (1962)

“The real theme of the episode is not resurrection, but amor and death.” Discuss this assessment of the Aristaeus-Orpheus episode. (1982)

More general questions left the candidates plenty of scope, sometimes with little guidance:

Write your views on the Georgics as a poem. (1917)

“Virgil shows a sad lack of the imaginative faculty.” Discuss this statement with special reference to the Fourth Georgic. (1920)

What justification is there for the view that the Georgics are Virgil’s masterpiece? (1930)

From your reading of Book IV of the Georgics, illustrate Virgil’s powers of description. (1955-standard level)

“Throughout it is by his power of imparting living interest to his subject that Virgil turns a treatise on husbandry into a true poem.” Discuss. (1967)

All the above questions, except for the 1955 example, ask the candidates to offer an opinion on the success, or otherwise, of the Georgics. To discuss terms such as “Virgil’s masterpiece” or “true poem”, the candidates would need to be familiar with works by
Virgil and other Latin poets well beyond the prescribed text. They would need criteria on which to base their evaluation: for example, was the prescribed Book to be compared to works of Virgil’s predecessors, or to those of himself and his contemporaries, or to any literature of any period, written in any language?

The *Aeneid* was prescribed far more often than the *Georgics*, and by its nature, offered a greater range of topics for examination. Early in the century, a much favoured topic was Virgil’s debt to his predecessors and the place of the *Aeneid* in literary tradition. More than forty years elapsed before the topic re-appeared in an examination, in 1958. It made five more appearances from 1968 to 1977.

“Virgil imitated Homer, but imitated him as a rival, not as a disciple.” Discuss this. (1903)

Discuss this passage: “The positive excellences of the *Aeneid* are so numerous and so splendid that the claim of its author to be the Roman Homer is not unreasonable.”(1907)

What Greek and Roman poets did Virgil make use of in writing the *Aeneid*? State what you consider to be his chief excellences. (1913)

No questions on Virgil’s literary heritage were asked until 1958, when the following elaborately worded example appeared:

‘quid quod et omne opus Vergilianum uelut de quodam Homerici operis speculo formatum est?’

Macrobius *Sat.* v.2.13.  

speculum= mirror

Discuss the nature of Virgil’s debt to Homer.

When the following question was asked in 1964:

“As a story of war and adventure the *Aeneid* cannot compete with the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.”

Discuss.

the Examiners’ Comment was:
Candidates should be urged not to attempt questions like (the above) if they have read little or no Homer.

A positive piece of advice regarding the reading of Homer was at last included, when the introduction of the Higher School Certificate prescriptions in 1967 was accompanied by instructions to teachers about areas of study. The exhortation that candidates should “consider Book XII of the Aeneid in relation to the Iliad of Homer and are particularly urged to read, at least in an English translation, Book XXII of the Iliad” was reflected in the following question:

Discuss and illustrate Virgil’s use of his sources in Book XII of the Aeneid. (1968)

Questions on Virgil’s sources persisted through the 1970s:

Discuss (with special reference to the character of Dido) the influence upon Virgil of Euripidean tragedy and Alexandrian epic. (1971)

That such a question was beyond the capabilities of many higher level candidates is revealed in the Examination Committee Report for 1971. After chiding the candidates for their “appalling ignorance of Greek and Roman literary history”, the examiners continued in this vein:

Candidates should be warned not to attempt literary questions on the basis of second-hand information. A specific example: to have attempted a question on the influence upon Virgil of Euripidean tragedy and Alexandrian epic without having read a work of Euripides and Apollonius (even in translation) is a hybris which will result inevitably in nemesis.

Candidates may well have been frightened by this comment, but just what first-hand information the 1973 candidates were expected to show in the answer to the following question was not made clear:

161 1968 Circular Memorandum to School Principals, issued by the Board of Senior School Studies.
Give a general indication of the literary and other means through which the story of the Trojan War was known at Rome when Virgil began to write the *Aeneid*.

The instruction that had accompanied the 1973 prescription (*Aeneid* 2 plus about 100 lines of *Aeneid* 1 for higher level) had not specified any sources to be read, directing the candidates only to “the development and tradition of Roman epic poetry, Virgil’s debt to his Greek and Roman predecessors . . .”\(^{162}\) The same words accompanied the 1975 prescription of *Aeneid* 6, and were reflected in this straightforward question:

What influences, Greek or Roman, helped to shape *Aeneid* 6?

Questions on literary history fell out of favour when the examination format was revised in 1976, and have never appeared since.

Virgil’s role as patriotic poet or imperialistic propagandist were explored in questions over a period of seventy years, with a concentration of such questions during the years 1932 to 1940. In 1911, the question on *Aeneid* 6 was all-encompassing:

“Virgil sought to combine in a work of Greek art the inspiration of the national epic with the personal celebration of Augustus”. Comment on this.

During the 1930s the examiners directed candidates to the nationalistic aspects of whatever Book had been prescribed:

Explain the importance, in the scheme of the *Aeneid*, of Aeneas’ visit to Evander at Pallanteum.

(1932- *Aeneid* 8)

The above question can, of course, be answered in terms of the narrative development, but the inclusion of Pallanteum in the question seems to direct the candidates to elaborate

---

\(^{162}\) Memorandum to Principals, 2/1972, E2/72/10
on the importance of the site and its Roman future.\textsuperscript{163} Questions set in 1934 and 1936 were more explicit, as in the following example:

Even in the Fifth Book, the \textit{national} purpose with which Virgil wrote the \textit{Aeneid} is made evident.

Explain and discuss this statement. (1936)

It is tempting to see, in the wording of the following 1940 question, a reflection of the doubts and insecurities of wartime Australia:

Discuss Sellar’s\textsuperscript{164} statement that the real keynote to the \textit{Aeneid} is not the \textit{Arma virumque cano} with which it opens, but the \textit{Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem} with which the exordium closes.

The examiners were unimpressed by responses to this question:

Many candidates reproduced carefully prepared answers which were proved by internal evidence not to be their own work even when, as did not always happen, they bore some relation to the question set. Few showed they had been encouraged to think for themselves.\textsuperscript{165}

The frequent complaint that candidates did not display first-hand knowledge and relied on prepared answers might indicate that the examination questions were ill-suited to students who could not have read very much of Virgil apart from the prescribed Book, and were, at the time, discouraged from reading translations. This 1957 question,

“‘The originality of Virgil is most manifest when he is most national’. Discuss.

would have been very challenging for students whose prescribed text was \textit{Aeneid} 4. It required a definition of what in Virgil could be called “original”, and the extrapolation of

\textsuperscript{163} \textit{Aeneid} 8.340-1
\textsuperscript{164} W.Y. Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age}, Oxford, 1877. This book was still recommended in 1967, but not thereafter.
\textsuperscript{165} 1940 Examiners’Comments, p.117.
those elements of Book 4 which could be seen as “national” in emphasis. Such a theme seemed more pertinent when Book 6 was prescribed, as in 1961.

“The fundamental theme of the Aeneid is the destiny of Rome” (Bowra). Discuss this, with particular reference to Book VI.

When Aeneid 6 was next prescribed, in 1975, candidates were advised to pay attention to, among other aspects of Virgil, “his place as the poet of Imperial Rome”. 166 Both the standard level and higher level candidates were offered essay questions on this theme, the latter group being face with the following:

“The Sixth Book is the great central dome of the basilica which is the whole Aeneid, and the long account given by the shade of Anchises of the glorious pageant of Alban and Roman posterity is its culmination.” Discuss and illustrate the importance of this part of the Aeneid.

One is tempted to speculate on what kind of “illustrations” the candidates might have offered.

The character of Aeneas has intrigued all who have studied the poem, and questions on this topic were frequent, especially in the second half of the century. A number of questions reflected the view, made famous by Page, that Virgil was “unhappy in his hero”. 167

“The failure of Aeneas to excite a lively personal interest is not to be attributed solely to a failure of power in the poet’s imagination.” Discuss this. (1901- Aeneid I)

Many of the questions on the character of Aeneas occurred, understandably, when Book 4 was prescribed. This prescription occurred for the first time in 1943, and stimulated the following question:

“At pius Aeneas.” In what does Aeneas’ *pietas* consist? Set down briefly and clearly your own impression of the character of Aeneas.

Book 4 was prescribed again in 1957, with the following question for higher level candidates:

“In his sympathetic drawing of a woman in love the poet goes near to transforming his hero into a poltroon.” (W.A. Laidlaw).

“The *Aeneid* succeeds in spite of its hero”. (Wight Duff) Discuss.

Candidates reading *Aeneid* 2 in 1958 were also invited to discuss the hero (if they could comprehend the relevance of the quotation!):

> “Who doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain.”


Discuss Virgil’s portrayal of the character of Aeneas.

The 1968 standard level paper (on *Aeneid* 12) asked candidates to comment on Page’s statement “Virgil is not happy in his hero” (*sic*), while their counterparts in 1971, reading *Aeneid* 4, were invited to discuss Camps’ description of Aeneas as “no more than a puppet or an automaton”. The hero is presented more impartially in questions from 1977:

> How adequately does the character of Aeneas, as revealed by Virgil, represent the Roman ideal? (*Aeneid* 4)

and 1979:
“In this book Aeneas is no hero with a mission.” R.G. Austin. Discuss the part Aeneas plays in the events of *Aeneid* 2, relating this to his role in the *Aeneid* as a whole.

Any book of the *Aeneid* was now an opportunity to view the hero’s character:

> What effect does Aeneas’ journey through the Underworld have on his development as the hero of the *Aeneid*? (1981- *Aeneid* 6)

Readers of *Aeneid* 4 in 1983 were offered an even-handed treatment of the male and female points of view:

> “Book 4 is as much Aeneas’ tragedy as Dido’s.” Do you agree?

Prescribed themes were introduced in 1993, and, in 1994, when *Aeneid* 10 was the set text, one of the themes was “The Character of Aeneas”. This was examined at standard level by an essay question that took a new format: three extracts were given, followed by this question:

> What does the contrast between Turnus’ treatment of Pallas and Aeneas’ treatment of Lausus tell us about the characters of Turnus and Aeneas respectively?

Presenting candidates with the extracts would make it clear that they had to draw from the Latin to support their statements, and would make it impossible to rely on a prepared essay. The same prescription of text and themes applied in 1995, and a similar format was followed in the corresponding question, in which one extract (783-8) was given, followed by:

> Is there conflict between Virgil’s description of Aeneas as *pius* and Aeneas’ behaviour in battle in *Book* 10?

---

168 *Aeneid* 10, 441-3, 491-7, 825-32.
A number of essay questions throughout the century were less specific than those categorised so far, and required candidates to discuss general characteristics of Virgil and the *Aeneid*, sometimes requesting a personal opinion or evaluation. An early example of such a question appeared in 1928:

What do you regard as the chief merits of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*?

This type of question, rare before the 1950s, became common thereafter. A few examples should suffice:

Name any incident in your book of the *Aeneid* which you admire as an example of vivid or affecting narrative, and give your reasons for admiring it. (1953 – *Aeneid* 2 – standard level)

“It is in Book VI that Virgil exhibits the highest poetic powers of imagination and invention”. (Page) Which part of *Aeneid* VI seems to you most to justify this comment, and why? (1961-standard level)

“The *Aeneid* is wanting in vitality and human interest”. (Page) Having read Book II, do you agree? (1973 – higher level)

In 1995, when one of the themes for *Aeneid* 10 was “The Portrayal of War”, this essay question appeared at standard level:

In Book X of the *Aeneid*, by what means does Virgil maintain interest in his battle descriptions?

The inclusion of the words “maintain interest” demands a personal evaluation. Such evaluation questions were usually directed at issues significant in the particular Book
prescribed. Examples of these were frequent during the 1980s and beyond, and point the way to the introduction of prescribed themes:

Discuss the importance of Roman religion in *Aeneid* VIII. (1985)

Do you think it would be right to entitle Book XII of the *Aeneid* ‘The Tragedy of Turnus’? Discuss. (1986)

We can observe an increasing emphasis in the second half of the twentieth century on detailed, first-hand knowledge of the Latin text. The first example of a literary analysis question occurred in 1953, when the higher level paper contained the following question:

Examine the following passage (*Aeneid* 2.301-317) as a typical specimen of Vergil’s art.

Although the question pre-supposed recognition of what is “typical” in Virgil, it clearly invited candidates to examine in detail the language of the extract put before them. The next time such a question appeared, in 1955, it was more explicit:

Write a literary appreciation of the following passage which need not be translated.

Once adopted, this question, with minor variations, became a regular part of all higher level papers. It was, apparently, well within the capabilities of the candidates, as indicated by the favourable comments from the examiners in 1964:

Well done, as usual. Candidates seem to like this type of question.\(^{169}\)

In 1979 this was the second most popular essay question of four, and the responses were described as “generally good” though some candidates were chided for “over-subjective interpretations”. The 1988 Examination Report devoted two paragraphs to this question, which was a successful choice for those who attempted it, in contrast to the “predictable” answers given to other questions:

The point is best made by the comparison with (c) which provided an excellent opportunity for candidates with a good knowledge of Latin, Virgil and poetic techniques to express their appreciation of the Virgil passage in terms of linguistic, stylistic and literary importance.

It is worth pointing out that these essays were amongst the top ten and that for the most part they were not highly technical appreciations but rather simple treatments of the passage as poetry: the visual images of Cocytus, the mock-heroic portrait of Charon, the double or parallel similes, striking words or unusual word-order. These and other examples showed ample evidence of the linguistic and literary skills that should be the aim of every 3 Unit candidate.

From 1990 Virgil was no longer examined at higher level. Literary appreciation questions were included among the short-answer questions on Virgil in the standard level papers, while the essay-length question of this type was applied to whichever author was featured in the higher level papers.

A development of the open-ended literary appreciation question began to appear alongside it during the 80s, and indicates to us that the teaching of Virgil was now taking a different direction. Such questions were specific but were attached to extracts, in the manner that had become familiar in the standard level short-answer section. The extracts,

170 1979 Examination Committee Report, p. 4.
however, were usually longer, and the answers were expected to take the form of essays. The first of the two examples quoted below contained one extract of Virgil, while the second example contained three:

Compare and contrast the characters of Aeneas and Turnus as they are presented in the following lines: *Aen.* 1.101-111 (1986).

[Aeneid 12.4-9, 746-755, and 853-860] Using the above lines as examples, discuss Virgil’s use of similes in Book XII (1987).

In the prevalence of such questions may be seen a greater emphasis on assessing the candidates’ *skills* in analysing and making inferences from any passage of the Latin text, rather than in testing their *knowledge* of literary history or of prepared topics. While the latter approach would have encouraged teachers to draw up outlines of predictable topics and supply subject-matter to be learnt, the teaching of literary appreciation would require repeated practical exercises by the students which the teacher would have to assess, discuss and evaluate. It would most probably generate classroom discussion and interaction. The students would have to engage with the Latin text at every stage of the reading of Virgil at a deeper level than that of literal translation and recognition of historical and mythological allusions. In short, the lessons would become “student-centred.” The application of such interactive teaching methods in the Latin classroom of the early 21\textsuperscript{st} century was observed and has been documented in Chapter 6 of this study.

**Recommended Commentaries and Reference Books**
To gain an accurate impression of the teaching of Virgil through the twentieth century in New South Wales it is necessary to examine the commentaries and reading material which were either prescribed for study or officially recommended as background reading. From the inception of the Leaving Certificate in 1913, it was the practice to specify a particular edition of the prescribed Latin authors. That this practice was seen by many as a mandate to be followed may be deduced from the following note that was attached to the 1932 prescriptions:

> These editions are not prescribed, and may be replaced by others at the discretion of teachers.\(^{171}\)

In 1979 the advice took this form:

> Candidates may make use of any edition [of *Aeneid* 2] available, but teachers should make reference to the edition by R.G. Austin (Oxford, 1964) and to the editions of *Aeneid* I-VI by R.D. Williams and, where possible by T.E. Page, both published by Macmillan. The text used in the examination will be that of Williams.\(^{172}\)

In practice, the “text used in the examination” became the edition used by students in the classroom, whether or not supplemented by the other commentaries recommended. It was widely accepted, both by teachers and by examiners, that the introduction and notes in the recommended edition could be the basis for questions in the public examinations. Thus the recommendation of an edition directly influenced both the content and the emphasis of the teaching of Virgil, at least for final-year students.

The *Courses of Study for Public High Schools*, an annual document that contained the Latin Syllabus and, until 1941, the Leaving Certificate prescriptions, also included a short

---

\(^{171}\) *Courses of Study for Public High Schools etc* (12\(^{th}\) ed. 1931), p. 42.

\(^{172}\) *1979 HSC Examination Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.*, p. 32.
list of “recommended books for study and reference”.\textsuperscript{173} It was expressly stated that these books were not intended solely for the teacher but that “pupils should be encouraged to make frequent reference to them.” Occasionally a supplementary booklist was issued, such as one entitled “A Classical Reference Library”, supplied by Professor A.D. Trendall, then Professor of Greek at the University of Sydney, “at the request of teachers”.\textsuperscript{174} With respect to Virgil, there was little change in the three or four titles that were recommended over about forty years. Even the list issued in 1965 for the new Higher School Certificate was substantially the same, with one significant addition, a very recently published study of Virgil by Brooks Otis.\textsuperscript{175}

Restructuring of the Higher School Certificate led, in 1974, to the publication of a new document, “Recommended Reading and Reference Material”, issued by the Board of Senior School Studies to accompany the Latin Syllabus. In addition to the familiar histories of Latin literature, this list contained some specialist literary studies of various authors, including Virgil. It then became the practice, for the next ten years, to issue a substantial reading list to accompany the prescribed texts. After 1985, however, no reading lists of this kind were issued. This was not an omission, but a deliberate change made to reflect the new teaching focus that was formally expressed in the 1992 Syllabus for 2/3 Unit Latin:

> When reading texts . . . students should be encouraged to study what the writer is saying, how he is saying it and what methods he is using to reinforce his content. At all times the focus should be on the Latin being read. The use of commentaries should be limited to those which serve to

\textsuperscript{173} e.g. Courses of Study etc. 1916, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{174} Education Gazette, 1\textsuperscript{st} October, 1941, pp. 267-8.
\textsuperscript{175} Education Gazette, 1\textsuperscript{st} October, 1965, p. cclxiii. Virgil – a study in civilized poetry, Oxford, 1964.
illustrate or illuminate an understanding of the text. Students are not required to memorize historical or erudite literary information which does not directly aid their understanding and appreciation of the Latin they are reading.  

In the year 1992, when this Syllabus was issued, two of the three prescribed texts, Livy and Tacitus, were listed in the Oxford Classical Text editions, without any commentary or vocabulary to aid the student. For the Virgil, however, the Williams edition was retained.

It can be observed that the listed commentaries and recommended reading material influenced the examination questions and thus affected the approach taken by teachers. The questions reflected the nature of the recommended reading: for example, the reliance on literary histories in the first sixty years of the century produced many essay questions on Virgil’s place in the literary tradition going back to Homer, his role as Augustan patriot and propagandist and his skill in developing the Latin hexameter. The last forty years or so produced regular examination questions requiring literary analysis. Such questions were complemented, increasingly, by questions on significant and unifying themes. These emphases showed the influence of the literary criticism approach that gathered momentum from the 1960s on.

The changes in examination questions must have also influenced the presentation of Virgil in the classroom. Although the bulk of class time was still needed for translation of the Latin text (perhaps with increasing reliance on the teacher’s help), from the 1970s

---

176 Syllabus for 2/3 Unit Latin, 1992, Board of Studies, p. 17.
less time was spent on providing students with information to be learned on topics such as Virgil’s Greek and Latin heritage, or mythological, historical and cultural references. More time was needed for discussion of issues raised by the text and in analysing Virgil’s literary techniques as a means of conveying those issues. The prescription of “themes” from 1993 formalized this approach.

For convenience, the books prescribed and recommended in official lists are discussed in chronological groups, according to the dates of their original publication. It should be noted that many books remained on the lists for a long time and that their influence thus extended over three or four generations of students. Some teachers may have been influenced more by the reading of their own student days than by newer publications that appeared during their professional careers.

\textbf{a. Before World War I –}

i. Commentaries - Page, Sidgwick, Stephenson

For most of the twentieth century the commentary of T.E. Page underpinned the teaching of Virgil in schools. Even though in some years a convenient school edition of a specific Book, by editors such as Sidgwick, or Stephenson, with elementary notes and vocabulary, was listed as a recommended text, these were to be used in addition to Page. Not until the appearance of R.D. Williams’ edition in 1972 was the supremacy of Page’s work challenged.
Page, an experienced schoolmaster teaching senior students at Charterhouse School, in England, produced his editions of *Aeneid* I-VI in 1894, the *Bucolics and Georgics* in 1898, and *Aeneid* VII-XII in 1900. His publisher, Macmillan, also produced his editions of *Aeneid* 1, 2, 3, 6, 11 and 12 and *Georgics* 4 separately in cheap school volumes with vocabularies. In composing his commentary, Page referred to a number of earlier scholars, notably Conington, Henry, Heyne, Kennedy, Nettleship, Sidgwick and Wagner. Where he disagreed with these, particularly Conington, he made his own views very clear.177

Page’s Introduction to the *Aeneid* included a short biography of Virgil and a descriptive synopsis of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. The *Aeneid* was summarized Book by Book and described as “a sort of national epic, intended to connect the origin of the Romans (and especially of the Julian family) with the gods and heroes of Homeric song”.178 He differentiated the *Aeneid* from the Homeric poems as an “artistic creation” rather than “a natural growth”. The portrayal of the hero Aeneas he found unappealing179 and felt that the poem itself was “wanting in vitality and human interest”.180 He praised Virgil’s skilled versification and his profound thoughtfulness, and extolled Books 4 and 6 in passionate terms. The second half of the *Aeneid* he dismissed as “less generally interesting and less congenial to Virgil’s Muse”181 despite some redeeming episodes and some striking character portraits.

177 e.g. notes on *Aeneid* 2.630 (re Conington); 2.256 (re Sidgwick); 6.606 (re Kennedy).
179 As had Sidgwick (1st ed. of Bk 4 1881, p.15): “The weak point of (Book 4) is the weak point of the whole poem, namely the character of Aeneas.”
Page’s influence can be observed in the selection of Books prescribed for public examinations and in many of the essay questions set. As the standard level examinations for most of the century (until 1976) contained short-answer questions on allusions, background facts and unusual grammar, teachers relied on the notes in the recommended edition to supply this essential information.

To gain an impression of the nature of Page’s commentary and the aspects of Virgil emphasised in it, it is useful to classify his notes according to topic addressed. *Aeneid* 2, as the Book most frequently studied, is used here as a representative sample of Page’s approach. This Book, with Page’s commentary, was available both in the first volume of the complete work and separately in the “blue” Macmillan Elementary Classics series.

The latter was especially suited to school use because, unlike the complete edition, it included a vocabulary, some pictorial illustrations, “First Steps in Scansion” and “Notes on Hexameters”. The Introduction of the complete edition was also included, abridged only by the omission of the Book-by-Book summary of *Aeneid* 7-12 and of three paragraphs dealing with the later Books. The Notes were the same in both editions.

A superficial classification\(^{182}\) of the Notes reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN FOCUS OF NOTE</th>
<th>NO. OF OCCURRENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation of words or phrases</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of references (mythological, cultural, historical etc.)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical points</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone, mood, irony, subtle meanings</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetic devices – figures of speech, alliteration, etc.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{182}\) Superficial, because some notes dealt with more than one aspect, and some were hard to classify. The overall impression is more important for our purposes than absolute accuracy.
It can be seen that the main aim of the Notes was to assist in comprehension of the content, by supplying translations of more difficult Latin expression and by explaining any reference which might prove unfamiliar to the students. Unusual or poetical grammar which might cause difficulty in translation was also singled out and explained.

Some of the cultural explanations went into great detail, perhaps beyond what was required to appreciate the content. As an example of such excess, we can cite the three paragraphs on the operation of ancient door-sockets, written to illuminate line 493 (emoti procumbunt cardine postes). Such an example seems to contradict Christopher Stray’s claim\(^\text{183}\) that Page was strongly in favour of studying the text itself (ipsissima verba) rather than importing information from non-literary scholarship, such as archaeology, linguistic study and textual criticism.

Virgil’s artistry as a poet, and the techniques he employed to influence his audience did not receive as much attention. Thus little was given to guide teachers or students in the direction of literary appreciation, although Page did alert the reader to some notable expressions\(^\text{184}\) and to some poetic features.\(^\text{185}\) Metrical effects were rarely mentioned.\(^\text{186}\)

---

\(^{184}\) e.g. on 51: “observe the nervous force of the repeated pronoun” and on 333: “observe the force and vigour of stat: the firmly gripped sword is personified as ‘standing firm’ and impatient for the slaughter.” 
\(^{185}\) e.g on similes at 416 and 471.  
\(^{186}\) e.g. on 251: “Note the monotony and heaviness of this line.”
Page assumed in his readers an interest in literature well beyond Virgil. The Notes on *Aeneid* contained about fifty untranslated quotations in Greek, a similar number of references to Latin authors, about twenty Biblical references and at least twelve quotations from English writers, most often Milton, but also Shakespeare, Dickens, Shelley, Tennyson and Wordsworth. The study of Virgil was thus seen as part of the literary culture that was the basis of English education in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. No examination questions in New South Wales, however, were ever asked on the literary references Page made to authors beyond Virgil. The ability to read Greek was rare among New South Wales Latin students and could not be assumed among teachers.\(^\text{187}\) Familiarity with the Bible could not (officially, at least) be taken for granted in a country without an established religion. It can be assumed that students and teachers did not pay much attention to Page’s literary references, as they were not material required for examination. The broad literary education that was the privilege of Page’s own students was not the general experience of those in New South Wales.

As observed by Niall Rudd,\(^\text{188}\) Page’s commentary remained the standard teaching resource for Virgil for the first three-quarters of the twentieth century. His influence was enormous: his notes underpinned the content and emphasis of examination papers and therefore of the teaching of Virgil. Page’s own formidable gifts as a teacher, his own

---


accomplishments as a practising poet and his close acquaintance with respected literature, both ancient and contemporary, evidently made his own classroom teaching anything but routinely linguistic and antiquarian. Unfortunately for students and teachers far removed from him in time, place and educational background, the commentary itself offers only glimpses of the inspirational teacher he was. The content is so heavily weighted in favour of translation, references and grammatical points that conscientious teachers were inclined to emphasize all the minutiae that might be asked in an examination, with little time to spare for appreciation of the poetry or for discussion of literary effects, depiction of characters or major themes. “It needs a poet to appreciate a poet”, Page wrote in his Introduction to the Aeneid before concluding it with Tennyson’s ode “To Virgil”. It is a great pity that Page’s own poetic sensibilities do not figure enough in his commentary to have influenced teachers to emphasize the literary aspects as much as the literal ones.

Two editions of Aeneid 4, both earlier than Page’s comprehensive work, were prescribed for school use for the greater part of the twentieth century. Although Aeneid 4 was very much admired by Page,189 his commentary on this Book was not published as a separate volume in the Macmillan’s Elementary Classics series. Instead this popular school series included the edition of H.M. Stephenson (1888). Both Stephenson’s edition and that of A. Sidgwick (1881) were the texts recommended in 1943, the first year in which Aeneid 4 was prescribed for examination study. The next prescription of Aeneid 4 occurred in 1957, with Stephenson as the sole recommended edition. By 1971, when Aeneid 4 was prescribed again, the examination text was to be taken from Page’s full edition, Aeneid I-

189 Introduction to Aeneid I-VI, pp. xiii-xiv.
Although Sidgwick’s edition was officially listed only once, it is worthwhile examining its content, both because it was consulted by Page and for the sake of comparing it with the more persistent edition of Stephenson. Sidgwick asserted that “the fourth book is on all hands allowed to be one of the finest of the whole Aeneid”. In view of this opinion, which was supported by Page, it is surprising that the fourth Book was not prescribed until 1943 and only once again before the 1970s. If there were doubts about the suitability of the content for schoolchildren, no such doubts seem to have troubled Sidgwick, who stated in his “prefatory note” that the edition was intended for students “not far advanced in Latin.” The areas he aimed to cover were historical and mythological allusions, difficult grammar, Virgil’s “licences and peculiarities of expression”, and help in translation of harder passages.

Sidgwick’s Introduction of fifteen pages contained eight sections, which may be summarized as follows:

1. The form of the poem – definition of epic; two forms of epic, primitive and literary- the Aeneid typifies the latter.

---

2. The subject and purpose of the poem – national greatness of Rome, inspired by the new age of Augustus. Rome’s links with Aeneas (the Julian ancestry) and the heroes of the Homeric age. Its religious character and interest in local Italian antiquities.

3. An outline of the story.

4. The similes, all listed. Superficial points of comparison- primitive use of simile as independent picture to be distinguished from the more insightful and profound similes in later poets e.g. Shelley.

5. Note on the fourth Book – Virgil’s gift of simple statements with wide significance – examples given. The weak point of the Book: Aeneas, the cold and ‘pious’ hero, described as “cruel and mean”.

6. Virgil’s peculiarity of style. Virgil largely used elaborate style, constantly surprising the reader – “an inexhaustible field for the literary analyst”.

7. Imitations of Homer and others in Virgil. Virgil remained master of his materials and stamped his own mark on them.

8. Outline of Virgil’s life.

Sidgwick also provided two Appendices: a list of principal Homeric parallels from Aeneid 4 and a list of subjunctive usages. The Notes themselves were brief, almost all devoted to help with translation and explanation of allusions, with only occasional comments on literary effects, such as that on line 215:
Notice the powerful scorn of this passage, given by the language, the metre (*semiviro comitatu*) and the alliteration (*Maeon . . . ment . . . mitra . . . madentem* and *fama . . . fovemus*).

All in all, students would have found considerable help in Sidgwick’s Introduction and Notes in covering those aspects of *Aeneid* 4 to be studied for examinations. It is therefore surprising that this edition was apparently passed over in favour of that by Stephenson.

H.M. Stephenson devoted his Introduction to the “Diction of Vergil”. After a description of Virgil’s style in highly figurative English, for example:

> its fulness (sic) and richness, its weight and solidity, or, to borrow a metaphor from wine-making, the full-bodied quality of it . . .

Stephenson attributed its success to the combination of “rhythm, arrangement and diction.” The Introduction was to be confined to “diction”. It was emphasized that the diction was strongly influenced by the restrictions of the hexameter. Stephenson then presented ten features of Virgilian usage as “appliances to bring more words within the range of hexameter verse”. The list comprised the use of *-que*, the ablative case (“a frequent metrical solvent”), the omission of *sum*, adverbs to qualify substantives, Graecisms, archaisms, plural for singular, synecdoche, personification, and the use of the indicative in conditional sentences.

---

The fact that all the above were viewed as “appliances” for the writing of hexameters is partly explained by Stephenson’s reference to “the young versifier”\(^\text{193}\) in the next paragraph. It transpires that the Introduction was aimed at helping students with their own verse compositions, and not at appreciating Virgil \textit{per se}. This impression is confirmed by the examples of verse composition, both English and Latin, which concluded the Introduction.

Verse composition was not included in any secondary Latin syllabus in New South Wales during the twentieth century. The content of Stephenson’s Introduction must have seemed quite irrelevant to the teachers and students who perused it, and yet this edition of \textit{Aeneid} 4 was still on the official list in 1971, when changing conditions were causing such a dramatic fall in Latin enrolments that it seemed that the subject was rapidly heading for extinction.\(^\text{194}\)

\textbf{ii. Background Reading- Sellar, Mackail, Glover, Duff}

To accompany the reading of the Latin text, certain books were officially recommended as background information. From the earliest days of the Leaving Certificate a comprehensive three-volume work by W.Y.Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age}, first published in 1876, appeared as recommended reading.\(^\text{195}\) One volume was devoted to Virgil. This book provided a quotation for a 1940 examination essay question

\(^{193}\) M.Stephenson (ed.) \textit{Aeneid IV}, p. xiv.  
\(^{194}\) See table on p. 41 in this study.  
\(^{195}\) Courses of Study for Public High Schools for 1916 and 1917, p. 38.
and was still being recommended in 1965 to accompany the Virgil text prescribed for the first Higher School Certificate examination in 1967.¹⁹⁶

Sellar’s book contained eleven chapters: the first three provided an introduction to poetry in the Augustan age and its Alexandrine influences, an account of the reception of Virgil from his own time on, and a biography of the poet. Chapter 4 outlined the *Eclogues* and Chapters 5-7 presented the *Georgics* as part of the didactic tradition and as a demonstration of the poet’s devotion to Italy. The remaining chapters dealt with the *Aeneid*.

After a description of earlier epic, Sellar explained the *Aeneid* as primarily about the foundation of the Roman people, rather than the exploits of its hero.¹⁹⁷ He found the *Aeneid* much inferior to the Homeric poems in natural human interest, lacking Homer’s “vivacity” in scenes of daily life¹⁹⁸ and confined to persons from the “elevated class” in society.¹⁹⁹ The individuals in the *Aeneid* Sellar felt were “less capable of awakening human interest”²⁰⁰ than those of Homer. Like Page, Sellar found Aeneas particularly unappealing. The hero’s very virtues prevented him from being interesting; he resigned Dido without any passionate struggle, and was only momentarily redeemed from being a

“tame and colourless character” by his outbursts of rage in battle.\textsuperscript{201} The secondary characters, such as Anchises, Iulus, Creusa, Anna and Andromache were similarly dismissed as uninteresting.\textsuperscript{202} Sellar’s sympathy and admiration lay with Turnus and even with the unpleasant Mezentius,\textsuperscript{203} but especially with Dido who, he said, “ranks for all times as one of the great heroines of poetry”.\textsuperscript{204}

Sellar devoted little of his book to Virgil’s poetic art. While he considered Virgil’s imagery to be less inventive that Homer’s,\textsuperscript{205} he nevertheless commended some original similes like the comparisons of the Carthaginians to bees (\textit{Aen.} 1.430) or of the Trojans to ants (\textit{Aen.} 4.404). The hexameter in Virgil he thought a powerful medium for elevated moods, but not suited to natural diction.\textsuperscript{206} Of the 129 pages devoted specifically to the \textit{Aeneid} only about six\textsuperscript{207} deal with Virgil’s imagery and use of metre.

J.W Mackail’s \textit{Latin Literature} (1895) was also recommended from the earliest years of the Leaving Certificate\textsuperscript{208} and was still on the list in 1949.\textsuperscript{209} It was not included in the 1965 list for the first Higher School Certificate. Mackail took a chronological approach to Latin literary history. He devoted 14 pages to Virgil, outlining the poet’s life, education

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{201} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, p. 399.
\item \textsuperscript{202} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, pp. 399-401.
\item \textsuperscript{203} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, pp. 401-405.
\item \textsuperscript{204} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, p. 409.
\item \textsuperscript{205} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, p. 414.
\item \textsuperscript{206} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, p. 420.
\item \textsuperscript{207} Sellar, \textit{The Roman Poets}, pp. 413-20.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Courses of Study for Public High Schools 1916, p. 38.
\item \textsuperscript{209} \textit{Education Gazette}, 1st August, 1949, p. 301.
\end{itemize}
and literary compositions. He was particularly impressed with the *Georgics*, “the most perfect work of Latin, or perhaps of any literature”.\(^{210}\) He described the reception of the *Aeneid* from its own time to the 19th century and defended it against the criticism of being “artificial”.\(^{211}\) While listing the aspects in which Virgil was inferior to other poets, Greek and Latin, Mackail praised the *Aeneid* as a “masterpiece of construction”.\(^{212}\) He commended in particular Books 2 and 4 and portions of Books 9 and 11, but found other sections tedious, such as the games in Book 5 and the last three Books in general. He admired Virgil’s portrayal of pity and pathos and his psychological insights (“unique Virgilian tenderness”\(^{213}\)) and praised his innovative perfection of the hexameter.

*Virgil* was the succinct title of a book by T.R. Glover, published in 1904.\(^{214}\) This book was listed once only, in 1965, when it appeared alongside the then new study by Brooks Otis. In orientation Glover’s work was somewhat different from the books discussed so far, as its approach was based on the author’s experience (stated in his Preface) as a professor in Canada, when the study of Classics was already under threat at the beginning of the century. Glover was convinced that the students had to be directed to the “human value” of what they were reading and that “the training of literary instinct must be more generally recognized as a main part of the teacher’s work”.\(^{215}\)

\(^{212}\) Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p. 100.
\(^{214}\) 7th edition, Methuen, 1942.
Virgil contained twelve chapters based on a series of lectures. The first four provided the usual background material: Virgil’s biography, his literary heritage and his contemporaries. Three subsequent chapters were entitled respectively “Italy”, “Rome” and “Augustus”, and discussed the importance of these themes in Virgil’s works. Separate chapters then presented the characters of Dido and of Aeneas, while the final three were concerned with aspects of the spiritual, supernatural, religious and philosophical ideas in Virgil. There was little attention paid to the Latin text.

Unlike other scholars of the period, Glover was sympathetic to Aeneas. He recognized that Aeneas had to be a different type of hero from those depicted by Homer, that the world “had moved far since Homer’s day”.216 He felt for Aeneas in his isolation: “he is perhaps the most solitary figure in literature”.217 Glover compared Virgil’s hero to Wordsworth’s “Happy Warrior”,218 a comparison that inspired this 1957 examination question:

Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain.”

Wordsworth, Character of the Happy Warrior, 12-14.

Discuss Virgil’s portrayal of the character of Aeneas.

---

217 Glover, *Virgil*, p. 221.
Despite Glover’s introductory assertion about the “training of literary instinct” his book did not instruct his readers on the literary features or poetic techniques in Virgil’s work. He paid attention to content and ideas rather than structure, language or artistic features.

Another literary history, more extensive than Mackail’s handbook, was *A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age*, by J. Wight Duff, first published in 1909, and re-issued in many editions since. This work made its first appearance on the official list in 1933\textsuperscript{219} and its last in 1974.\textsuperscript{220} It was included in Trendall’s list\textsuperscript{221} in 1941, in which it was recommended as “suitable for advanced or honours students”.

Duff’s treatment of Virgil extended for 37 pages.\textsuperscript{222} He described the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid* in turn, relating their content to Augustan policies and to Virgil’s literary predecessors. He admired Virgil’s “verbal sorcery”,\textsuperscript{223} metrical artistry, tender melancholy and spirit of humanity. He was somewhat scornful of Virgil’s adaptations from Homer,\textsuperscript{224} giving him credit for greater originality when he was “most national”\textsuperscript{225} in glorifying Rome’s destiny and the Augustan age. Like Page, Duff did not approve of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[219] Courses of Study for High Schools, Secondary Schools etc. (13\textsuperscript{th} ed.), p. 46.
\item[220] Recommended Reading and Reference Material (Latin), for Form V and Form VI.
\item[221] “A Classical Reference Library”, *Education Gazette*, 1\textsuperscript{st} Oct. 1941, p. 267.
\item[222] in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} edition (1953), corrected by A.M. Duff (1960).
\item[223] Duff, *Golden Age*, p. 349.
\item[225] Duff, *Golden Age*, p. 337.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Virgil’s portrayal of Aeneas. “He does not make him uniformly interesting”\textsuperscript{226} he said, though he conceded that the hero developed as the epic proceeded. He found Dido, in contrast, a strong object of sympathy. His preference was for Books 2, 4 and 6 – the most popular prescriptions in our period of study – and liked the second half of the \textit{Aeneid} far less. Of the later Books, his favourites were Books 9 and 12, in that order.

Duff’s influence can be seen in the wording of examination questions\textsuperscript{227} and in the general thrust of many questions which dealt with those aspects of Virgil he discussed. The continued availability of his book in its successive editions made it a convenient resource for schools and the content lent itself to easy extrapolation of nuggets of information. The section on Virgil was illustrated with many examples from the Latin text which could be listed and memorized for use in examination essays. Although Duff’s style was sometimes abstruse, as in

\begin{quote}
Chiefly to this power of reading the heart is due Virgil’s success in Dido\textsuperscript{228},
\end{quote}

he had a gift for memorable short sentences and pithy pronouncements:

\begin{quote}
To Homer Virgil owed both merits and defects (p. 334).

Aeneas is too often a puppet. (p. 339)

Horace stands for the externals of the Augustan Age, Virgil for its inwardness. (p. 337)

Virgil is more humane; he is less simply human. (p. 337)
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{227} e.g. 1957 Leaving Honours in which he was quoted but not acknowledged.

\textsuperscript{228} Duff, \textit{Golden Age}, p. 345.
A student could easily accumulate a storehouse of useful points about Virgil from Wight Duff, enough to write an acceptable answer to a general essay question. Such an approach, however, would not encourage the student to form an independent appraisal of Virgil based on a close reading and analysis of the Latin text. With the change in emphasis that emerged in the teaching of Virgil in the 1970s, Duff’s literary history made its last appearance as recommended reading in 1974.

What is striking about these works of the late 19th and early 20th centuries is the fact that they remained as basic resources for the study of Virgil for such a long time after their dates of publication. While Page’s commentary was being used in schools for the greater part of the twentieth century, there were in the meantime many advances in Virgilian scholarship. Those listed by Page’s biographer Rudd\(^\text{229}\) include the Oxford Classical Texts of Hertzel (1900) and Mynors (1969), editions of single books by Norden (1916), Pease (1935), Austin (1955, 1964, 1971, 1974) and Williams (1960, 1961), “important” books by Heinze (1915), Knauer (1964), Wilkinson (1963, 1969) and Klingner (1967), and the “stimulating but more controversial” books by Pöschl (1962) and Otis (1964). Some of these were to find their way to the recommended reading lists in the last quarter of the century, and would in their turn influence the teaching of Virgil in schools.

\(^{229}\) *T.E. Page*, pp. 49-50.
b. Between the Wars to the 1950s

The time-lag between the publication of a book and its appearance on an official reading list for teachers and students continued to be significant. Just as Glover (1904) and Sellar (1896) had made their first appearance on the reading list for 1967\(^{230}\), so the list for 1974 listed H.J. Rose (1936)\(^{231}\) and the 1977 list included Jackson Knight (1944), Bowra (1945) and Guillemin (1951)\(^{232}\), all making their first appearance on lists which now also included many of the critical works of the 1960s.

In this section the contributions of Rose, Jackson Knight, Bowra and Guillemin will be discussed in turn. The radical changes in the teaching of Latin language and literature in schools which took place on the 1970s were paralleled in the reading lists of the period. The older books on Virgil sat side-by-side with the newer works of literary criticism. As the reading lists included no guidance or comment on the content or usefulness of particular books, some teachers may well have continued to rely solely on the books already in their school libraries or on those long familiar to them. Those teachers, however, (and there were many such, owing to the “Baby Boom”) who graduated during the later 1960s or the 1970s would have been acquainted with the writings of Pöschl (1962), Wilkinson (1963), Brooks Otis (1964) and Putnam (1965), either directly through their own undergraduate reading or indirectly through their university lectures. The pre-1960s books discussed in this section could be used alongside these later works,

\(^{230}\) Education Gazette, 1st October, 1965, p. cclxiii.
\(^{231}\) Recommended Reading and Reference Material, Form V and Form VI, NSW Dept of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, 1974.
\(^{232}\) Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc., NSW Dept of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, 1977, p. 22.
discarded in their favour by some teachers, or used in preference to the newer works by
others.

appearance on an official reading list only in 1974, in its 3rd edition (1954), issued in
1966 as a University Paperback by Methuen & Co Ltd, London. This book covered much
the same ground as Mackail’s *Latin Literature*, discussed earlier in this study. Whereas
Mackail had devoted three separate chapters to Virgil, Horace, and Propertius and the
Elegists, Rose dealt with all these in one chapter headed “Vergil and Augustan Poetry”,
thus indicating his view of Virgil as the leading poet of the age.

In the Augustan age, Rose maintained, men trained in rhetoric had an outlet for their
talents in producing literature in keeping with the new order and its ruler. 233 Virgil’s
*Georgics*, glorifying Italy and the peaceful pursuits of agriculture, fitted well with
Augustus’ vision, and was, according to Rose, “pure poetry”234, the second finest
didactic poem in Latin after Lucretius’ *De rerum natura*.235

Augustus wanted a new heroic epic to glorify the Romans, the work of Ennius being too
old-fashioned for this sophisticated age.236 Rose described the composition of the
*Aeneid*,237 provided a summary of each of its Books,238 and pointed out that Virgil’s

---

sources were many, and that comparison with Homer, a poet in a very different society, was “futile”\textsuperscript{239}, though he provided footnotes giving Homeric parallels to incidents in the \textit{Aeneid}.

Teachers and students seeking critical opinions on the \textit{Aeneid} would have gained the impression that as a character Aeneas was “apt to be brutal instead of strong, and then inconsistently kindly and scrupulous”\textsuperscript{240}. He behaved “like a brute” to Dido. The inadequacies Rose saw in Aeneas he attributed to Virgil’s “certain lack of ability to understand men of action (his gentle and almost effeminate nature made him a better presenter of women)”\textsuperscript{241}. The second half of the \textit{Aeneid}, “perhaps less polished”\textsuperscript{242}, was less to Rose’s taste than the first.

Rose’s \textit{Handbook} was the last reference book of its type to appear on the reading lists, which, from 1974, featured increasing numbers of specialized works on Latin poetry and specifically on Virgil. Its influence, however, like that of Wight Duff and Mackail, must not be underestimated. General handbooks and literary histories were staple reference books in school and classroom libraries. A single chapter on Virgil, containing a summary of content and a number of succinct appraisals of the poet’s aims, beliefs, sources, style and characterizations, could appear to provide all the essentials for school students. More specialized works might be too costly for schools or individual teachers to purchase, and too time-consuming for teachers and too advanced for students to read.

\textsuperscript{239} Rose, \textit{Handbook}, p. 250.
\textsuperscript{240} Rose, \textit{Handbook}, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{241} Rose, \textit{Handbook}, p. 249.
Sydney Boys High School library only nine times from 1973 to 2004!) The ideas contained in specialized secondary literature might reach teachers and students more regularly through lectures given at study days and articles in teachers’ journals such as Classicum. For classroom instruction a general work like Rose’s Handbook was more accessible.

When, during the 1940s, candidate numbers were affected by the removal of Latin from compulsory requirements for university entrance, there is some evidence that an easier approach was being sought to the study of prescribed texts for the final examination. In 1942 the prescribed text was an anthology, *Four Latin Authors*, E.C. Kennedy, Cambridge, 1940. This book, edited by an English schoolmaster for “present-day boys and girls whose Latin is not perhaps their strongest subject”, contained two extracts from Virgil, *Aeneid* 9.176-449 (Nisus and Euryalus) and *Georgics* 4.387-558 (Orpheus and Eurydice). Both extracts were prescribed for the 1942 Leaving Certificate.

The selection of this “school reader” as the prescribed text in 1942 was a new departure, and may indicate the need for a more accessible, less scholarly, edition for the current generation of Latin students. Kennedy’s notes were directed solely to help with translation; he deliberately omitted “literary references and historical allusions which are necessary only for classical specialists”. The presentation of selections from two different poems accords with the view of Virgil expressed in Kennedy’s introduction:

---

241 Kennedy, preface p. vii.
244 Kennedy, preface p. vii.
The story of Orpheus and Eurydice may have been added as an afterthought . . . but it is a fine example of Vergil’s art as poet and story-teller, and is one of the most beautiful legends in literature.\textsuperscript{245}

The \textit{Aeneid} is an ‘epic’ or heroic poem, which contains many passages unparalleled in grandeur and sheer poetry. The hero, Aeneas, is not the ideal heroic character, and Vergil is not at his best in some of the scenes of war in the last part of the poem, but it is a magnificent achievement, setting Vergil by himself in Latin literature, and containing on every page passages of unforgettable beauty.\textsuperscript{246}

It is apparent that Kennedy saw Virgil’s achievement as the creation of a number of outstanding passages in poems of otherwise uneven composition.

This edition may not have been well received; at any rate it was never prescribed again. However, it revealed the possibilities afforded by the setting of two separate extracts, namely that students could make a comparative study of the selections, and form a more comprehensive impression of Virgil’s style. This opportunity was exploited in one of the questions in the 1942 higher level examination:

What have you found in the passages of \textit{Aeneid} and \textit{Georgics} which you have been studying, that seems to you to be characteristically Vergilian?

The isolation of the two extracts meant that student would have to seek Virgilian characteristics in a close examination of the language of each passage, rather than through discussion of the poet’s aims, use of traditional material, or major themes.

\textsuperscript{245} Kennedy, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{246} Kennedy, p. 52.
*Roman Vergil*, by W.F. Jackson Knight, published in 1944 by Faber & Faber, London, but officially recommended only in 1977, was a comprehensive work, giving far more attention to Virgil’s poetic technique than Sellar or Glover had done. Early in the book Knight observed that Virgil’s poetry relied for effect on suggestion and association—association not only of thoughts but of “moods, sounds, rhythms and images”. He restated this view many times. Another of his convictions related to Virgil’s use of source-material. In the third chapter, “Tradition and Poetry”, Knight traced Virgil’s sources in Greek and Latin literature, particularly for the *Aeneid*, defending the derivative nature of Latin poetry and the use of allusions to arouse a pleased response in an audience that would recognize them. Virgil selected traditions to suit his purpose, combining them “for the imaginative value which [they have] or can be made to have”.

Characters and tragic situations were derived from Greek poetry, while the Italian/Roman aspects were drawn from Latin literature, supplemented by Virgil’s own imagination and experience.

As to the depiction of the hero of the *Aeneid*, Knight was more favourably disposed to Aeneas than many earlier critics. He found that Aeneas’ character grew in “moral stature”, and interpreted his desertion of Dido not as a callous act, but as one of necessity for which he needed to suppress his feelings by sheer will-power. Knight saw Aeneas as a man of powerful, masculine emotion, a man of action in Troy, “hot in
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adventure and passionate”, capable of cruel brutality on the battlefield and in the final killing of Turnus, described as “sheer vindictive vengeance”. Aeneas was a complex and developing character, in contrast to most of the other persons of the Aeneid, dismissed by Knight as “outlines” - types derived from epic and from drama, both tragedy and comedy.

Virgil’s employment of recurring images and themes interested Knight, and he collected references to gold, numbers, place names, storms, trees, portents, epiphanies, flowers, bees, labyrinths and circles. In this quest he seemed to have been influenced by the critical work done by his brother, G. Wilson Knight, on imagery in English literature. Jackson Knight brought to classical scholarship many cross-disciplinary insights and what is now termed “lateral thinking”, producing original views that were to have far-reaching influence.

Virgil’s adaptation of Homeric similes was discussed, to the conclusion that, while Homer’s similes “develop themselves in more or less complete detachment” from the point of comparison, those of Virgil “continue in similarity, making contact at several points”. Similes, visual imagery, and Virgil’s use of colour and light all received attention, but not to Knight’s complete satisfaction. “A thorough examination of the imagery of Vergil has long been wanted, and is still to be done.” With this statement
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Knight opened the door to the detailed literary studies that were to come, and alerted his readers to the possibilities afforded by such studies.

In his fifth chapter, “Language, Verse and Style”, Knight analysed many of the features of Virgilian diction which were to appear in New South Wales examination questions, especially in the last two decades of the twentieth century. He pointed out that the basic unit of Virgil’s poetry was not, as in Homer, the single line, but a group of lines, a structure influenced by the periodic style of prose but employing coordination rather than subordination of clauses and utilizing enjambement as a culminating device.260 Again he emphasized the importance of word-association, etymology and deliberate ambiguities such as *lacrimae volvuntur inanes* (*Aen. 4.449*)261. “Vergil never meant to write like James Joyce, but to some degree he prepared a way for him.”262

Knight discussed unusual grammatical structures and word forms, particularly “Greek” idioms such as the adverbial use of the accusative case263 and the use of the same case in phrases like *nudus membra*,264 Other case-usages and constructions (like the infinitive to express purpose) not usual in prose were listed,265 usually to exemplify Virgil’s adoption of Greek or early Latin usages to enable him to compress several meanings and associations in a brief phrase.266 An error Knight made was to state that Virgil used
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tmesis only twice, in *Aen.* 9.288 and 10.794.\textsuperscript{267} In this he seemed to be following Page’s notes to these lines. (Page ignored the occurrence of tmesis in *Aen.* 1.412, 5.603 and 6.62 but mentioned that in 5.384.)

Knight paid a good deal of attention to Virgil’s use of sound. “Sound dominated Vergil”\textsuperscript{268}, he asserted. He examined Virgil’s use of the hexameter and exploitation of irregularities for special effect. \textsuperscript{269} He discussed stress and ictus and the creation of “homodyne” and “heterodyne” feet to complement the meaning of the words. “Homodined lines are free, and likely, especially if they are dactylic, to run very quickly; heterodined lines are constricted and lack freedom.”\textsuperscript{270} As well as the metrical effects described at length, Knight pointed out the contribution of all sorts of sounds in Virgil’s verse: the use of vowels, rhyming endings, alliteration, sequences of Greek names. He even ascribed particular emotions to particular letters and vowel sounds.\textsuperscript{271} His detailed listings could provide a useful guide to the teaching of literary criticism, giving teachers and students a clear outline of features to be identified for discussion.

Knight placed great emphasis on the aural impact of Virgil’s poetry and the importance of reading it aloud with the “restored pronunciation”.\textsuperscript{272} This interest was reinvigorated in the schools of New South Wales in the 1990s, largely by the contribution of David Raeburn, whose production of *Dido*, a 1992 adaptation of *Aeneid* 4 for the stage, inspired

\textsuperscript{267} Knight, *Roman Vergil*, p. 215.
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\textsuperscript{272} Knight, *Roman Vergil*, p. 277.
many teachers to instruct students in the expressive speaking of Virgilian verse. Raeburn’s influence was also disseminated through “The Sound of Virgil”, a taped reading of the 1997 HSC prescription from *Aeneid* 12 by senior Latin students trained by him.273 This recording included a lecture by Raeburn on sound effects in Virgil, referring to stress and ictus, homodyne and heterodyne, and other aspects very much as discussed by Jackson Knight.274 “The Sound of Virgil” tape was sold to most schools and teachers in New South Wales and must be considered a significant influence in the teaching of Virgil in the closing years of the twentieth century.

Knight attempted to define “style”, somewhat apologetically, as “a manner of matching mood and personality by words and word-order”.275 Under the heading of style, he discussed Virgil’s juxtaposition of contrasting words,276 such features as zeugma, asyndeton and chiasmus, the significant use of *at* and *interea*, restraint and word-balance. This was all useful material for teachers and students preparing for examination questions requiring literary analysis.

It seems clear that *Roman Vergil* was a book that pointed the way to later literary criticism on the poet’s work. Written in an accessible style, it contained many sensible observations which could be used by students in their own written appreciations of Virgilian poetry. It contained enough background information on the Augustan scene, Virgil’s aims and his debt to his literary predecessors to supplant the earlier works by
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Sellar and Glover. Knight acknowledged the work of contemporary scholars (including
his brother, G. Wilson Knight) on English poets and adopted their view that a poem was
an integrated work of art composed of many elements drawn from the poet’s own reading
and experiences, blended by an imaginative process resembling a dream or
hallucination.\(^ {277}\) Although fancifully expressed, Knight’s appreciation of the artistic unity
of a poem foreshadowed later work on Virgil. His personal enthusiasms and
eccentricities, as described by T.P. Wiseman\(^ {278}\), did not overwhelm what was a very
useful and influential guide to the study of Virgil.

It is opportune, if slightly out of chronological order, to discuss at this point an anthology
of extracts from Virgil compiled by Jackson Knight, published in 1949 by George Allen
and Unwin, London, in a series called “The Roman World”, of which Knight was co-
editor. *Vergil— Selection from the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid* was the prescribed
verse text for the 1951 Leaving Certificate examination. This was the second, and indeed
the last, attempt to prescribe a collection of extracts rather than a discrete Book of Virgil
for examination study.

As mentioned in the discussion of Kennedy’s *Four Latin Authors*, it may not be far-
fetched to link the choice of such school anthologies to a general anxiety prevalent
among classicists in the 1940s. As noted earlier, there had been a sharp decline in the
number of Latin candidates following progressive changes in Sydney University’s
entrance requirements between 1937 and 1945. A discussion of this decline took place at

\(^ {277}\) Knight, *Roman Vergil*, pp. 77-79.
a meeting of the Classical Association of New South Wales on September 12, 1944.\(^{279}\)

As reported, the participants in this discussion did not attribute the decline in Latin numbers only to the changes in matriculation requirements, nor did they refer at all to pressures of contemporary world events. Instead the blame was laid on “commercial interests”, “bad teaching” and “over-indulgent parents”. One member, Katherine Lyons, suggested that the set books were too demanding and advocated the use of anthologies and abridged texts for public examinations. This suggestion may well reflect a prevailing view, as not only was Knight’s *Vergil* prescribed for 1951, but a Catullus selection in the same series\(^ {280}\) had been prescribed in 1948, and the Cicero text for 1951 was taken from a collection called *Rogue’s Gallery*.\(^ {281}\)

The 1951 Virgil prescription comprised most of the *Aeneid* extracts in Jackson Knight’s selection. He had included a total of 705 lines, taken from all twelve Books.\(^ {282}\) The last four extracts, representing Books 11 and 12, were dropped from the examination prescription,\(^ {283}\) leaving 27 extracts containing a total of 605 lines.

The style and spirit of Knight’s Foreword left no doubt that this collection was aimed at engaging the interest of school students. “I have avoided subtleties and modern ideas about Vergil”\(^ {284}\) he declared, after insisting on the supreme importance of reading the poetry aloud “with the nearest approach to artistic perfection”. His Introduction was

\(^{279}\) *CANSW Proceedings*, 1944, p. 9. There was no separate classics teachers’ organization at that time.


\(^{283}\) *Education Gazette*, 1st August, 1951, p. 260.

\(^{284}\) Knight, *Selections*, p. 6.
written in the same breezy style, using short simple sentences and showing unashamed partisan views:

After about seven centuries of hard fighting, mainly in self-defence, the Romans found themselves in possession of a rather unmanageable empire.\textsuperscript{285}

Knight’s brief account of Roman history up to the time of Augustus was followed by a biography of Virgil and a description of his method of composition, cheerily described as “crib and brew”.\textsuperscript{286} Virgil took from the works of others (“cribbed”) and “left it in his head to ‘brew’”, so producing new poetry of his own.

Genius is said to be an unusual capacity for taking pains. So it is, but it is also an unusual capacity for picking brains. Virgil made the old poets do half his work for him; and he makes his readers do some too.\textsuperscript{287}

In such commonsense words, Knight foreshadowed the work of Brooks Otis and other scholars of the 1960s.

The importance of reading Virgil aloud was further emphasized and the technique of doing this with correct pronunciation and metre was explained in detail.\textsuperscript{288} Translation into “graceful and natural English”\textsuperscript{289} was extolled not only for its communicative value but also, rather oddly, for its uplifting effect on the translator! The final message of the Introduction was an exhortation to learn passages of Virgil by heart.

The twenty-seven extracts prescribed for the 1951 examination were each linked to the next by a paragraph or two of simple narrative and some literary comment. Notes were
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positioned at the bottom of each page; nearly all these were explanations of proper nouns and allusions, with very little help in translation. A few difficult forms were explained, for example “exoriare, a short form of exoriaris, ‘may you arise’”, but, in general, the expectation was that students could comprehend the Latin without too much trouble. A vocabulary at the end of the book was preceded by the following warning, which confirmed Knight’s encouragement to translate into “graceful and natural English”:

Very often the English word given here is chosen because it shows the regular meaning, but a far better word, with almost the same meaning, will be needed for translation.

Where Knight commented on the literary qualities of the poetry, it was usually to remark on the effect of sound in creating mood, but he did not give enough specific references to enable a student to appreciate the point he was making. His remarks on Aeneid 2.559-594 read as follows:

This fierce passage is full of rich sounds, and many of the words rhyme or nearly rhyme. It is easy to see with the imagination the sights described. The art of the poetry is now showing a great difference. Vergil scarcely seems to have had to think at all, the inspiration was so tremendous.

Such commentary may have helped to engender enthusiasm, but can hardly have developed the students’ ability to identify poetic techniques for themselves.

Knight’s interpretation of the content of the extracts was similarly chatty, but not always helpful. His comment on Aeneid 4.160-172 (the cave-scene) was the following:

It is all very exciting. There is some deep meaning, but probably no one can understand all of it.

At any rate, Aeneas and Dido could now count as married, if Juno herself had married them.
From his remark on *Aeneid* 6.724-744 (re-incarnation), students could catch a glimpse of Knight’s own fascination with the after-life:

Some people think nowadays that Vergil was not being fanciful, but describing human destiny as it really is.\(^{294}\)

On *Aeneid* 8.362-369 (Evander speaking to Aeneas about Hercules), Knight remarked, with child-like candour, “Aeneas was always having to learn something”.\(^{295}\)

The examination questions in 1951, at both standard and higher levels, reflected the general overview that students should have gained from this prescription:

- Discuss either Vergil’s character drawing or his powers of description, as they are shown in your selection. (Pass paper)
- What opinion have you formed of the *Aeneid* as an epic poem from the selections in your set book? (Honours paper)
- What part or parts of the *Aeneid* in your selection interested you most? Give reasons for your answers. (Honours paper)

These questions were very much in the spirit of Jackson Knight’s opening sentence:

We wanted to make it easier for people who are already learning Latin . . . to discover for themselves what the poetry of . . . Vergil is like.\(^{296}\)

To answer such examination questions, students needed to have discussed and formed personal impressions of the *Aeneid*. The influence of Jackson Knight was to broaden the teaching of Virgil beyond instruction in the poet’s sources, aims and historical context. Questions requiring personal responses became more common in examinations during the 1950s.

\(^{293}\) Knight, *Selections*, p. 55.
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Despite this new direction, teachers may well have found Knight’s book difficult to use as an examination text. It gave little help with translation, and seemed to assume fluent comprehension of the Latin verse that would have been beyond that of most students. Although it made many enthusiastic references to Virgil’s excellence, it did not point out specific features of the poet’s technique in enough detail to enable students to identify these for themselves. Personal enjoyment could not be objectively assessed. As a text, it seemed more suited for use in a pre-examination year.

Knight’s *Vergil* was never prescribed again for examination study, but its influence should not be underestimated. It looked forward to the literary analysis of the 1960s which gave a technical basis to literary appreciation and could be systematically taught and objectively assessed in an examination.

Bowra’s work, *From Virgil to Milton*, Macmillan, London, 1945, was not specifically about Virgil, but was a study of the literary epic as exemplified in turn by the *Aeneid*, *The Sons of Lusus* by the Portuguese poet Camoes, *Jerusalem Delivered* by the Italian Tasso, and finally Milton’s English epic, *Paradise Lost*. As the book was recommended for Latin students in 1977 it is presumed that they were expected to read only the chapter on Virgil, entitled “Virgil and the Ideal of Rome”.
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As implied in its title, the chapter dealt with the major themes and the depiction of the principal characters. It did not include Virgil’s poetic techniques. Bowra emphasized the enduring place of the *Aeneid* in European literature over two millennia, and its role in linking the mythical past with recorded history and the events of Virgil’s own time. The fundamental theme was the destiny of Rome. As this epic, unlike those of Homer, was about a nation rather than about the glory of individuals, Virgil was obliged to create a new type of hero in Aeneas.

About the greatness of Rome Virgil was said to have doubts and misgivings, being uncertain about the ultimate worth of Roman achievements. “There is no gaiety and little joy in the *Aeneid*” but a mood of “resigned sadness”. As to the characters, Bowra cautioned against treating them as dramatic characters; they were types or symbols, specially created for Virgil’s purpose. Aeneas, in particular, Bowra saw as Virgil’s own creation - a renowned Homeric hero endowed with the Roman virtue of *pietas*, a good man in the making, according to Stoic theory. “The result was Aeneas, a character so compounded of different elements that he has often been derided even by those who love Virgil.” Bowra understood the reservations of many readers about Aeneas, but sought to explain the complications inherent in depicting such a hero.

300 Bowra, *Virgil to Milton*, p. 82.
Aeneas’ various “failures” were enumerated, but Bowra pointed out that, once he landed in Italy, Aeneas made no more mistakes but became the just and peace-loving leader of his people. Despite the Stoic influence, Aeneas was no Stoic, as shown by his outbursts of fury and other emotions. Unlike the Homeric heroes, Aeneas took no pride in his exploits; he simply did what he must in obedience to the gods.

This sketch of Aeneas showed him as very different from other characters in the poem. Some were unattractive villains, like Sinon and Neoptolemus. Dido and Turnus were described as tragic figures. Turnus, “one of Virgil’s most convincing creations”, was considered a heroic peer of Achilles and Ajax and a man of honour. His death was a tragic event, a necessary sacrifice for the creation of Rome, and the outcome of his own ἔβρις. Bowra saw Dido as a counterpart to Turnus- a tragic heroine condemned partly by her own fault. In both Turnus and Dido, Virgil showed that the heroic nature easily turned to become destructive when frustrated, and that for Rome to be successful a new type of hero was required, one whose virtus lay in conquering his weaknesses and pursuing his goal despite his own uncertainties.

Bowra’s brief account of the themes and main characters of the Aeneid was to prove both useful and influential in the classroom. He emphasised pietas as the most important quality in Aeneas and defined Dido and Turnus as tragic characters (as understood in
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Greek drama). With lessened emphasis on Virgil’s literary heritage and his part in the creation of the Augustan vision, the teaching and examining of the *Aeneid* in the last quarter of the twentieth century was focussed on the reading of the text itself, and the issues discussed by Bowra were reflected in the “themes” prescribed for HSC study.

The sole book not in the English language to make its appearance on the recommended reading list of 1977 was *Virgile – poète, artiste et penseur* by A-M. Guillemin, published in 1952 by Albin Michel, Paris.⁴¹² Possibly because of the language difficulty (although many Latin teachers in New South Wales have taught French as well), this book has received little attention from teachers. It contained, however, a number of interesting insights on some of the major themes and incidents in the *Aeneid*, in particular, observed from a different viewpoint, which deserve to be more widely known.

The book was divided into three parts, dealing respectively with the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, the last part being substantially longer than the first two combined. The discussion of the *Aeneid* highlighted character-types, the role of Destiny, the significance of the Dido episode, the importance of the Latin-Italian quality of the later Books, the depiction of war and the combination of several artistic influences in the composition of the *Aeneid*.

Guillemin classified the secondary characters of the *Aeneid* into identifiable types: physically weak old men, like Priam, Latinus and Evander⁴¹³, women overwhelmed by

---

⁴¹² *Prescribed Texts etc., 1977*, NSW Dept. of Ed. for the Board of Senior School Studies, p. 22.
⁴¹³ Guillemin, *Virgile*, p. 201.
their emotions, like Dido, Amata and even the martial Camilla, who was undone by her vanity, and youths like Pallas, Lausus, Nisus and Euryalus, doomed to a pathos-filled death.\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, p. 202.} A character like Mezentius, however, was more complex: though cruel and impious, he was yet redeemed at the end by his love for his son Lausus and by his own noble death.\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, pp. 203-4.}

Virgil was strongly influenced by Greek tragedy, according to Guillemin, not least in his depiction of characters wrestling with Destiny, and inevitably failing in the struggle. In the \textit{Aeneid}, the one who wrestled with Destiny most notably was Juno, doing all she could to prevent what she knew must happen in the future\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, p. 208.}, while Jupiter remained the impartial spokesman for Destiny. Aeneas, Destiny’s instrument, took time to learn his task. Lacking at first the essential energy, mastery of events and optimism, he needed the support of, among others, the Sibyl and the Tiber-god, as he learned to establish his dominion in the land of Italy.\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, p. 241.}

Guillemin devoted more than twenty pages to the Dido-Aeneas relationship\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, pp. 242-269.}, which she presented as a re-working of the ancient poetic theme of \textit{l’amour coupable}. This plot-type was distinguished by five elements: a danger to the hero, divinely-inspired love, help rendered by the heroine to the hero, a fault committed by the heroine, and the ingratitude of the hero.\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, p. 243.} Virgil did not make Aeneas as culpable as Jason, Theseus or Minos\footnote{Guillemin, \textit{Virgile}, p. 249.}, and
showed Dido’s “fault” (her infidelity to Sychaeus) without dishonour and with respect and sympathy.\textsuperscript{321} The relationship was depicted from a Roman standpoint. Not only was the “marriage” in the cave conducted according to the most solemn of Roman rites\textsuperscript{322}, but Dido’s infidelity to a dead husband was seen as reprehensible because it conflicted with the Roman ideal of the \textit{univira}.\textsuperscript{323} Aeneas, as a good Roman, had to acknowledge gratitude to Dido for her help, and did so, but he could not be portrayed as faithless. He had not consciously broken any contract of marriage. What he did was to obey a demand superior to that of his emotions in leaving Dido and pursuing his destiny. In her un-Romanness, her beauty and her exotic wealth Dido was seen as a prototype of Cleopatra, a parallel demonstrated by Virgil’s use of almost identical phrases for both women: Dido is described as \textit{pallida morte futura} (\textit{Aen.} 4.644) and Cleopatra as \textit{pallentem morte futura} (\textit{Aen.} 8.709).\textsuperscript{324}

The Roman viewpoint stressed by Guillemin was further demonstrated by Aeneas’ visit to Pallanteum, where the simple austerity of Evander’s court (at the site of the Rome of the future) was contrasted with the decadent richness of Carthage.\textsuperscript{325} This picture accorded well with Roman notions of the moral integrity of their frugal, hard-working forefathers, and with Stoic attitudes to luxury.

Regarding Virgil’s depiction of war, Guillemin drew a contrast between Augustan-Roman views and Greek-heroic ones. In Roman terms, war was necessary as a pathway
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to peace. Virgil did not question this necessity but felt intense pity for those who suffered because of it. The Greek-heroic scenes, such as the aristeiai of Turnus and other warriors, are depicted in an archaic light, as an unrealistic and stylized “fresco” to be viewed at a distance, one of the features of Virgil’s Alexandrian influence. The Aeneid achieved its grandeur through Virgil’s artistic blending of so many elements: epic, tragedy, comedy, visual arts, Alexandrianism, and above all, in Guillemin’s view, the legends and traditions of early Italy. She blamed the school curriculum for the unjustified neglect of the second half of the Aeneid:

L’enseignement secondaire, en n’offrant guère à l’étude de ses élèves que la première moitié de l’Énéide, à laquelle les légendes grecques prêtent tout leur éclat, a beaucoup contribué – en quoi il a eu tort – à la mise en oubli de la seconde, dans laquelle apparaissent les légendes latines, d’un charme si différent, dans leur intimité, leur simplicité et parfois leur effroi.

Guillemin provided a view of the Aeneid that was different from the English writings surveyed so far in this study, in that she placed as much importance on the Roman-Italian traditions as on the Greek literary heritage, and did not approve of the usual emphasis on the first half of the Aeneid that resulted in the neglect of the second. She made only passing reference to the Latin language of the poem but offered a discussion of the major themes that was original and of potential interest to school students and their teachers.
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The period encompassing the inter-War years to the 1950s saw little change in the formal structure of education in New South Wales. The public examination system was well established, selective high schools dominated the public school system, and syllabuses remained substantially the same. In the case of Latin, however, there were threats to its security as a major component of the academic curriculum. The steps taken, from the late 1930s to the mid-1940s, to remove Latin from all matriculation requirements caused a significant drop in the numbers of final-examination candidates by the 1950s. The anxiety engendered by this decline caused some re-appraisal of the texts prescribed for public examinations, and experiments were made with less-demanding books of selections instead of the traditional complete texts. Surprisingly little attempt was made, however, to incorporate recent scholarship in the approach to the study of Virgil. Important books by Jackson Knight (1944) or Bowra (1945) did not appear on official reading lists until 1977. The only hint of change was the first appearance of a passage for critical appreciation in the higher-level examination of 1953. In general, until the mid-1970s, the examination questions comprised translation, quiz-questions on allusions, mechanical exercises on scansion and essays on Virgil’s role as Augustan propagandist, imitator of Homer and virtuoso of the Latin hexameter. The answers to such questions could be derived from study of the prescribed commentary and literary histories like that of Wight Duff (1909). Influenced by the unchanging examinations, the teaching of Virgil remained largely static through this period, despite the uneasiness caused by the decline in the number of Latin students persisting to the level of studying the work of the greatest Latin poet.
c. The 1960s and beyond

i. Literary Criticism

Many works of literary criticism were produced during the 1960s, including some substantial and innovative books on Virgil. Many of these were listed as recommended reading for teachers and students from the mid-1970s, although the order in which they appeared seems random: Brooks Otis’ major book was recommended as early as 1965, while Pöschl, one of Otis’ major inspirations, did not appear on the official list until 1979. For convenience in this study, the books are discussed in chronological order of their publication.

The book that inspired many of the critics of the 1960s never appeared on any of our recommended reading lists at all. This was Richard Heinze’s *Virgils Epische Technik*, published in 1903. Until 1993, this book was accessible only to readers of German, a fact which impeded its inclusion in reading lists for teachers and students in New South Wales. Heinze had offered a view of Virgil as a literary innovator who fused many earlier traditions and used every available poetic technique to create an integrated and original artistic work. This view was developed by Brooks Otis in particular, who stressed the innovative nature of Virgil’s poems and the outstanding craftsmanship revealed by their structure, style and content.

---

332 *Education Gazette*, October 1, 1965, p. cclxiii.
333 *Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.*, 1979, p. 33.
334 translated by Hazel and David Harvey and Fred Robertson, Bristol Classical Paperbacks, 1993.
The earliest work of the 1960s to appear on an official list was *The Art of Vergil – Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*, by Viktor Pöschl (translated by G. Seligman), published by the University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1962. Pöschl regarded the *Aeneid* as a consciously symbolic poem. His study explored the imagery, motifs and emotions expressed in the *Aeneid*, making comparisons with Homer only to illustrate Virgil’s difference, not his inferiority. Homer and Virgil represented “two stages in the history of creative imagination”.\(^{335}\) Pöschl realized that his approach was revolutionary: he referred to “the schooldust of the ages”\(^{336}\) as a major obstacle to approaching the study of Virgil with the “love of the heart”; even Heinze was criticized for pursuing “a much too rationalistic direction”.\(^{337}\)

Pöschl saw in the *Aeneid* the forces of destructive chaos, represented by Juno, Dido, Turnus and, in the real world, Mark Antony, in conflict with the forces of order, represented by Jupiter himself, the hero Aeneas, and the ruler of the new age, Augustus. The two halves of the *Aeneid* each opened with a symbolic portrayal of chaos: the storm that almost destroyed Aeneas in Book 1, and the horrifying onslaught of the Fury Allecto in Book 7. Both were the product of the ill-will of Juno. The whole of the *Aeneid* was thus perceived as the working-out of a single major theme, rather than an episodic narrative based in turn on the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

\(^{336}\) Pöschl, *The Art of Vergil*, p. 5.
Pöschl discussed in depth the three major characters, Aeneas, Dido and Turnus. Aeneas he saw as a “man of memory and of inner vision”, fashioned to be an amalgam of Homeric heroism, early Roman Stoicism and Virgilian/Augustan *humanitas*. He explored the concept of *pietas* as a response to love and drew attention to Aeneas’ capacity for compassion and grief for others while maintaining firmness and resolution in pursuit of his goal. Dido, in many ways a counterpart to Aeneas, was discussed with frequent reference to Virgil’s use of simile. Her equivalence to Aeneas was portrayed through the Diana-simile in Book 1, corresponding to the Aeneas-Apollo simile in Book 4. The Dido-deer simile of Book 4 was analysed in detail. Pöschl explained how Virgil’s use of similes differed from Homer’s: “Homer strives to make an event explicit. Virgil strives to explain and interpret it.” The conflicts in Dido were like the conflicts experienced by Aeneas, but she was a more tragic figure filled with greater tension. Dido was manipulated by the powers of darkness, symbolized by the storm she perceived as her marriage ceremony and by the growing, demoniacal figure of Fama.

Turnus’ role as an agent of the dark powers was symbolized by his first appearance at midnight, when he was visited by Allecto (7.414). Although he had all the best qualities of a hero—youth, beauty, nobility and courage—he became a victim of tragic delusion. The use of similes in drawing attention to the difference between Turnus and Aeneas was

---

338 Pöschl, The Art of Vergil, p. 35.
343 Pöschl, The Art of Vergil, p. 81.
345 Pöschl, The Art of Vergil, p. 90.
346 Pöschl, The Art of Vergil, p. 93.
discussed in detail:\textsuperscript{347} for example, while Turnus was often compared with wild animals, Aeneas was so compared only once, to a wolf defending its cubs (2.355). Pöschl perceived in the later Books of the \textit{Aeneid} a “tragic force” which was “insolubly connected with the figure of Turnus”, and commented on the general lack of recognition of this aspect of the second half of the \textit{Aeneid}. \textsuperscript{348} It is perhaps ultimately due to Pöschl’s perceptiveness that “Elements of Tragedy” was a prescribed theme for HSC study in the years 1996-9 in connection with \textit{Aeneid} 12. \textsuperscript{349}

Pöschl discerned in the \textit{Aeneid} a style of poetic composition that consisted of a “sequence of moods”. \textsuperscript{350} To create mood Virgil made symbolic use of every detail: depiction of landscapes, \textsuperscript{351} description of artefacts, \textsuperscript{352} careful crafting of similes, \textsuperscript{353} and the alternation of “light and shadow”. \textsuperscript{354} This conscious creation of mood was seen by Pöschl as a particularly innovative characteristic of Virgil’s poetry.

While Pöschl had analysed imagery, symbolism and character, he did not deal with the aural impact of Virgil’s poetry. The work of L.P. Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin Artistry}, made its appearance only one year later\textsuperscript{355} and concentrated on the “verbal music” of Latin

\textsuperscript{348} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{349} \textit{1996 HSC Prescribed Texts etc.}, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{350} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{351} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, p. 142.
\textsuperscript{352} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, pp. 148-50.
\textsuperscript{353} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{354} Pöschl, \textit{The Art of Vergil}, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{355} 1963, Cambridge University Press.
poetry and prose. This book appeared on the official recommended reading list in 1974, five years before the listing of Pöschl.356

Wilkinson discussed many genres of literature, but much of his analysis of the aural effects in Latin writing was particularly relevant to the study of Virgil. After affirming his support for the “reformed pronunciation” of Latin, Wilkinson devoted his second chapter to a detailed inventory of the ingredients of verbal music: “sonorous vowels, vowels subtly modified by consonants, concurrence of vowels, avoidance of cacophonies, smoothness, ease of utterance, variation of sounds, and on the other hand alliteration, assonance and rhyme”.357 In the third chapter, entitled “Expressiveness”, Wilkinson explained and exemplified the use of appropriate sound-effects to enhance meaning and convey emotion: hissing sounds to convey anger, for example.358 He included the emotional effects created by word-order and expressive repetition, as well as the onomatopoeia of such lines as the famous

quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum (Aeneid 8.596)359

Like Jackson Knight, Wilkinson attributed characteristic effects to particular metrical arrangements: “spondees are restful, dactyls restless”.360 He discussed ictus and accent at length, claiming that coincidence helped to represent smooth motion or repose, as in “Virgil’s melodiously narcotic” line

356 Recommended Reading and Reference Material– Form V and Form VI, Board of Senior School Studies, 1974.
357 Wilkinson, Golden Latin, p. 41.
358 Wilkinson, Golden Latin, p. 54.
359 Wilkinson, Golden Latin, p. 58.
360 Wilkinson, Golden Latin, p. 68.
spargens umida mella soporiferumque papaver (\textit{Aeneid} 4.486)\textsuperscript{361}

while conflicting accent suggested conflict or buffeting, as in

apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto (\textit{Aeneid} 1.118)\textsuperscript{362}

Wilkinson acknowledged Jackson Knight’s appropriation of the terms “homodyne” and “heterodyne”, although he felt that Knight sometimes went too far:

Mr Knight is courageously exploring territory that is important, even though he goes to lengths that invite counter-attack.\textsuperscript{363}

Like many before him, Wilkinson thought that the hexameter, as a verse form, achieved its maximum effectiveness in the work of Virgil.\textsuperscript{364} He added fresh insights, however, by exploring the contribution of oratorical prose to the fashioning of Virgil’s sentence structure:

[Virgil relies] on the juxtaposition of short sentences (parataxis) often without explicit connection, . . . enlivened by all the rhetorical figures- antithesis, anaphora, question, exclamation, symmetry, chiasmus, homoeoleuton and the rest.\textsuperscript{365}

Several pages of examples of Virgilian periodic verse followed this statement.\textsuperscript{366}

Wilkinson’s book was very useful for teachers. It drew attention, with many examples, to the technical details that made the Virgilian hexameter so much admired. It thus provided a practical guide to the literary analysis that was becoming increasingly central to the teaching of Latin literature in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Most strikingly, Wilkinson emphasized the aural impact of Latin literature, an aspect of teaching that became more significant than ever in the 1980s and 1990s, with the general

\textsuperscript{361} Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{362} Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin}, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{363} Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin}, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{364} Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin}, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{365} Wilkinson, \textit{Golden Latin}, p. 190.
adoption of the reformed pronunciation among teachers. (The decline of Latin in Catholic schools, many of which taught the Church pronunciation, may have contributed to the acceptance of the reformed pronunciation as standard in schools at this time.) The general interest in teaching students to read aloud expressively and correctly, already supported by the Greek and Latin Reading Competitions for older students run by the Classical Association of New South Wales, was further encouraged by the Classical Languages Teachers Association which established in 1981 an annual Latin reading competition for Year 9 students which included choral recitation of an extract of Virgil. The same year saw the presentation of an Evening of Classical Drama in which students from five schools presented extracts of poetry in Latin and Greek— a forerunner of the major drama festivals that were to come.\textsuperscript{367} Oral recitation and aural appreciation became a usual feature of the teaching of Virgil in the classroom.

The most comprehensive and influential work on Virgil in this period was, without doubt, \textit{Virgil – a Study in Civilized Poetry} by Brooks Otis, published by Oxford in 1964. This book appeared as recommended reading soon after publication, in 1965,\textsuperscript{368} and was still on the list for 1983,\textsuperscript{369} although strangely omitted from the 1985 list.

Otis represented the works of Virgil as highly innovative compositions, and the \textit{Aeneid}, in particular, as an original work with “no true precursors”\textsuperscript{370} which developed the themes and the style already discernible in the \textit{Eclogues} and the \textit{Georgics}. Virgil did not

\textsuperscript{367} Reference to both events is found in \textit{Classicum}, Vol.VII.2, Oct 1981. pp. 16 and 19.
\textsuperscript{368} \textit{Education Gazette}, 1st October, 1965, p. cclxiii.
\textsuperscript{369} 1983 HSC Prescribed Texts etc., Board of Senior School Studies, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{370} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 40.
seek to imitate Homer, but to adapt Homeric features to the Augustan ideas and the subjective style\textsuperscript{371} he had demonstrated in his earlier works.\textsuperscript{372} Otis acknowledged his own debts to Heinze and Pöschl, the latter for his work on symbolism and atmospheric effects\textsuperscript{373} and the latter for his well-supported insights:

The great achievement of Heinze was his almost definitive demonstration that Virgil’s narrative technique had . . . a psychological and dramatic emphasis different from that of all Greek epic.\textsuperscript{374}

Otis analysed all the works of Virgil in depth, drawing attention to the integrated structure of the poems, the centrality of Virgil’s Augustan ideas, the interplay of Homeric and other literary features, the unifying use of symbols and motifs, and the subjective style that led to a “psychologically continuous narrative”\textsuperscript{375} in the \textit{Aeneid}. He outlined the contributions of Virgil’s predecessors, both Greek (Homeric, classical and Hellenistic) and Roman, emphasizing the novelty and uniqueness of Virgil’s own concept:

Virgil did what no one else had done before him and no one was able to do after him.\textsuperscript{376}

In his third chapter, “The Subjective Style”, Otis discussed what he identified as the outstanding difference in Virgil’s approach to narrative poetry. He began by analysing at length the language of two related passages, the race in \textit{Iliad} 23.751-83 and the passage of Virgil inspired by this scene: \textit{Aeneid} 5.315-42.\textsuperscript{377} From his comparison of these passages, Otis was able to show that Virgil’s narrative was “doubly subjective – first in the empathy with which he shares the emotions of each runner, second in his own,

\textsuperscript{371} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 221.
\textsuperscript{372} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 216.
\textsuperscript{373} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 415.
\textsuperscript{374} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 414. Original italics.
\textsuperscript{375} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 385.
\textsuperscript{376} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{377} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, pp. 41-61.
personal reaction to their emotions.”\textsuperscript{378} Paradoxically, this subjective approach had the effect of making Virgil’s characters less vivid than Homer’s,\textsuperscript{379} whose individuals were left to be defined by their own actions.

The dominance of symbols and motifs in Virgil was illustrated by a comparison of Dido with the Medea of the \textit{Argonautica}. Virgil used some of the same images, such as those of the “flame” and the “wound”, as Apollonius had done, but developed them from merely descriptive similes into motifs which created an emotional progression in his narrative.\textsuperscript{380} In Virgil imagery was used not only to elucidate, to highlight and to create atmosphere, but to signpost connections and to integrate different parts of the narrative. An example of such a unifying image could be seen in Virgil’s two storms, in \textit{Aeneid} 1.124ff and in 4.160ff. Both storms were introduced with the same Latin words, both were engineered by Juno, and both symbolized confusion, calamity, and the power of \textit{furor}.

In his discussion of the \textit{Eclogues} and the \textit{Georgics}, Otis traced the development of Virgil’s subjective style. The \textit{Georgics} he described as not really a didactic poem, but a continuous expression of serious themes pertinent to Augustan Rome.\textsuperscript{381} He devoted much of his discussion to the fourth Book, in which he saw a prototype of the subjective style as applied to mythological narrative: “the \textit{Orpheus} is the first great example of a

\textsuperscript{378} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{379} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, pp 51 and 89.
\textsuperscript{380} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, pp. 72-5.
\textsuperscript{381} Otis, \textit{Virgil}, p. 145.
new style”.\textsuperscript{382} The \textit{Georgics} as a whole he considered to be unified by a philosophical theme, namely that “man is, so to speak, at the centre of a vast network of cosmic sympathy and moral law.”\textsuperscript{383}

Such universal concerns led Virgil to the \textit{Aeneid}, which, according to Otis, was “the story of the interplay between the cosmic power of fate and human response to it”.\textsuperscript{384} The real plot was the “formation and victory of the Augustan hero”\textsuperscript{385} who had to combat the destructive power of \textit{furor}, not only externally but within himself. In Books 1-6, the “Odyssean \textit{Aeneid}”, the hero had to make both an actual journey and a symbolic journey towards the attainment of \textit{pietas}. His guide was Anchises, whose recognition of the will of the gods (2.701ff) was the real “conversion”\textsuperscript{386} to a new outlook. After the death of Anchises, Aeneas was morally bereft and vulnerable, a ready victim for Juno’s machinations. Dido, in so many ways Aeneas’ counterpart, was destroyed by the effects of \textit{furor}, but Aeneas was recalled to \textit{pietas} by the gods and the visions of Anchises, with whom he renewed his bond in Book 5 and, of course, in Book 6.

Otis interpreted \textit{Aeneid} 6 in very symbolic terms, from the carved temple doors at the beginning (the labyrinth depicted Aeneas’ past\textsuperscript{387}) to all the hero’s encounters in the Underworld. His attempt to embrace Anchises failed, showing that he could not recover the past and could not any longer depend on his father’s help. Otis thus regarded the first

\begin{enumerate}
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 208.
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 213.
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 220.
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 222.
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 250.
\item Otis, \textit{Virgil}. p. 284.
\end{enumerate}
half of the *Aeneid* as a continuous account of Aeneas’ development away from dependence on Anchises, culminating in an independent *pietas*, that of the leader of a great nation. The supernatural elements of epic – the “wonder-world of the *Odyssey* and *Argonautica*” – were correlated in the *Aeneid* with human psychology. Juno’s *furor* corresponded to human *furor*; its antithesis, Jupiter/Fate, provoked the response of human reaction.

In the second half of the *Aeneid*, Otis observed, Aeneas had achieved self-mastery, while his opponents, Turnus, Lausus, Camilla, and Mezentius struggled with “pathetic heroism”. The fighting in Italy, engendered by Juno, was in effect a mass outbreak of *furor*. In opening the gates of War (*Aeneid* 7.620) Juno demonstrated that she was the opponent of Jupiter’s prediction in 1.294, and in unleashing Allecto she set in motion a series of calamities even greater than those caused by the storm in Book 1. Book 7 could thus be seen as corresponding to Book 1, opening the second phase of Aeneas’ quest.

Each Book was analysed, and in each Otis found interwoven motifs, symbols and references. Book 8 showed “great unity of design”, both looking back to the legendary past of Rome and to its future greatness as depicted on Aeneas’ shield. The Hercules-Cacus story illustrated the defeat of violent *furor* by a great hero. Book 9 brought into prominence again some characters already featured in Book 5, and showed immature heroism (in the absence of Aeneas) in contrast with the mature leadership of the hero.

---

390 Otis, *Virgil*, p. 313.
The significance of Book 10, in which the outcome of the *Aeneid* was determined, was indicated by the *concilium deorum* at its start. The gods did not influence the final outcome; Fate found its way through the actions of human beings. The death of Pallas in the unequal duel with Turnus caused Aeneas to show the extreme violence previously associated with Turnus himself. Otis did not find this dramatically convincing: not enough had been established about the relationship of Aeneas with Evander or Pallas to justify such intense grief. Otis, he thought, was trying to show Aeneas as a hero who could fight Homerically despite his essentially unHomeric values. In the last two Books Virgil was trying to delay events until the final duel. Not until 12.697 did Turnus reach the point at which he left events in Book 10. Virgil wanted to depict Turnus as a true hero: it was through his character and will that Juno and her minion Juturna were finally defeated. His return to battle and his death were like a sacrifice of atonement.

Brooks Otis concluded with the affirmation of Aeneas as embodying the the “Augustan ruler-ideal”, a “new idea in history”, a Roman who could enforce the peace that the Greeks, for all their talents, had failed to achieve. Virgil, himself a “convinced Augustan”, had succeeded in making the narrative work because it was “psychologically continuous”. Through use of the subjective style he had created a unique literary work which allowed the reader to empathise with the characters and to experience the atmosphere and the action through the feelings of those characters.

---

393 Otis, *Virgil*, p. 361.
Otis’ work has been outlined at such length in this study because it was very influential. His book was not an easy handbook for students or teachers; it did not offer classified examples of diction, sound effects, poetic devices, or other techniques which would help students to identify such features in the text. Its influence lay in the fact that it focused on the totality of the *Aeneid* as an integrated work, conceived to express a theme: the development of the Augustan ruler-hero who was the embodiment of *pietas* and his successful battle, internal and external, with the forces of *furor*. This theme was what determined the inclusion of incidents, descriptions and images, whether these were derived from Homer, from other literature, from Italian folklore, or from Virgil’s own imagination. Every part of the *Aeneid* had to be regarded as significant; all parts of the *Aeneid* were interlinked and all related to the central theme.

The influence of Brooks Otis on the teaching of Virgil was a subtle one. The identification of Augustan values in Virgil’s poetry was certainly not a new concept, and had formed the basis for examination questions over many years.\(^{398}\) But now it was no longer possible to separate the study of Virgil as poet from the study of Virgil as storyteller or Virgil as propagandist. The introduction of prescribed “themes” for HSC study, introduced in 1993, encouraged the search for unifying elements within a Book of the *Aeneid*, and examination questions required candidates to relate extracts to major themes. An example of such a question, asked in 1998, was:

> How does this passage relate to the theme of destiny in Book XII? (lines 796-803)

\(^{398}\) See examples on p. 95 of this study.
Candidates in this examination needed to show their awareness of the role of Jupiter/Destiny as opposed to Juno, the representative of furor, the enemy of Aeneas/pietas and the instigator of Turnus.

The fact that only one Book of Virgil was prescribed for the final examination made it difficult to convey to students an appreciation of the poem as a unity. Some teachers compensated for this limitation by offering an overview of the Aeneid in earlier years, either through an English adaptation or translation, or by reading extracts from other Books in Latin with linking narrative in English. The requirement to read the remainder of the Book prescribed for HSC in translation first appeared in 1977; there has never been a requirement to read the whole Aeneid in translation.

Another study which acknowledged the inspiration of Heinze and Pöschl was The Poetry of the Aeneid – Four Studies in Imaginative Unity, by Michael C.J. Putnam, published by Harvard University Press in 1966. This work contained detailed studies of four Books of the Aeneid: namely, the second, fifth, eighth and twelfth. It was listed as recommended reading for the first time in 1977, probably more for its general approach than because it offered specific help with the 1977 prescription, Aeneid 4.

Putnam finished his book in 1963, a fact which accounts for the lack of any reference to Brooks Otis, with whom Putnam shared some similarities in approach, most significantly a view of the Aeneid as a unified work bound together by structural devices.

---

399 See Chapter 5 of this study.
400 Prescribed Texts etc., 1977, Board of Senior School Studies, p. 22.
and by recurring symbols, images and key words. Whilst he considered the search for “calculated symmetry” as “propounded by several American and European scholars”, to be an incorrect approach to Virgil’s work, Putnam did discern an internal pattern of construction common to Books 2, 6 and 8. These, he found, could all be divided into three stages: a symbolic introduction, scenes of action or trials and a final section showing prophecy and revelation. Such an overview of an individual Book would prove useful in teaching it, preventing a fragmented treatment and forestalling the temptation to disregard as irrelevant those sections not prescribed for translation.

The main emphasis of Putnam’s study was to trace “imagistic strands” in the four Books he selected for discussion, making links with nearly every other part of the Aeneid. In Book 2, he pointed out, there were recurrent references to snakes, both actual and metaphorical. In Book 12 there were persistent similes comparing Turnus to wild animals, from ferocious beasts to a timid deer pursued by a hunting dog (12.748ff.) – “a pitiful, not to say ironic, conclusion”. The violence and blood-thirstiness of Turnus was linked with Furor itself through the initial lion-simile in Book 12 (fremit ore cruento) which echoed the description of Furor in 1.296: fremet horridus ore cruento. Through such verbal echoes Virgil indicated connections and consistent strands throughout the Aeneid.

402 Putnam, Poetry of the Aeneid, p. x.
404 Putnam, Poetry of the Aeneid, p. xi.
In terms of theme, Putnam denied that the *Aeneid* was “an ideal vision of the greatness of Augustan Rome”; quite the opposite, its essential theme was “the ultimate triumph of violence and death over any idealistic and reasoned pursuits”. In Putnam’s view, *Furor*, not the Augustan hero, was the victor. This was demonstrated when Aeneas savagely slew the supplicant Turnus at the end of Book 12: “Aeneas becomes himself *impius Furor*”. Putnam interpreted the theme of the *Aeneid*, therefore, as essentially negative; he did not perceive Virgil’s empathy with the struggles of his characters or consider the ending as problematic; he did not allow the possibility that the killing of Turnus could be seen as an act of *pietas*.

For teachers and students of the *Aeneid*, Putnam offered an interpretation of the main theme that was quite different from the traditional view. Most importantly for teachers, he showed a convincing method of tracing Virgil’s ideas through careful observation of recurrent words, phrases and images. Whereas teachers of earlier generations might have searched in Virgil for Homeric references to point out to their students how and why Virgil had diverged from his model, Putnam encouraged teachers in the later twentieth century to search within the *Aeneid* for cross-references and to see in similes and recurrent phrases a stream of Virgilian consciousness that expressed his major themes. Such study could be done in the classroom through the reading of the Latin text itself, without reference to Homeric or other sources which were probably beyond the reading experience of secondary school students. This was very much in the spirit of the 1992 Latin Syllabus (2/3 Unit) which stated:

---

When reading texts therefore students should be encouraged to study what the writer is saying, how he is saying it and what methods he is using to reinforce his content. At all times the focus should be on the Latin being read. The use of commentaries should be limited to those which serve to illustrate or illuminate an understanding of the text. 410

Teachers seeking a quick overview of critical approaches to Virgil through the exploration of themes and symbols would have welcomed Steele Commager’s compendium entitled *Virgil- a Collection of Critical Essays*, published in 1966 by Prentice-Hall, New Jersey. This book, recommended in the 1979 official reading list, made available to teachers and students a selection from influential works originally published between 1945 and 1964, including extracts from the books by Bowra, Pöschl and Otis already described in this study.

Commager indicated in his introduction that he favoured a thematically coherent view of Virgil’s works:

One may doubt that Virgil had any thoughts of an *Aeneid* at the time of the *Eclogues*; yet certain themes persist in all three genres. One of the most obvious … is that of death and rebirth, of a flawed past and a redeemed future.411

The essays explore different aspects of Virgil’s ideas and themes and his expression of them through recurrent phrases and images. Those essays most relevant to teaching the frequently prescribed books are outlined below.

---

410 2/3 Unit Latin Syllabus Years 11-12, Board of Studies, p. 17.
C.S. Lewis, in “Virgil and the Secondary Epic” (1954), described Virgil as radically different from Homer. The *Aeneid* contained far wider implications than the legend it narrated: it was “the story of … transition in the world-order”\(^{412}\) and depicted a hero with the unHomeric quality of a sense of vocation.

Wendell Clausen emphasised the sorrowful view of Roman history he discerned in the *Aeneid*. In “An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*” (1964), he denied the notion that Virgil’s view of Roman history was propaganda,\(^ {413}\) nor did it show sentimentality. While enlisting the reader’s sympathy “on the side of loneliness, suffering and defeat”, Virgil ended his poem with “an outburst of savage sorrow and a death”.\(^ {414}\)

The duality of Virgil’s message was the subject of Adam Parry’s essay, “The Two Voices of Virgil’s *Aeneid*” (1963). National glory demanded a heavy personal price:

> We hear two distinct voices in the *Aeneid*, a public voice of triumph, and a private voice of regret.\(^ {415}\) The hero Aeneas was never free from his burdens: he symbolically bore his destiny as he carried his father out of Troy. When he was shown the future of his people engraved on his divinely-crafted shield, he symbolically shouldered that

\(^{412}\) Commager, *Collection*, p. 64.
\(^{413}\) Commager, *Collection*, p. 86.
\(^{414}\) Commager, *Collection*, p. 85.
\(^{415}\) Commager, *Collection*, p. 121.
burden too. He could never make his own choices, as his ill-fated encounter with Dido proved:

Generations of Latin teachers have felt it necessary to defend Aeneas from the charge of having been a cad.

With this riposte to Page and others, Parry reinforced his view of Virgil’s two parallel voices in the *Aeneid*, lamenting the private price even as he extolled the public achievement.

Two essays explored the significance of an image within a particular Book of the *Aeneid*. Bernard M.W. Knox, in “The Serpent and the Flame: the Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*” (1950), discussed the pervasive effect of the two recurrent images of serpent and flame, both associated with the destruction of Troy and, paradoxically, with its re-birth as the Rome of the future. Knox examined not only overt references to serpents and flames, but traced subtle allusions to both in Virgil’s use of words such as *lambere* and *labi/lapsus*, expressions like *insinuat pavor* (2.229) and the names *Sinon* and *Pyrrhus*.

The essay “*Discolor Aura*: Reflections on the Golden Bough” by Robert A. Brooks (1953) discussed *Aeneid* 6 in relation to the golden bough as a central symbol,

---

representing the unknown and the unknowable, “alien things in union”, “death-in-life”.  

At the center of Virgil’s poem, the golden bough, in all its density of suggestion, is the primary symbol of this splendid despair.  

The cumulative effect of the essays in Commager’s collection would be to impress on readers the necessity of regarding every word written by Virgil as deliberate and significant. Rather than reading the Aeneid as a narrative, or even as a national morality tale about the moulding of the Roman hero, the student was encouraged to approach the poem as a work of complex craftsmanship in which major themes could be identified by tracing Virgil’s use of recurrent images, repeated vocabulary and turns of phrase, and by observing his empathetic depiction of human suffering.  

Kenneth Quinn’s publication, in 1968, of Virgil’s Aeneid – A Critical Description (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London), provided a very useful and influential manual for teachers and students. Although not always warmly applauded by academic writers, the book’s comprehensive scope, organized content, and lucid, almost colloquial, style made it a very attractive resource for schools. The appended List of Passages Discussed (totalling 158, derived from all Books of the Aeneid) allowed quick reference to specific sections, while the lengthy fourth chapter of the main body of the text offered a

---

418 Commager, Collection, p. 154.  
419 Commager, Collection, p. 163.  
421 Quinn, Critical Description, pp. 98-276.
detailed analysis of the structure and content of each Book. In addition, Quinn included a discussion of Virgil’s themes and purposes and of his synthesis of various literary traditions. Teachers and students seeking help with literary criticism could find a detailed analysis of grammatical features, vocabulary, sentence structure and imagery. The only serious omission was the lack of any systematic discussion of Virgil’s employment of aural effects, an omission acknowledged by Quinn, who referred the reader to other sources of information on such matters.\footnote{422 Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 415, n.1.} First “recommended” in 1979, Quinn’s book was repeatedly listed for as long as such official reading lists for Latin were issued by the Board of Senior School Studies.\footnote{423 \textit{Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects and Works etc.},1979 (p. 32), 1983 (p. 35) and 1985 (p. 51).}

The accessibility of Quinn’s book for comparatively unscholarly readers was explained in his Preface and opening chapter. He had begun the book while preparing a series of lectures for students in Melbourne,\footnote{424 Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. x.} and sought to present the \textit{Aeneid} to a generation who largely lacked familiarity with the literary tradition of the “great European classics”, and could not gain much from works of scholarship that assumed such familiarity.\footnote{425 Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 1-2.}

Quinn presented the \textit{Aeneid} as a poem consciously written to rival Homer,\footnote{426 Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 43.} but equally consciously written with a moral purpose that was very different from anything
The heroic impulse that governed Homeric characters was shown by Virgil to be inadequate for a new age.\textsuperscript{428}

The \textit{Aeneid} is a poem about a leader who has to learn to lead, who makes the mistakes that leaders make.\textsuperscript{429}

In short, the \textit{Aeneid} was not just a heroic story; nor, despite its patriotism,\textsuperscript{430} was it a panegyric of Augustus;\textsuperscript{431} it was an expression of a “moral truth” which the audience of Virgil’s time was ready to hear.\textsuperscript{432} To produce such a poem Virgil had to synthesize five different elements: contemporary issues (such as the resolution of the Civil Wars), a respectful selection from Roman history, a tale from the world of myth and legend, epic poetry of the Homeric genre, and finally, a symbolic style of writing that admitted levels of interpretation beyond the apparent events of the narrative—“large-scale transfers of significance”\textsuperscript{433}. The result of this synthesis was a unique work of art.

While acknowledging and accepting Otis’ emphasis on Virgil’s subjective approach and Pöschl’s on the symbolic and mystical aspects,\textsuperscript{434} Quinn stressed that these attributes rested on a carefully crafted structural basis. He divided and subdivided the \textit{Aeneid},

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[427] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 22, 45, 53.
\item[428] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 20.
\item[429] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 54. Here Quinn follows Heinze (tr. Harvey/Robertson) p. 224: “we should not regard Aeneas as an ideal hero . . . but as a man who learns how to become a hero in the school of fate.”
\item[430] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 22.
\item[431] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 49.
\item[432] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 22.
\item[433] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 56.
\item[434] Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 77n.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
arriving at a hierarchy comprising Sections, Episodes, Tableaux and Vignettes.\textsuperscript{435} Such structure provided the narrative with a succession of highlights and memorable passages which drew the reader’s attention and prevented monotony. This breakdown was particularly useful to a teacher preparing a prescribed text for an examination class: the text could be presented in easily-comprehended sub-divisions, each with its own features of interest. Quinn’s detailed synopsis of each of the twelve Books gave further help to teachers in developing a coherent and dramatically involving presentation of a particular prescription.

Quinn was especially successful in imparting to modern students a means of appreciating Virgil’s narrative technique. Using the language of film, he analysed Virgil’s ability to produce changes in tempo, perspective and degree of involvement in the action:

\begin{quote}
The effect may be compared to a technique of film-making: the camera starts at some distance from a scene and moves progressively closer to it, securing not only greater detail, but an illusion of participation in the action.\textsuperscript{436}
\end{quote}

Virgil’s changes of tempo and perspective were attributed in large part to his creative use of verb tenses: the historic present to bring the reader, as it were, face-to-face with the action,\textsuperscript{437} the imperfect to focus on duration when that was significant,\textsuperscript{438} and the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{435} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{436} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{437} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 83 and 89.
\textsuperscript{438} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 93.
\end{footnotesize}
perfect, used either to show abrupt action\textsuperscript{439} or to effect closure and distancing at the end of an incident.\textsuperscript{440} These techniques were given further analysis in a presentation to HSC students as part of an organized Study Day in 1999, when Virgil’s use of tenses in \textit{Aeneid} 12 was discussed by the present writer in the context of his success as a storyteller.\textsuperscript{441} Unlike Quinn, however, this lecture emphasized the \textit{aural} impact of Virgil’s poetry on a listening audience, an aspect that had been receiving much more attention in the last decade of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

Quinn offered guidance on Virgil’s treatment of the gods, a topic that appeared regularly in examination essay questions:

Discuss the significance of the part played by divine powers in the \textit{Aeneid}, with particular reference to the Fourth Book. (1977 3 Unit)

Discuss the role of the gods in Book 4 of Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid}. To what extent are they responsible for the tragic outcome. (1983 3 Unit)

Quinn’s view was that Virgil’s interest was primarily in the psychological or moral impetus for a character’s actions, but that he used the divine machinery he had inherited from the Homeric tradition for two purposes: firstly, to prompt the reader to consider the story as a parable consistent with the Stoic view of Fate, and secondly, to keep the story within the realm of fantasy rather than history.\textsuperscript{442} Where a divinity was the ostensible cause of a character’s action, Virgil made sure that sufficient motive could be found

\textsuperscript{439} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 91.
\textsuperscript{440} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 92.
\textsuperscript{442} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 303-5.
within that character’s own nature.\textsuperscript{443} All in all, Quinn did not find Virgil successful in his employment of the gods in the \textit{Aeneid}:

\ldots success eluded him. His attempt to restrict the divine machinery so that it will not overshadow the heroic action has resulted in a serious loss of dramatic plausibility.\textsuperscript{444}

In his treatment of Virgil’s language and style, Quinn provided a range of observations and examples that were helpful in approaching exercises in literary analysis. He pointed out that sophisticated language was a feature of Augustan poetry, used not just to communicate ideas, but to challenge the audience intellectually.\textsuperscript{445} In Virgil he described innovations in expressions like \textit{stant lumina flamma} (\textit{Aen.} 6.300), and subtle jumps in the meaning of words (“semantic gaps”), latent metaphors, deliberate ambiguity, and learned puns based on etymology.\textsuperscript{446} In Quinn’s view, the ambiguity that can result from imprecisely defined case-endings in Latin was a deliberate feature of Virgil’s style. It had appeal for an audience who, unlike modern readers, were familiar with the double meaning of oracular pronouncements:

We have lost the habit of regarding words as slippery customers.\textsuperscript{447}

Some difficulties in translation could thus be regarded as legitimate obscurities. Students could be told that sometimes there was more than one “correct meaning”, and that such ambiguity was a feature of Virgil’s style.

\textsuperscript{443} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 319 re Dido and Amata.
\textsuperscript{444} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 306.
\textsuperscript{445} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 370.
\textsuperscript{446} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 386-394.
\textsuperscript{447} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 408.
Assistance was offered with analysis of Virgil’s syntax, his use of repetition, especially for pathos,\textsuperscript{448} and, finally, his use of imagery.\textsuperscript{449} Quinn classified Virgil’s similes into two broad types: the visual, intended to make the object of comparison more vivid in the reader’s imagination,\textsuperscript{450} and the emotional, in which a mental state was represented by visual or aural imagery.\textsuperscript{451} In the latter type Virgil, unlike Homer, often introduced an ironical touch. Analysis of similes was regularly required in examination questions, especially in the short-answer format that was adopted in 1977 and followed to the end of the century.\textsuperscript{452}

In conclusion, \textit{Virgil’s Aeneid – a Critical Description} was a very useful handbook that accorded well with the critical approach required in Latin examinations in the last two decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Only the shorter book by W.A. Camps, \textit{An Introduction to Virgil’s Aeneid} (OUP 1969) provided similar help to the same readership. The teaching of literary criticism of Virgil to students who had read less original Latin than those of earlier times and whose grasp of Latin grammar was more tenuous was a challenge to New South Wales teachers in the late 1970s and beyond. This task had been anticipated in England a decade earlier by the authors of \textit{Aestimanda},\textsuperscript{453} a ground-breaking

\textsuperscript{448} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 428.
\textsuperscript{449} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 431-7.
\textsuperscript{450} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, pp. 432-6.
\textsuperscript{451} Quinn, \textit{Critical Description}, p. 436-7.
\textsuperscript{452} See pp. 64ff. of this study.
\textsuperscript{453} M.G. Balme and M.S. Warman, \textit{Aestimanda – practical criticism of Latin and Greek poetry and prose} (OUP 1965).
textbook that did not have wide application in Australia, for reasons that will be discussed later in this study.

The characteristics of the major Augustan poets, including Virgil, were discussed by Gordon Williams in *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968). This book was listed in the 1974 official pamphlet issued to support the restructured Latin syllabus first examined in 1976. It’s subject was the Augustan poets’ creation of new works of literature by synthesizing a variety of traditional ideas and forms. Despite the author’s hope that the book would “interest a wide audience”, not confined to “classical scholars”, it did not provide any introductory guidance through the works of any of the Augustan poets. Instead it offered insights into their ideas, sources, methods of composition and poetic techniques, classified under broad chapter headings such as “The Blending of Greek and Roman”, “Interest in the Individual” and “Observation, Description and Imagination”. The student of Virgil would find that references to that poet were scattered throughout the book: these could be located by means of the useful index of “Poems and Passages Discussed” which listed 27 references from the *Eclogues*, 28 from the *Georgics* and 51 from all Books of the *Aeneid* except the third.

Of all the Augustan poets, Gordon Williams considered Virgil to be the most successful in combining “tradition and originality”:

---
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Virgil’s imagination was more powerful and original than that of any other Roman poet: he had
the capacity to take an idea and make something entirely new out of it, combining it with elements
from anywhere and everywhere.457

Virgil’s means of achieving this success were explored among discussions of other
Augustan poets and earlier Greek and Latin writers. What follows here is a summary of
those observations on Virgil that had the most relevance for teachers and students at
school after 1974. The substantial discussions of the Eclogues, for example, are not
included in the summary, as these poems were not prescribed for examination and were
rarely, if ever, read in schools.

Like the other Augustan poets, Virgil took his task seriously. The word vates, now in
use to denote a poet, implied a dignified, semi-religious or prophetic role.458

Virgil shares with the reader a serious experience which is objectified by being focused into a
work of art.459

Moral, political and historical ideas, therefore, underpinned Virgil’s artistic creations.
His mythological narrative in the Aeneid and didactic exposition of agriculture in the
Georgics allowed deliberate glimpses of the sweep of Roman history, the building of the
Roman character and the culmination of both in the age of Augustus.460 Virgil’s indirect
approach to his main themes allowed him to avoid gross flattery (even in the direct

---

457 G. Williams, Tradition and Originality, p. 95.
458 G. Williams, Tradition and Originality, p. 47.
459 G. Williams, Tradition and Originality, p. 56.
460 G. Williams, Tradition and Originality, p. 75.
address to Octavian in *Georgics* 1.24-42\(^{461}\) and to portray Octavian’s triumphs on the shield of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 8.714-28), a literary device that admitted patriotic sentiments within the respected frameworks of Homeric precedent and Hellenistic ecphrasis.

Gordon Williams offered a number of examples to illustrate Virgil’s successful synthesizing of traditions. Dido’s final words (*Aeneid* 4.651-8), for instance, were described as “a mosaic pattern of intricate design”,\(^ {462}\) combining elements from Greek tragedy and Roman memorials, with Homeric echoes and an ending that recalled Catullus. Virgil’s ability to combine ideas in the composition of *Aeneid* 4 resulted in “one of the great poetic conceptions of the ancient world”.\(^ {463}\) In the story of Dido and Aeneas, Virgil had taken a mythological romance analogous to that of Medea and Jason in the *Argonautica* and permeated it with concepts that were essentially Roman: the untrustworthy nature of Carthage,\(^ {464}\) Dido’s moral obligation to retain her status as *univira*,\(^ {465}\) the supernatural wedding with its Roman ceremonial features.\(^ {466}\) These elements, combined with the Homeric/Hellenistic involvement of the gods, enabled Virgil to portray both Dido and Aeneas with dignity, though Gordon Williams thought he came “close to making Aeneas dishonorable”,\(^ {467}\) requiring Mercury to play the part of Aeneas’ conscience to awaken him to his duty.

\(^{461}\) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, pp. 93-5.
\(^{462}\) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, p. 262.
\(^{463}\) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, p. 375.
\(^{466}\) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, p. 379.
\(^{467}\) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, p. 383.
The journey to the Underworld in Book 6 was also a triumph of Virgil’s ability to draw from different traditions.\textsuperscript{468} The reader was expected to recognize the references to earlier Greek and Roman literature\textsuperscript{469} and to familiar Roman institutions, such as trial procedures described in Roman terms (\textit{Aeneid} 6.431-3). The journey culminated, of course, in the parade of Roman celebrities and the very Roman precepts of Anchises (\textit{Aeneid} 6.847-53) - one of the three set-pieces in the \textit{Aeneid} extolling the \textit{pax Romana}.\textsuperscript{470}

As well as the content, Gordon Williams discussed Virgil’s language and style, his powers of description, his innovative use of Latin and his creative development of the traditional simile. A typical Virgilian descriptive technique he called “theme and variation”,\textsuperscript{471} – an expression coined by J. Henry in 1873\textsuperscript{472} – in which the poet restated the same idea in different words, often from a different perspective. An example of this technique could be seen in \textit{Aeneid} 1.159-169, a description of landscape derived from several Homeric precedents; in this passage the phrase \textit{silvis scaena coruscis / desuper}, containing the arresting metaphor \textit{scaena} (“backdrop”) was paralleled by \textit{horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbra}. The first colon gave the impression of flashing light (\textit{coruscis}), the second one of darkness and shadow (\textit{atrum, umbra}).\textsuperscript{473} So vivid was

\begin{itemize}
  \item G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 285.
  \item G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, pp. 395-7
  \item G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 389 and p. 642.
  \item J. Henry, \textit{Aeneidea}, Williams and Norgate, London, 1873, Vol 1, p. 205: “thus we have at last ... a variation – if I may apply to poetry an expression almost consecrate to music – of the theme ...” On this feature as being peculiarly Virgilian, see Vol. 3, p. 731.
  \item G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, pp. 637-644.
\end{itemize}
Virgil’s description of this place that ancient commentators were convinced of its existence and tried in vain to locate it.\textsuperscript{474}

Other characteristics of Virgil’s expression were analysed: his ability to capture the essence of an object, using words to suggest rather than to describe,\textsuperscript{475} his capacity to be serious without pomposity,\textsuperscript{476} his implicit communication of emotion so that the reader would perceive it for himself,\textsuperscript{477} Rhetorical devices,\textsuperscript{478} word-order,\textsuperscript{479} archaic or colloquial vocabulary,\textsuperscript{480} and a developed use of the simile\textsuperscript{481} were all part of Virgil’s technique; his outstanding characteristic, however, was his use of words in unexpected, multi-faceted or extended meanings. Examples of such language were given: \textit{sic volvere Parcas} (\textit{Aeneid} 1.22), or \textit{spem fronte serenat} (\textit{Aeneid} 4. 474),\textsuperscript{482} with the comment, “the writing of Virgil is dense with phrases like those”.\textsuperscript{483}

Although Gordon Williams considered Virgil to be the outstanding Latin poet and discussed many examples from his works, \textit{Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry} was not a convenient handbook for the teacher seeking a systematic guide to a prescribed Book of Virgil. It offered a detailed and comprehensive discussion of the

\textsuperscript{474} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 643.
\textsuperscript{475} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 662.
\textsuperscript{476} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 722.
\textsuperscript{477} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 724.
\textsuperscript{478} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 725.
\textsuperscript{479} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, pp. 728-9.
\textsuperscript{480} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, pp. 737-8.
\textsuperscript{481} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, pp. 732-6.
\textsuperscript{482} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 739.
\textsuperscript{483} G. Williams, \textit{Tradition and Originality}, p. 740.
nature of Augustan poetry, in which elements of earlier Greek and Roman literature, traditions and institutions, both actual and imaginary, were blended to produce literary masterpieces of a new type. Read in its entirety, the book would provide the Latin teacher with an excellent understanding of several authors commonly studied at school, including Catullus, Horace and Ovid, as well as Virgil. The arrangement of the book, however, made it difficult to extrapolate information about Virgil in isolation, and indeed the wide range of the content would discourage the reader who needed specific guidance on one work or one poet. For school students themselves, the book was far too advanced. It is perhaps significant that after its initial inclusion in the official list in 1974, it was not recommended again as background reading for teachers.

A more accessible guide for teacher and students, included in every list of recommended reading from 1971 to 1985, was *An Introduction to Virgil’s Aeneid* by W.A. Camps (OUP 1969). Writing expressly for students, including first-time readers of Virgil, and those unacquainted with Homer, Camps offered eleven short chapters, each covering a significant aspect of the *Aeneid*. The structure of the book, and its comparative brevity, would encourage the reader to peruse it right through and so to gain both an overview of the *Aeneid* and a grasp of its outstanding features. The absence of an index of passages discussed, however, made it less than useful for quick reference.

---

486 110 pages in the main body of text.
Camps saw the *Aeneid* as a poem celebrating “the idea of Rome”, 487 but not as a work of political propaganda. 488 The structure he described as being essentially a division into two uneven sections: Books 1 to 4 (Carthage, Dido) and Books 7 to 12 (Italy, Turnus). The events in each section in turn were instigated by the malevolence of Juno, and ended with the death of the leading individual. The transitional section (Books 5 and 6) was concerned with Aeneas’ bond with his father Anchises. 489 Apart from these divisions, Camps described the *Aeneid* as “episodic” 490 in character and by no means flawless in design: two of his appendices dealt with discrepancies and imperfections in the structure of the poem.

While Camps clearly admired the *Aeneid* as an artistic achievement, he preferred to discuss and analyse its features objectively rather than to offer explicit praise. After summarizing the story 491 (“the most economical way of conveying an interpretation” 492), he pointed out that, while the *Aeneid* combined the subject-matter of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, 493 it was presented as the beginning of the ongoing story of Rome, thus abounding in references to the Italian scene and institutions familiar to Virgil’s readers. 494 The blending of Greek and Roman cultural elements, as seen in the story, was a continuing process in Virgil’s own day. 495

A whole chapter was devoted to the presentation of the hero, a type without precedent in Greek or Latin literature.\textsuperscript{496} Camps disagreed with those who found Aeneas a “puppet”, or otherwise lacking in emotion: he asserted that the hero struggled in trying to follow the dictates of Destiny and showed compassion as a major characteristic.\textsuperscript{497} With regard to Aeneas’ treatment of Dido, Camps acknowledged the opposing views that prevailed:

To some readers he has seemed a stiff and unfeeling figure . . . to others a romantic lover making an agonizing sacrifice.\textsuperscript{498}

Camps did not support either view, but referred to the connotations of \textit{amor} prevalent in Virgil’s time: a force that made its victims forget their normal responsibilities. Contemporary readers could not fail to think of Mark Antony’s behaviour when under the spell of Cleopatra.

A separate chapter dealt with Dido and Turnus, both sympathetically treated by Virgil as tragic victims, both showing in their natures the ungovernable passion (\textit{furor}) that was to lead to their destruction.\textsuperscript{499} They were manipulated by the gods and were not, in themselves, morally reprehensible. The various gods who intervened in the lives of

\textsuperscript{496} Camps, \textit{Introduction}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{498} Camps, \textit{Introduction}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{499} Camps, \textit{Introduction}, p. 40.
mortals were essentially self-interested, and could be deceitful and heartless.\textsuperscript{500} The exception was Jupiter, whose will was identified with Fate.\textsuperscript{501}

Camps described the confusion of ideas in Virgil’s time about the function of the supernatural. In general, Romans believed in the power of the gods rather than showing the scepticism expressed by Ovid and taken as typical by many modern readers.\textsuperscript{502} Fate, unlike the gods, could not be influenced by prayer or ritual,\textsuperscript{503} the outward manifestations of \textit{pietas}, but some aspects of Fate were not completely pre-ordained.\textsuperscript{504} Although, by the end of the \textit{Aeneid}, both Fate and all the gods supported Aeneas,\textsuperscript{505} Virgil’s view of the role of the supernatural was not an optimistic one. Confused, pessimistic feelings about the divine were widespread at the time\textsuperscript{506} and the \textit{Aeneid} was said to reflect “a feeling about the supernatural . . . congenial to Roman national sentiment but . . . profoundly discouraging to the individual”.\textsuperscript{507}

Chapter 7, “Poetic expression: language and sensibility”, contained many points that could be usefully applied in literary analysis of Virgil’s expression, although Camps asserted that Virgil’s achievement “resists analysis”.\textsuperscript{508} He commented on features such
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as vocabulary, syntax (including Virgil’s flexible use of cases) and the coining of compact and expressive phrases.\(^{509}\) Most particularly, he described Virgil’s tendency to employ common words with widened and expressive meanings.\(^{510}\) The effects of sound and rhythm were grouped into three categories: those engendered by the dactylic hexameter, employing either coincidence of accent and ictus or lack of it; those created by placement and patterning of the words (e.g. chiasmus, anaphora), and finally the effects of assonance and alliteration, whether for highlighting, emotional intensity or onomatopoeia.\(^{511}\)

“The Aeneid is full of echoes”,\(^{512}\) Camps wrote, and added that these echoes varied in purpose and significance: some established an equivalence with Homer;\(^{513}\) some contributed to a pattern or design; some might just be unconscious workings in the poet’s mind without particular significance.\(^{514}\) All were part of Virgil’s “kaleidoscopic rearrangement” of influences and motifs from Greek and Latin literature,\(^{515}\) and allusions to Italian landscape and legend, Roman institutions and historical and contemporary events. Camps warned against attributing significance to each and every repetition or verbal echo.\(^{516}\)

\(^{510}\) Camps, Introduction, p. 65.
\(^{511}\) Camps, Introduction, pp. 66-70.
\(^{512}\) Camps, Introduction, p. 105.
\(^{513}\) Camps, Introduction, p. 81.
\(^{514}\) Camps, Introduction, p. 106.
\(^{515}\) Camps, Introduction, pp. 75-83.
\(^{516}\) Camps, Introduction, p. 108.
That Camps was willing to leave difficult questions unanswered was illustrated in Chapter 9, the only chapter devoted to a single Book of the *Aeneid*. In this discussion of Book 6, Camps did not offer any definite interpretation of the meaning of the Golden Bough or of the Gates of Horn and Ivory.\(^{517}\) He presented Plato and Cicero as sources for some of Virgil’s ideas about the Underworld and re-incarnation, but did not ascribe these ideas to any particular doctrine.\(^{518}\) He remarked on the Sibyl’s continual insistence on haste, but did not venture on any interpretation of her role.\(^{519}\)

Camps covered all the major aspects of the *Aeneid* likely to be needed by the beginning reader. He did not take a strong line on the more controversial issues, but presented a generally dispassionate and factual account of the content, structure and composition of the *Aeneid*, suggesting some possibilities but leaving the final interpretation to the reader. His matter-of-fact style, conciseness and comprehensive coverage caused his book to be an enduring resource for teachers and students alike.

Less practical help for teachers and students could be found in the collection of essays on Virgil edited by D.R. Dudley, in the series *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969). As implied in the series title, four of the eight essays dealt with Virgil’s influence on later writers and artists, and not with the work of the poet himself. Of the remaining essays, none was strictly relevant to the

\(^{517}\) Camps, *Introduction*, p. 93.

\(^{518}\) Camps, *Introduction*, p. 91.

\(^{519}\) Camps, *Introduction*, p. 93.
changed needs of secondary students in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Despite
the limitations of the Virgil volume, the whole series was listed as being “of especial
interest and importance” in the official reading list issued in 1974.\footnote{Recommended Reading and Reference Material, Latin, Board of Senior School Studies, 1974.} The Virgil volume
was then separately recommended in the reading lists for 1979 and 1983.\footnote{Prescribed Texts, Topics etc.1979, p. 32 and 1983, p. 35.}

For a reading of the \textit{Aeneid}, the essay by Brooks Otis, “The Originality of the \textit{Aeneid}”,
provided an interesting study on Virgil’s reworking of Homer. Written in an easy,
colloquial style, Otis’ essay argued that in reproducing Homer in the \textit{Aeneid}, Virgil was
giving epic-heroic status to the idea of Augustan Rome,\footnote{Dudley (ed.), \textit{Studies}, p. 52.} while at the same time
showing how dissimilar both Aeneas and his mission were to the heroes and heroic
ordeal s depicted by Homer. The result was a creative work of unprecedented originality.

Otis’ essay would have seemed relevant to the 3 Unit Latin course launched in 1975: the
new syllabus referred to “the ability to discuss points of . . . literary history arising out
of the reading of works of particular authors”.\footnote{Latin Syllabus, 3 Unit, 2 Unit and 2 Unit A Courses, Board of Senior School Studies, 1974, p. 3.} In practice, however, teaching
emphases had changed: no questions on Virgil’s sources were ever asked in HSC
examinations after 1975.
R.D. Williams’ contribution, “Changing Attitudes to Virgil”, discussed the reception of Virgil’s works in England from the late seventeenth to the end of the nineteenth century. While the central issue was not relevant to the needs of school students in New South Wales, some of Williams’ remarks may have helped teachers to understand recent changes in Virgilian scholarship. He mentioned, for instance, the contemporary interest in studying “repeated imagery or psychologically significant symbols or numerical structure or semantic study of key words”.\(^{524}\) He put in perspective the nineteenth century Romantic preference for Homer and rejection of Virgil, and referred to the 1876 work of Sellar – a long-standing inclusion in New South Wales reading lists – as emphasizing the “pathos” in Virgil’s writing. Williams’ conclusion, that the excitement of the *Aeneid* resulted from its difficult combination of so many conflicting strands,\(^{525}\) offered teachers a useful lead in how to present the poem to students.

“Virgil’s Elysium”, by W.F. Jackson Knight, was included in this volume as a posthumous tribute.\(^{526}\) In this essay, Knight explored ideas of the after-life depicted in *Aeneid* 6, and recounted the episodes of the journey through the Underworld. He suggested sources and interpretations in the course of his account, and concluded that Virgil was combing two strands of belief: the Homeric and the Platonic.\(^{527}\) The essay contained many potentially useful insights into the intense and profound nature of *Aeneid* 6, and the importance of the journey in transforming the hero, but it lacked

\(^{524}\) Dudley (ed.), *Studies*, p. 119.  
\(^{525}\) Dudley (ed.), *Studies*, pp. 136-7.  
\(^{526}\) Dudley (ed.), *Studies*, Introduction, p. x.  
\(^{527}\) Dudley (ed.), *Studies*, p. 174.
precision, and its discursive method made it difficult to follow. As a guide to teachers or students of *Aeneid* 6, it would have little appeal.

In short, the volume on Virgil in *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence*, while containing much that was of general interest, was not particularly helpful to teachers or students in the last quarter of the century. The fact that it was recommended first in 1974, and then twice thereafter, must indicate a lack of communication between those who compiled the reading lists and the teachers for whom the lists were intended.

The 1979 list of recommended reading included *Aeneas and the Roman Hero*, by R.D. Williams (Macmillan Education 1973). This was the only listing of a book on Virgil written specifically for secondary school students. It belonged to a series, *Inside the Ancient World*, which included a number of short books on Cicero, Homer, Roman comedy, mythology and social issues such as education, democracy, trade and provincial government. This series was one of several produced in the early 1970s to support the new directions in classics teaching implemented at that time in Britain. Although *Inside the Ancient World* was aimed at students of the classical civilization courses then being developed, Williams included substantial extracts of Virgil in Latin, clearly intending to meet the needs of Latin students as well. The author was a respected Virgilian scholar and the editor of the 1972 commentary on the *Aeneid* that supplanted that of Page as the standard prescribed edition: these facts would certainly

---

528 Cunningham, M. General Editor’s Preface, p. 7.
have made *Aeneas and the Roman Hero* very acceptable as an adjunct to the teaching of the prescribed text.

*Aeneas and the Roman Hero* presented the political events of Virgil’s lifetime as the background against which the ideals of the *Aeneid* must be viewed. Virgil shared Augustus’ vision regarding the restoration of peace, stable government and traditional Roman virtues, and expressed this vision through the *Aeneid*. He realized, however that great suffering and sacrifice were demanded in the achievement of such ideals, and his poem was imbued with sympathy for the victims of Rome’s ascent to greatness.\(^{529}\)

After a discussion of the four famous passages which speak directly of Rome’s destined greatness,\(^ {530}\) Williams turned his attention to the type of hero Virgil created to lead his people to such greatness. He showed how Aeneas, though ostensibly a Trojan warrior from the world of Homer’s *Iliad*, could not remain a Homeric hero if he was to be the founder of the Roman race. He had to be a community leader, a man with social responsibility rather than personal prowess. In short, he had to be a man of *pietas*\.\(^ {531}\) Williams devoted thirty\(^ {532}\) of the seventy-one pages of this short book to a recounting of the whole *Aeneid*, illustrating Virgil’s portrayal of Aeneas’ development with key extracts in Latin (with translations). The problem of the ending of the poem was discussed but not resolved: “each reader must decide for himself whether Aeneas has

\(^{529}\) R.D. Williams, *Roman Hero*, pp. 16-17.
\(^{532}\) R.D. Williams, *Roman Hero*, pp. 31-60.
acted rightly or not”. The hero Virgil created was a complex character, sometimes admirable, sometimes not. This was a strength and not a weakness of the *Aeneid*.

Williams’ final chapter, “Virgil’s private voice: Dido, Turnus, Juno”, dealt with the poet’s treatment of those who represented opposition to the glorious destiny of Rome. Virgil’s sympathy with both sides marked his exceptional greatness and resulted in his enduring appeal to readers over many centuries. Both Dido and Turnus were portrayed as admirable and deserving of pity; the reader felt their defeat even while intellectually acknowledging that such defeat was necessary. In the remainder of the chapter Williams discussed Virgil’s view of human suffering. Was it divinely caused, as by Juno in the *Aeneid*? Was there a hope of reward in the after-life, as depicted in Virgil’s Elysium? Virgil had no firm doctrine to express on such matters, but only an amalgam of various philosophical ideas. In the last analysis, despite all the sorrows, Virgil was expressing an optimistic vision of human potential within the context of “the Roman mission”.

*Aeneas and the Roman Hero* effectively presented a valid interpretation of the essential message of the *Aeneid*, and justified the creation of a hero very different from the Homeric type. It gave a concise overview of the poem as an integrated work with a

---

533 R.D. Williams, *Roman Hero*, p. 60.
consistent theme, a very useful perspective for students whose direct experience of Virgil may have been little more than the reading in Latin of part of one Book.

“Dido’s Culpa”, an essay by Niall Rudd in his book *Lines of Enquiry* (CUP 1976), was recommended in 1983 to accompany the reading of *Aeneid* 4. Discussing the views of earlier scholars regarding the “tragedy” of Dido, Rudd cited Pease, De Witt, Maguinness, Quinn and Austin among those who had considered the story of Dido in this light. He went on to analyse what made it a “tragedy”. Dido, in his view, could not be correctly regarded as the victim of irrational malice on the part of the gods: Jupiter certainly had a strong sense of purpose, and even Juno had a rational agenda, namely to ensure the future greatness of Carthage.

Therefore the cause of Dido’s tragedy had to be sought in the concept of *hamartia*, interpreted by Pease as “flaw or error”. Rudd took issue with this definition, claiming that “flaw” and “error” were two different things, one a moral quality and the second an act. He examined various moral flaws attributed to Dido, such as inordinate susceptibility or wild impetuosity, but dismissed these as unjustified.536 What wrong act, then, had Dido committed? Not neglect of her city, which was actually under construction at the time of Mercury’s visit to Aeneas. Marriage to Aeneas, as Anna had pointed out, could be seen as a positive benefit to Carthage.

---

536 Rudd, “Dido’s Culpa”, p. 34.
There remained her lack of fidelity to Sychaeus. Glover, Quinn and Otis had all referred to Dido’s guilt in breaking this oath. Dido recognized that a relationship with Aeneas involved a breach of *pudor* (4.172). By viewing the relationship as marriage, she covered her *culpa* (4.172), but when faced with Aeneas’ imminent departure, her sense of guilt returned (4.322 *extinctus pudor*). Would the Romans of Virgil’s time, as some have asserted, set great value on *univiratus*? Rudd concluded that such views would have been outmoded: even Augustus had married Julia off after the death of her young husband Marcellus. Dido could not be considered reprehensible for marrying again.

What caused Dido’s tragedy, in Rudd’s opinion, was her error in not recognizing that her view of the relationship was not shared by Aeneas.537 She had not chosen to fall in love. The passion engendered in her by Venus and Cupid caused her to be overtaken by *furor*. She was wounded, inflamed, frenzied and finally overcome by forces she could not control. She killed herself because she could not bear what she perceived as betrayal and humiliation, not because she deserved death.538

Rudd’s essay summarized previous views of Dido as a tragic heroine, and presented a reasoned argument to the effect that, in Virgil’s view, Dido did not deserve her fate.539 Such an essay, if read by students under a teacher’s guidance, would stimulate
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537 Rudd,”Dido’s Culpa”, p. 49.
538 Rudd,”Dido’s Culpa”, pp. 52-53.
539 Rudd, ”Dido’s Culpa”, p. 53: Aen.6.475- casu . . . iniquo.
classroom discussion and encourage close examination of the Latin text. For example, how are the words *facta impia* (4.596) to be interpreted? Rudd followed Williams and Austin in understanding them to refer to Dido’s own actions, but could they not be justified as referring bitterly to Aeneas? Students would probably enjoy discussing such questions, and would be interested in the dilemmas and choices faced by the characters. The degree of responsibility that belonged to human beings when manipulated by the gods was a subject of perennial interest. These issues were likely to engage adolescents and to impress on them the “relevance” of the *Aeneid* to their own lives, a consideration very much in keeping with the educational thinking of the 1970s and 1980s.

The central aim of education . . . is to guide individual development . . . towards perceptive understanding, mature judgement, responsible self-direction and moral autonomy.  

How far removed the Latin syllabus committees generally were from current educational priorities in the 1980s may be illustrated by examining two articles that were recommended to support the 1985 prescription of *Aeneid*. Although both were written in the 1960s, it is convenient to discuss them at this point, in the context of the last official reading list to be issued. The discontinuation of such lists may have been induced by the nature of their content which bore little relevance to the needs of the HSC candidates of the mid-1980s.

---

540 Rudd, "Dido’s Culpa", p. 41.
542 *Prescribed Texts, Topics* etc. 1985, p. 51.
The first article was “Vergil’s Aeneid and Homer”, by G.N. Knauer (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, 5:2, 1964, pp. 61-84). Knauer sought to demonstrate that in composing the Aeneid Virgil had compressed large sections of the Homeric poems and combined the roles of several characters from both the Iliad and the Odyssey to form the structure of his own poem. Thus his adaptation of Homer was far more radical and substantial than the mere appropriation of details or incidents and his hero, Aeneas, was both to combine and to morally surpass the heroes in Homer. 543

Only a small part of the article dealt directly with Aeneid 8, the text prescribed for 1985. 544 Knauer pointed out that various sections of this Book were derived from the Odyssey, but that the episode of the Shield was modelled on the Iliad. Therefore Aeneas’ situation on his landing in Latium was equated with both that of Odysseus on arrival in Ithaca and that of Achilles after the death of Patroclus.

The usefulness of this article for secondary school teaching is hard to justify. It assumed a close knowledge of the Iliad and the Odyssey in Greek and an acquaintance with earlier scholarship on Virgil’s Homeric sources. It is doubtful that either students or their teachers would have developed deeper insights into the major issues in Aeneid 8 as a result of reading it

The second article, on the same reading list, would at first appear more relevant to the study of Aeneid 8. It was “The Hercules-Cacus Episode in Aeneid VIII”, by G.K.

543 Knauer, “Virgil’s Aeneid and Homer”, p. 81.
544 Knauer, “Virgil’s Aeneid and Homer”, pp. 76-78.
Galinsky (American Journal of Philology, Vol. 87, 1966, pp. 18-51). This made reference to a number of earlier studies on the structure and unification of the Aeneid through motifs, symbols and parallels within the poem.\(^{545}\) Galinsky took the view that the Hercules-Cacus episode supplied links with other parts of the Aeneid, to reveal structural connections, particularly with Books 2 and 12, through symbols and recurrent motifs, such as the imagery of serpents, fire and rocks. Through references to the Underworld and its creatures, he also found links between Book 6 and Book 8, reinforcing the view of a tripartite structure to the Aeneid.\(^{546}\) Most significantly, Galinsky interpreted the episode as representing the struggle between Aeneas and Turnus, going to some lengths to demonstrate verbal associations that would identify Cacus with Turnus.\(^{547}\)

This article provided the opportunity to examine Virgil’s language in detail, and to discuss the significance of the most extensive and self-contained mythological digression in the Aeneid. This opportunity, however, was unlikely to have been used in 1985, as the prescription (lines 1-125 and 370-731)\(^{548}\) did not include the Hercules-Cacus episode at all! It could have proved most useful in 1992-3, when a different selection from Book 8 was prescribed: lines 101-369 and 454-593,\(^{549}\) but the reading lists had now been discontinued. The emphasis of the 1992 Syllabus on the “Latin being read”\(^{550}\) expressly discouraged the use of commentaries and scholarly studies in favour of direct engagement with the text.

\(^{545}\) Galinsky, “Hercules-Cacus”, p. 18.
\(^{547}\) Galinsky, “Hercules-Cacus”, p. 26ff.
\(^{548}\) Prescribed Texts, Topics etc. 1985, p. 50.
\(^{549}\) Prescribed Texts, Topics etc. 1992, p. 179.
\(^{550}\) 2/3 Unit Latin Syllabus, 1992, p. 17.
What emerges is the confusion of purpose and lack of communication among syllabus committee members, examiners and classroom teachers during the 1980s as to what approach to take in the teaching of Virgil at secondary school level. The outpouring of literary criticism in the 1960s was manifested in the generous reading lists issued until the mid-1980s, sometimes with little regard for relevance to the prescribed text or to appropriate levels of scholarship. The discontinuation of reading lists after 1985, on the other hand, left teachers without guidance as to more recent academic works. The gap was to some extent filled by HSC Study Days,\textsuperscript{551} some professional conferences and in-service sessions for teachers and local publications such as \textit{Classicum}, founded in 1975 and published jointly by the Classical Association of New South Wales and the Classical Languages Teachers Association. The contribution of these professional initiatives to the teaching of Virgil is discussed in Chapter 3 of this study.

\textbf{ii. Prescribed commentaries}

The two-volume edition and commentary of the \textit{Aeneid} by R.D. Williams (Macmillan, 1972-3) was quickly taken up by the Latin syllabus committee. In a circular Memorandum to School Principals regarding the prescribed texts for 1973, the official recommendation was T.E. Page’s edition of \textit{Aeneid} 2, with the following appended remarks:

\textsuperscript{551} Re-introduced by the Classical Languages Teachers Association in 1978.
This latter edition is due to lapse out of print, being superseded by an edition of *Aeneid I-VI* by R.D. Williams. Teachers will find this edition most helpful. . .

In the prescriptions for 1975, Page and Williams were listed side by side, although “the text used in the examination” was still to be that of Page. By 1977 Williams had replaced Page as the text “cited in the examination” and has remained the official text ever since.

Williams’ edition was aimed at senior secondary and undergraduate students. While he praised the work of Page, (“one of the most perceptive commentators Virgil has ever had”) he indicated that his own commentary would take a different direction:

In seventy years our approaches to poetry have changed and our knowledge of the ancient world has been enlarged in many ways, and the times call for a new commentary in a more modern idiom.

In his bibliography Williams included many of the works on Virgil already discussed in this study: Sellar, Glover, Jackson Knight, Bowra, Pöschl, Otis, Wilkinson, Parry, Putnam, Commager, Quinn, Dudley and Camps, and also Heinze, Perret and others who were not included in the Recommended Reading Lists in New South Wales.

Williams’ Introduction was more systematically arranged than that of Page, and provided a clear, succinct guide to the background of the *Aeneid* and to the areas most essential for the beginning reader. He summarized the reception of the *Aeneid* at different periods of
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553 Memo to School Principals, 22nd October, 1973, Circular 18.
554 1977 Prescribed Texts, Topics etc., Board of Senior School Studies, p. 21.
556 *ibid*.
557 *ibid*. 
history, concluding with the later twentieth-century interest in the contradictions inherent in the poem, particularly the tensions between its “private” and “public” aspects and between the divine and human operations in the narrative. Students were supplied with basic information on Virgil’s life and his relationship with Augustus to the conclusion that Virgil agreed with Augustan ideals but could not be fairly called a propagandist. Virgil’s sources were outlined: the legend of Aeneas, already existing but not inflexible; the Greek and Latin poets, from Homer to Catullus from whom Virgil drew ideas, structures and expressions to enable him to create “a brilliant personal synthesis of the human situation as it had been seen through many different eyes”.\textsuperscript{558} Following a concise synopsis of the narrative, Williams provided the students with a simplified guide to the major issues in Virgilian scholarship of the preceding decade (the 1960s), under the heading “Structure and Themes”.\textsuperscript{559} He pointed out the internal patterns of construction of the \textit{Aeneid}: as well as the more obvious two-part and three-part divisions, correspondences and contrasts between various Books had been identified, which indicated that the \textit{Aeneid} had been composed as a well-designed and integrated work.

The themes of the \textit{Aeneid} were summarized as the exploration of three areas of tension or contrast: first, the optimistic view of Rome’s greatness seen against the human suffering that was its price; secondly, the need for a new type of Roman heroism that was different from the Homeric type; thirdly, the contrast between the divine and human worlds, a contrast more complex than that found in Homer. Virgil emphasized the Stoic concept of

\textsuperscript{558} Williams, \textit{Aeneid I-VI}, p. xvi.
\textsuperscript{559} Williams, \textit{Aeneid I-VI}, pp. xix-xxv.
Fate and Jupiter as Fate’s executor, carrying out a plan that is ultimately for man’s benefit.

A short guide to Virgil’s use of the hexameter indicated its most successful characteristics: the interplay between sentences and line-endings, the controlled use of irregularities for special purposes and the exploitation of both coincidence and conflict of accent and ictus to produce particular effects.

Williams’ Introduction was analytical rather than descriptive. He did not praise Virgil’s achievement, nor single out particular Books for admiration or censure. In discussing the character of Aeneas, Williams acknowledged that the hero depicted by Virgil was not “entirely successful in realizing this new concept of heroism”. He did not, however, view this lack of success as a failure on the part of the poet, but rather as an expression of Virgil’s intention to involve his readers in a difficult and unresolved moral dilemma. In his Introduction, Williams provided both a useful outline for a teaching program on the Aeneid and a stimulus for classroom discussion and controversy.

As has previously been done in discussing Page’s commentary, Williams’ notes on Aeneid 2 (the most frequently prescribed Book) have been used as a representative sample of his work. An “introductory note” in the form of a short essay directed the reader to the structure, themes and special features of each Book. In the case of Aeneid 2, the introductory note emphasized the dark, tragic intensity of “the night which preceded

560 Williams, Aeneid I-VI, p. xxiii-xxiv.
the dawn of Roman civilization”. Williams divided the Book into three episodes, dealing respectively with the Wooden Horse, the sack of the city leading to the death of Priam, and the escape of Aeneas and his family. Much of his introductory note described the effect of events on Aeneas himself: the realization that he now bore new responsibilities and had to set aside his personal desires and sufferings in the interests of a national future. Shorter introductory paragraphs divided up the body of the commentary, summarizing each incident, interpreting the action and pointing out the outstanding features of the section, including its mood, tone and pace. In this way Williams provided far more guidance for the student than Page had done in his very brief sectional summaries.

Williams’ intention seemed to be to supplement rather than replace Page’s notes. While bearing in mind the fact that Williams’ commentary on Aeneid 2 was somewhat shorter than Page’s, it may be useful to compare the number of entries in each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN FOCUS OF NOTE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>WILLIAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation of words, phrases or longer extracts</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of references (myth,cultural,historical etc)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical points</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone, mood, irony, subtle meanings</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetic devices- figures of speech, alliteration etc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

561 Williams, Aeneid I-VI, p. 215.  
562 an approximate calculation: Williams 1990 lines, Page 2770 lines.
Williams provided fewer translations, seldom translating lines already rendered by Page, unless it was to offer a more modern version, as can be seen for lines 2.142-3:

\[ \textit{per si qua est quae restet adhuc mortalibus usquam} \]

\[ \textit{intemerata fides} \]

\textit{Page}: if any pledge there be such as still remains anywhere among mortal men inviolable...

\textit{Williams}: by any faith which anywhere still remains uncorrupted among men. . .

The much smaller number of comments on tone, mood and nuances of feeling in Williams can be explained by his inclusion of such observations in his introductory remarks, whereas it was Page’s practice to make such comments in the course of his notes, leaving to the reader the task of drawing together a general impression of each section. With respect to poetic devices, Williams gave clear explanations of similes, explicitly enumerating the points of comparison, and showing the effect created in the context. To take as an example the simile in 2.304ff. (Aeneas compared to a shepherd surveying destruction), Page gave help with the translation and provided a Homeric precedent, while Williams explained the main point of similarity, outlined the Homeric precedent and indicated how Virgil had modified Homer to suit his purpose. To take another example, for the simile in 2.626ff. (the fall of Troy compared to a crashing tree), Williams listed three points of similarity, commented on the effect and provided a translation. Page also explained the simile, offered a translation, and in addition, made a very perceptive remark:
The tree, it will be observed, is uprooted, not cut down.

In referring to sound effects such as alliteration and assonance, Williams was the more assiduous. He noted, with reference to 2.53:

\[ \text{insonuere cavae gemitumque dedere cavernae} \]

The assonance of this line, intended to convey the reverberation caused by the quivering spear, is most remarkable, mainly because of the trochaic caesurae and the rhyme of \(-ere, ae\).

On the same line Page had simply remarked:

The repetition of sound is intentional.

Williams was more inclined to explore the technicalities of metre. His note on 2.266-7 read as follows:

\[ \text{caeduntur vigiles, portisque patentibus omnis} \]
\[ \text{accipiant socios atque agmina conscia iungunt.} \]

Notice how the fourth foot coincidence in 266 prepares for the even more decisive coincidence (diaeresis before and after a dactyl) of 267.

Page had made no metrical comment on these lines. Williams often directed the reader’s attention to the effect of the metrical arrangement, as in his comment on line 2.217:

\[ \text{corripiunt spirisque ligant ingentibus; et iam} \]

The unusual pause after the fifth foot, and the double monosyllable at the line ending, compel the attention for the statuesque description of the next two lines.

On this line, too, Page had been silent. As the examination questions from the 1980s onwards tended to require comment on the contribution of metrical effects to meaning and mood, teachers would have found guidance in Williams’ notes such as these. In
general, he provided a useful model for the kind of literary analysis students were increasingly expected to show, especially during the last decade of the twentieth century. A good example of this type of comment, again on a line ignored by Page, can be seen on 2.245:

\[ \textit{et monstrum infelix sacrata sistimus arce,} \]

Observe how the finality of this line is achieved by slow spondees, alliteration of \textit{s}, use of the powerful word \textit{monstrum}, and juxtaposition of the conflicting religious terms \textit{infelix} and \textit{sacrata}.

The comparison of Williams’ commentary with that of Page illustrates the changes in the teaching of Virgil that took place during the seventy years that separated them. In summary, Williams’ commentary was very much in line with the emphasis on literary criticism and analysis that was a feature of the teaching of Virgil from the 1970s on. It did not always provide the basic help with translation that school students required, perhaps because it was assumed that they could readily consult published translations. Because it was no longer usual for Latin students or for secondary school teachers to know Greek, even in Britain, Williams included very few Greek quotations, although he supplied references to the texts which then could be consulted either in the original or in translation. Progress in scholarship in areas such as textual criticism and metrical analysis was reflected in Williams’ greater attention to these aspects, to a degree that was too advanced for secondary school students. The absence of a vocabulary list was a great inconvenience: the publishers did not think fit to issue separate volumes (with vocabulary) for the Books commonly taught in schools, as had been done with Page. As
a result, teachers tended to rely on Williams for guidance on interpretation and literary analysis, while continuing to consult Page and other school editions for help with vocabulary and translation. Towards the end of the twentieth century, word-order vocabularies, like those included in reading courses like the Cambridge Latin Course, were being prepared by teachers for their classes to accompany the use of Williams’ edition. Some lists of this kind were made available for purchase. The expectation that students would prepare vocabulary lists themselves was becoming less common.

With Williams established as the examination text, it became the practice during the 1970s and thereafter to recommend additional commentaries to be used alongside that of Williams. These ranged from elementary school editions to serious works of scholarship. Their dates of publication spanned a period of fifty years, from 1941 to 1991: thus they represent different eras of Virgil teaching and scholarship. Some, because of their complexity and their price, would have been consulted mainly by teachers; other may have been regularly used by students to supplement or even replace the official edition by Williams.

563 A good example is Dido et Aeneas, a leaflet containing substantial portions of Aeneid 4, published in Unit V of The Cambridge Latin Course, 1974.

564 The catalogue of Teaching Materials issued by the American Classical League lists ‘Vergil Running Vocabularies’ for the first six Books of the Aeneid. (#B106). “An HSC Study Guide to Aeneid 12”, issued in 1996 and sold to most schools teaching the subject, was the work of the present author and contained a word-order vocabulary for the prescribed lines.
A selection of the recommended editions is discussed below, grouped by level of difficulty rather than by publication date. In several cases, an edition was already twenty or more years old when it first appeared on the official list.565

At the most elementary level were the editions of separate Books of the *Aeneid* by H.E. Gould and J.L. Whiteley, including Book 4 (1943), Book 6 (1946) and Book 8 (1952), published by Macmillan in the Modern School Classics series. The Foreward in these editions made it clear that these were texts prepared for schoolchildren with little experience of reading original Latin:

> In these times such pupils will need a great deal of help which in the spacious days of classical teaching fifty years ago they were considered not to require . . .

All the volumes contained the same Introduction, which included a biography of Virgil, a summary of the plot of the *Aeneid*, and a detailed guide to scansion of the hexameter. The *Aeneid* was praised for its “superlative artistry” and “sensitivity and sympathy with human troubles”.566 Without expressing agreement or otherwise, the editors referred to adverse judgements of the character of Aeneas “in whom *pietas* . . . is allowed prominence at the expense of warmer and more human feelings”.567 The Notes placed at the end of the text consisted almost entirely of very simple grammatical explanations and aids to translation. Mythological and other allusions were briefly explained. Literary comment was hardly attempted; the few examples that were included were rudimentary in nature:

---

565 A number of school editions, such as those of Gould and Whiteley, were reprinted in the 1980s by Bristol Classical Press, U.K.
Notice the alliteration in the phrase *magno misceri murmure – Aen.4.160*, intended to imitate the sound of distant thunder. This is an instance of what is called *onomatopoeia*, the matching of sound to sense.\(^568\)

An alphabetical vocabulary was placed at the end of each volume.

As commentaries, the Gould and Whiteley editions would not have prepared candidates adequately for literary analysis as required in the public examinations of the late 1970s and beyond. That they continued to be recommended alongside the Williams commentary in the official lists of 1977 and 1985\(^569\) probably reflected the need for students to have access to a vocabulary list, which Williams did not provide.

Only two years before the publication of the first of the Gould and Whiteley editions, Frank Fletcher had produced an edition of *Aeneid* 6 (Oxford 1941) which successfully combined the elementary needs of school students (vocabulary and a basic introduction to the works of Virgil) with more advanced literary commentary and references to other writers, both Greek and Latin.

Fletcher’s Preface expressed the same awareness as experienced by Gould and Whiteley, namely that during the 1940s Latin students did not generally have the years of language training and depth of classical knowledge that earlier commentators like Page could take for granted. Unlike Gould and Whiteley, however, Fletcher realized that, when the study of Latin was commenced at a later age, the students might compensate to some extent for their lack of linguistic knowledge by a greater interest in literary appreciation. It was

---

\(^{568}\) Gould & Whiteley, *Aeneid 4*, p. 73.

\(^{569}\) *Prescribed Text*, etc. for 1977, p. 21 and 1985, p. 50.
therefore appropriate to include more sophisticated literary interpretations as well as introductory help.\footnote{Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid 6}, Preface, p. vi.} Fletcher’s realization proved prophetic: sixty years after the appearance of his edition, students were approaching Virgil with even less Latin, often without fully completing a basic course in Latin syntax, but with more highly-developed skills in self-expression and critical thinking than younger students could show. Fletcher’s edition, now out of print, has been eagerly sought by Latin teachers preparing \textit{Aeneid 6} for the Higher School Certificate of 2005.

To support students with less experience of reading Latin, Fletcher preceded his alphabetical vocabulary list with a list of thirteen “Remarks” which contained useful, commonsense advice on translation, like the following:

7. In verse words may be arranged in ways that would be unnatural in prose . . . never fancy that in verse order has no relation to meaning and emphasis.\footnote{Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid 6}, p. 113.}

Readers unfamiliar with the \textit{Aeneid} could read “The Story of \textit{Aeneid} I-V” before embarking on the sixth Book.\footnote{Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid 6}, pp. xxix-xxxi.} The notes in the Commentary provided help with translation and explained Virgil’s many allusions to mythology, history and other references familiar to his contemporaries. Grammar was discussed only when it was unusual.

The notes were interesting as well as useful. Fletcher provided many insightful interpretations of Virgil’s lines, as exemplified by his comments on \textit{Aen.} 6.268:

\textit{ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram}
Suddenly, as in a dream, we find ourselves, we know not how, moving in the dim mysterious world of the dead. The effect of the magnificent line is enhanced by the ‘slow spondees’. Servius comments on the ‘hypallage’ or transference of epithets . . . We may say here, if we care to analyse, that the darkness of the night has passed into the hearts of the travellers, and the loneliness of their feelings seems to be part of the night itself.\textsuperscript{573}

Fletcher included an essay on the “literary and philosophical sources of \textit{Aeneid} VI”, advising that it should be read after studying the Latin text.\textsuperscript{574} Other supplementary material took the form of appendices on sections of the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey} used and transformed by Virgil in \textit{Aeneid} 6, and an “excursus” on the Virgilian hexameter. This section contained not only a basic guide to scansion but a discussion of the interplay of accent and \textit{ictus},\textsuperscript{575} different types of caesura and the use of elision.\textsuperscript{576} Examples of alliteration were included in the excursus on metre, with the final comment:

\begin{quote}
It will be found that the device gives life and character to single lines and groups of lines and helps to fix them in the memory. Virgil must have liked alliterations; he made so many.\textsuperscript{577}
\end{quote}

A series of texts with aims similar to those expressed by Fletcher was Methuen’s Classical Texts. The General Editor of the series, W.S. Maguinness, contributed an edition of \textit{Aeneid} 12 (1953), which was first listed as the recommended edition for study in 1968.\textsuperscript{578} It met the requirements of the new public examinations of the late 1960s, and anticipated the increasing interest in Virgil’s literary techniques. Maguinness’ Preface

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{573} Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid} 6, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{574} Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid} 6, p. vi.
\textsuperscript{575} Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid} 6, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{576} Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid} 6, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{577} Fletcher, \textit{Aeneid} 6, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{578} Another volume in the series, \textit{Georgics} I and IV, edited by H.H. Huxley, had been prescribed for the first Higher School Certificate examination in 1967-\textit{Education Gazette}, 1\textsuperscript{st} October, 1965, p. cclxiii.
\end{flushright}
mentioned senior school students (“sixth formers” in British terminology) and undergraduates, but also “the better class of GCE candidates at the Ordinary Level, for whose benefit a full Vocabulary has been compiled and a good deal of comparatively elementary matter has been included in the Notes.” Maguinness thus succeeded in producing an edition that was accessible to the less specialized Australian final-year school students, while still providing substantial information and stimulating their interest in more advanced areas of study. The provision of an alphabetical vocabulary was a great help; the brief summary of the Books of the *Aeneid* presumed no previous acquaintance with the poem; the Notes contained plenty of grammatical explanations and down-to-earth pointers to interpretation. The following examples with serve to illustrate Maguinness’ approach:

*(Aeneid 12.665) obstipuit:* an extremely powerful term, describing something like a mental ‘black-out’, as 1.669 shows.⁵⁷⁹

*(Aeneid 12.403) trepidare* has nothing to do with ‘trembling’; it describes the (usually foolish or ineffective) behaviour of a person not in control of himself through fear, excitement, anxiety, uncertainty or undue haste. It describes helpless fussing, in 1.737 the flurried haste that caused Turnus to take the wrong sword.⁵⁸⁰

Students and teachers preparing for public examinations would, of course, regard translation of the Latin text as their major task. Maguinness discussed an approach to translation in his Introduction, asserting that the only purpose of this exercise was to ensure that the meaning was understood, “as a preliminary to reading in the original”.⁵⁸¹ He objected to rendition into “a kind of English nowhere seen or heard except in the

---

⁵⁸⁰ Maguinness, *Aeneid XII*, p. 89.
Latin classroom”\textsuperscript{582} and considered that repeated reading of every line in Latin was essential. Only through such familiarization would the student come to understand Latin word-order and appreciate it as an essential part of the poet’s meaning, instead of “a gratuitous obstruction to understanding”.\textsuperscript{583} Maguinness alerted the student to the difficulties in finding exact correspondences between Latin and English words: his note on the words \textit{emicat} and \textit{molitur} (\textit{Aeneid} 12.327)\textsuperscript{584} suggested ways of communicating the sense of forceful Latin verbs through the use of descriptive phrases rather than solely by verbs in English.

Closely connected with Maguinness’ conviction that Virgil could only be properly understood in the Latin words themselves was his interest in the oral recitation of the poetry. Reading aloud expressively and with correct metre was essential. Practice in this skill was encouraged by “the increasing popularity of Latin Reading Competitions in schools”.\textsuperscript{585} Maguinness provided a clear and thorough explanation of the hexameter, also giving details of Virgil’s exploitation of irregularities,\textsuperscript{586} his effective placement of pauses\textsuperscript{587} and his disposition of accented syllables.\textsuperscript{588} The poetry had to be read with attention to both word-accent and quantity. Non-metrical sound-effects, such as alliteration, assonance, internal rhyme and repetition\textsuperscript{589} were also discussed as essential features of Virgil’s craft.

\textsuperscript{582} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{583} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{584} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{585} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. v.
\textsuperscript{586} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{587} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{588} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{589} Maguinness, \textit{Aeneid XII}, p. 35.
Maguinness did not analyse Virgil’s figurative language in as much depth. His approach to the similes was that they were a decorative or traditional component of epic poetry, rather than, in Virgil, a symbolic way of expressing mood and emotion at several levels.

Virgil’s similes are often unnecessary to the context, but they always add variety and beauty to his narrative, and sometimes provide a momentary relief in passages of horror, pathos or tension. 590 He failed to appreciate, for example, the contribution of the simile in Aen.12.331ff, in which Turnus was compared to Mars driving his war-horses into battle, causing distant lands to groan at the impact of the war-god and his dreadful retinue of Terror, Rage and Treachery. The emotional impact of this simile gave to Turnus, advancing in his chariot with deadly effect, a larger-than-life, terrifying grandeur. Maguinness did not appear to gain any such impression:

The poet acts for a moment as if he forgot that the function of the simile is that of comparison, and treats the picture it contains as one to be developed because of its own interest. 591 This treatment would mislead students, rather than help them to appreciate the function of similes in Virgil.

Maguinness’ general view of the Aeneid was that its ending expressed, not triumph, but tragedy. Dido and Turnus were both tragic figures, and even Aeneas, according to Dido’s curse (Aeneid 4.618-20) would not live long to enjoy his victory. Virgil felt deeply for his human characters, caught as they were “in a web of destiny”, 592 manipulated by irresponsible, selfish deities. The grand design – the story of Rome’s founding and

590 Maguinness, Aeneid XII, p. 17.
591 Maguinness, Aeneid XII, p. 18.
592 Maguinness, Aeneid XII, p. 12.
glorious future – was taken for granted by Maguinness and treated very briefly in his Introduction.

Maguinness’ edition of *Aeneid* 12 has been discussed at some length here because it was an example of an edition of Virgil which was well-suited to the level of final-year school students. It met the requirements of the public examinations of the late 1960s, and looked forward to the increasing interest in literary criticism that was developing at the time of its first inclusion on the official list (1968). Unfortunately, by the time that *Aeneid* 12 was prescribed again, in 1986, this edition had gone out of print, although it was still listed after the Williams edition as “also acceptable for study”.593 Although reprinted by Bristol Classical Press in 1992, it was not listed in the prescription of *Aeneid* 12 in 1996-1999.

The series, Methuen’s Classical Texts, also included an edition of *Georgics* 1 and 4, by H.H.Huxley (1963), that was prescribed for the first Higher School Certificate examination in 1967. The text to be read that year was the whole of *Georgics* 1. In 1982, *Georgics* 4 was set for study, using the same edition. The format of Huxley’s edition was much like that of Maguinness, and the content was aimed at the same level of readership. Like Maguinness, Huxley commended the benefits of reading Latin poetry aloud:

> To gain a true appreciation of the musical artistry of Virgil one must be prepared to read him aloud and to overcome the fashionable distaste for committing verses to memory.594

He referred to Maguinness’ explanation of the Virgilian hexameter in his Introduction,595 which, as well as a guide to metre, contained a brief history of didactic poetry from

---

593 1986 *Prescribed Texts, Projects, etc.* p. 57.
Hesiod onwards, a summary of all four Books of the *Georgics*, and a section on later didactic poetry.

At a higher level of scholarly sophistication were the editions of R.G. Austin. These commentaries on selected Books of the *Aeneid* were recommended for use by teachers to supplement the text set for examination, usually that of Williams. The first of these to be officially listed was the edition of *Aeneid* 4 (Oxford, 1955), described in the 1971 prescription list\(^596\) as “invaluable” as a resource for teachers. Austin’s later commentaries, on *Aeneid* 2 (1964) and *Aeneid* 6 (1977), were also recommended for teacher reference, the former in 1972 and 1979 and the latter in 1988. This discussion of Austin’s contribution is based on an examination of his commentary on *Aeneid* 4.

In his Preface, Austin explained that the commentary on *Aeneid* 4 had developed from his lectures to undergraduates in 1948. Like several other editors already mentioned in this study, Austin had found that the students of the 1940s lacked the intensive classical education of earlier times, often knowing no Greek and having had no training in verse composition. On the other hand, recent advances in the study of Virgilian style had yielded new approaches to stimulate the keen and able. It was timely to devise a commentary with a different emphasis. The result was an excellent resource for the secondary school teachers of the 1970s, many of whom would have fitted Austin’s description of his own students: they had less specialized classical knowledge but were ready and able to undertake detailed literary analysis of Virgil’s poetry.

\(^596\) *Education Gazette*, 1\(^{st}\) March, 1970, pp. 94-95.
The commentary was readable, comprehensive and very thorough. Of the 705 lines in *Aeneid 4*, Austin commented on all but sixteen.\(^{597}\) He gave generous help with translation and discussed the contribution of metrical and poetic features. He often devoted a lengthy dissertation to individual words, phrases or lines which seemed difficult, controversial, significant or just interesting. Some examples will serve to illustrate his approach.

More than two pages were given to Dido’s utterance in lines 550-1:\(^{598}\)

\[
\text{non licuit thalami experton sine crimine vitam}
\]
\[
\text{degere more ferae}
\]

After citing earlier editors, particularly Henry, but also Conington and Mackail, and comparing occurrences of the phrases *thalami experton* and *more ferae* in several Latin authors, Austin arrived at an interpretation of the passage that accorded well with Dido’s emotional state at this point in the narrative:

“\text{You would not let me live my life in widowhood, innocently, like a woodland creature, without tasting the bitterness of love like this.}”\(^{599}\)

He was not dogmatic about his conclusion:

“This is one of those passages which will have a different message for every reader of Virgil.”\(^{600}\)

On the words *at pius Aeneas* in line 393, Austin spent nearly two pages\(^{601}\) discussing the significance of the epithet *pius* and of its use at this point, the first occurrence since *Aen.*1.378. He condemned as “unjust and misleading”\(^{602}\) Page’s dismissive view of these words, concluding instead that they were “eloquent of struggle and bewilderment and

\(^{597}\) No comment on lines 59, 134, 136, 177, 182, 186, 200, 255, 267, 272, 282, 287, 324, 364, 611, 657.

\(^{598}\) Austin, *Aeneid IV*, pp. 163-5.

\(^{599}\) Austin, *Aeneid IV*, p. 164.

\(^{600}\) Austin, *Aeneid IV*, p. 164.

\(^{601}\) Austin, *Aeneid I*, pp. 121-123.

\(^{602}\) Austin, *Aeneid I*, p. 121.
submission”. Austin showed great sensitivity to Virgil’s powers of reticence in his portrayal of Aeneas, and his exploration of the various occurrences of \textit{pius} supported his view that Virgil intended the epithet to have a particularly poignant impact in this line.

Many comments dealt with Virgil’s metrical skill and its effects, although Austin did not include a formal explanation of the hexameter; instead he referred students to the editions by Fletcher and Maguinness discussed above. His extensive note on line 132

\begin{quote}
\textit{Massylique ruunt equites et odora canum vis}
\end{quote}

included a discussion of the interplay of ictus and accent, “an integral feature of the hexameter as Virgil writes it”. The lack of strong caesura in line 486

\begin{quote}
\textit{spargens umida mella soporiferumque papaver}
\end{quote}

created a “dreamy and dropping” rhythm that contributed to the atmosphere of magic and witchcraft described at some length in Austin’s note on this line. In line 235, the hiatus between \textit{spe} and \textit{inimica} seen in

\begin{quote}
\textit{quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur}
\end{quote}

is said to show Jupiter “musing over the possible reasons for Aeneas’ behaviour, or trying to decide exactly how to refer to the Carthaginians”. There were very many similar comments on metrical effects.

Austin’s Introduction to this edition emphasized the special place of the fourth Book in the \textit{Aeneid}, as a realistic human drama inserted into an epic narrative that did not require

\begin{small}
\begin{itemize}
\item 603 Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, p. 123.
\item 604 Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, Introduction, p. xix.
\item 605 Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, p. 62.
\item 606 Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, p. 144.
\end{itemize}
\end{small}
its inclusion. He recounted the events of the Book,\textsuperscript{607} interpreting the various developments in a vivid present-tense retelling that conveyed some of the intensity of Virgil’s poetry. Teachers might be inclined to read this aloud to a class beginning the study of \textit{Aeneid} 4, or use it as a summary and vehicle for discussion when revising the reading. The characters of both Dido and Aeneas, a frequent subject for examination questions, were analysed with impartial sympathy, both in the Introduction\textsuperscript{608} and at crucial points in the notes.\textsuperscript{609}

Austin’s notes were written in an easy style, with trenchant remarks that might stimulate oral or written discussion; a good example is the conclusion to his note introducing 331ff. (Aeneas’ speech):

\begin{quote}
Aeneas has wronged Dido, and he knows it; he has wronged God, and he knows it; atonement either way means pain for ever: and it is our pity that we should give him, not our scorn.\textsuperscript{610}
\end{quote}

However, the sheer length and weightiness of the commentary, the lack of a vocabulary list, and the relative costliness of Austin’s editions kept them in the hands of teachers rather than school students. Cost may have been the deciding factor: an edition of a single Book was more expensive than one volume of the Williams edition, containing half the \textit{Aeneid}.\textsuperscript{611}

It would appear that the ideal school edition of Virgil remains to be written, or rather that it needs to be written afresh for each generation of students. The well-organized approach

\textsuperscript{607} Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, pp. xi-xii.
\textsuperscript{608} Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, pp. xiii-xvi.
\textsuperscript{609} Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, see notes on lines 30, 56, 80, 172, 279, 291, 305ff, 331ff, 360-1, 365ff, 390, 433-4, 449, 479, 521, 547,590.
\textsuperscript{610} Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV}, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{611} Prices in 2004: Williams, \textit{Aeneid I-VI} - A$56; Austin, \textit{Aeneid IV} - A$80.
of Sidgwick (1881) and the detailed comprehensiveness of Page (1884-1900) set a high standard for the school commentaries of the twentieth century to follow. The challenge was not really taken up until the 1940s, when changes in education and society were producing school students with less expertise in Latin language and less experience in reading original Latin authors. One response to their needs was the publication of a number of anthologies containing excerpts from Virgil or from several different authors. Another response was the production of simplistic commentaries like those of Gould and Whiteley (from 1943), giving grammatical help, vocabulary and brief explanations, but few insights into literary appreciation.

A more thoughtful approach to the changing educational scene was shown by Fletcher, whose commentary on *Aeneid* 6 (1941) combined help with language and vocabulary with more sophisticated literary comment, suitable for students with less linguistic skill but greater overall maturity. Fletcher’s example was followed by Maguinness, both in his own edition of *Aeneid* 12 (1953) and in the series, Methuen’s Classical Texts, which he superintended as General Editor. (It is good to see that several titles in this series have been reprinted by Bristol Classical Press.)

The publication of R.D. Williams’ commentary on the whole *Aeneid* (1972-3) established, as the standard prescribed text, an edition that included the many developments in literary criticism over the seventy years since the work of Page. While useful for help with translation and the explanation of allusions and literary features, Williams’ edition was pitched at a higher level of linguistic competence than that of most
late-twentieth century school students. The dense nature of the commentary and the lack of a vocabulary list made it necessary for teachers to look for ways to simplify and supplement what Williams provided. Although some new commentaries on Virgil have been published since the 1990s, there has been no move to displace the convenient two-volume Williams edition as the regularly prescribed text. During the 1990s and beyond, however, workbooks and study guides were produced by teachers themselves, individually and co-operatively, dealing specifically with the prescribed lines and themes, and offering practice in examination-type questions. These privately-produced workbooks have been very gladly received by teachers and appear to be widely used to supplement and interpret the Williams commentary.

612 E.g. E. Matters, *Aeneid XII: HSC Latin 1996-7 Study Guide*, (See Appendix 8) containing word-order vocabulary, summaries of each section, relevant extracts from the *Iliad*, and exercises on grammar, literary features, allusions and references, metre and general appreciation of Virgil’s techniques in creating atmosphere and empathy. L. Stephenson produced a workbook on *Aeneid VI* (HSC 2004-5) with vocabulary, notes and exercises on grammar and sample examination questions.
CHAPTER THREE

The Contribution of Professional Organizations

Establishment of Conferences and Study Days

During the last four decades of the twentieth century, there was a great increase in the secondary school population, but a steady decline in the proportion who studied Latin. The curriculum was diversified to meet the needs of the many adolescents now completing high school with no intention of proceeding to university. With so many demands being made for official support in developing areas like the social sciences, creative arts and vocational subjects, there were few resources to spare for languages, especially Latin and Classical Greek. The withdrawal of practical support for classical languages can be observed in several changes to official structures.

In 1961 there were six government high schools in Sydney with separate classics departments with a specialist head teacher; by 1978 there remained only one; by the end of the century, none. The last classical specialist to hold the post of “Inspector of Schools” in New South Wales, Archibald McGeorge, retired in 1983 and was not replaced. The Office of the Board of Studies, established in 1990 to take responsibility for all school syllabuses and public examinations in the State, has never employed a special officer for classical languages: although these languages (Latin, Classical Greek

---

and Classical Hebrew) are regarded as a separate sub-category, operations such as the composition of syllabuses and the prescribing of texts are performed by teachers recruited on a casual basis under the supervision of general language officers with little or no acquaintance with classical languages or how these languages are taught. The Languages Support Unit of the Department of Education and Training has shown little interest in classical language projects, probably because of the very few government schools teaching these subjects.614

In response to the withdrawal of official support, secondary and tertiary teachers took action themselves to provide support for Latin teaching in schools, including help with the preparation of prescribed texts. An early initiative was a residential conference held in January, 1961, at Morpeth in New South Wales, organized by Godfrey Tanner under the auspices of the Hunter District Classical Association, in conjunction with staff from various universities in the State.615 The aim of this conference was stated as threefold:

i. to enable teachers of Latin, Greek and Ancient History from every type of school to meet their colleagues from other schools and universities;

ii. to provide opportunity for the discussion of curricula and methods of presentation in the light of present-day problems;

iii. to inform teachers of recent progress in various field of classical scholarship.

The Morpeth teachers’ conference does not appear to have been repeated in its original form, but the organizers transferred their energies into a conference for final-year school

614 www.curriculumsupport.nsw.edu.au/languages: this website gives the numbers of Classical Greek and Latin students in government schools in 2003: 104 Latin and 6 Classical Greek in Year 10 and 39 Latin and 7 Classical Greek in Year 11. No support programs or materials are advertised for either of these languages.  
615 Education Gazette, 1st December, 1960, p. 460. McKinnon, M.Ed. thesis, p. 59: “this pioneer venture was highly successful”. 
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students of Latin, held in the same place at the same time of year. At these conferences, students heard academic lectures and participated in social and recreational activities with other Latin students, supervised by volunteer Latin teachers and undergraduates. In its heyday, the Morpeth Conference attracted about 120 senior Latin students. By the mid 1970s numbers had declined, and the last of these summer conferences, transferred to the Sydney University Farm at Camden, was held in 1975.

The Classical Association of New South Wales continued to support the teaching of Latin in schools, especially for senior students. In May 1965, a one-day conference organized by Professor A.J. Dunston at the University of Sydney attracted 380 teachers and students to hear lectures on the prescribed texts (not Virgil in that year). The following year (the transitional year between the last Leaving Certificate examination and the first examination of the six-year Higher School Certificate course) a conference for teachers only heard H.D. Jocelyn speak on Virgil’s *Georgics* and Lucretius in a program designed to prepare for the new examination to be held in 1967.

Study Days for HSC Latin became a regular annual event, organized by the Classical Association with the co-operation of the Latin Department of the University of Sydney. Students, accompanied by their teachers, attended on a Saturday to hear lectures presented by university staff on matters relating to their prescribed texts. In 1975, the last Study Day in this series included talks by Patricia and Lindsay Watson on *Georgic* 4 and

---

616 I am grateful to Bruce Marshall for his recollections of these events in which he took part.


Aeneid 6 respectively. When problems with the venue brought an end to this annual
Study Day, some efforts were made by the Classical Association to provide alternative
support. At an evening meeting of the Association on 27th April, 1977, for example,
Professor Dunston gave an introductory talk on Aeneid 4, followed by a discussion with
teachers and school students on “The Teaching of Aeneid 4 at School Level”.

The HSC Study Day as a one-day conference was revived in 1978 by the Classical
Languages Teachers Association (CLTA). It was decided to hold the event on a school
day in a school venue, and to invite academics to present lectures on the prescribed texts,
as in the previous Study Days. A new feature, however, was introduced in order to
involve the students more actively: the program now included small-group tutorials led
by teachers on such topics as unseen translation and practical criticism. The inclusion
of this kind of session arose because the organizers, teachers themselves, realized that
students needed more practice in the skills tested in the examinations as well as
information on the prescribed texts. As a result of a stronger drive to meet the specific
needs of school students, from 1987, some of the lectures on the prescribed texts were
given by teachers in place of university staff. With only small changes in format, the
HSC Study Days continued to be held annually to the end of the twentieth century and
beyond. The majority of candidates attended, and those who missed the day could, from
the mid-1990s, obtain a tape-recording of the lectures from the CLTA.

620 Classicum, April, 1977, p. 2.
of Virgil for 3 Unit students.


**Study Days and the Teaching of Virgil**

The HSC Study Days contributed in several ways to support the teaching of Virgil:

- by providing, within the space of a single lecture, an overview of the main themes of the prescribed Book;
- by showing students and teachers some ideas about Virgil derived from recent scholarship so as to inspire further reading;
- by giving practical instruction on how to answer typical examination questions.

As might be expected, the Study Days organized by the CLTA showed a greater emphasis on the demands of the examination than on general topics related to Virgil. The revised Latin Syllabus issued in 1992 emphasized direct engagement with the Latin text rather than “historical or erudite literary information”.\(^{622}\) The introduction, in 1993, of prescribed “themes” for the set texts gave the lecturers a ready-made structure, if they chose to base their lectures on these themes. Some examples of lectures given are outlined below to illustrate the topics covered.

1981: Lindsay Watson (University of Sydney) on “Some Themes in *Aeneid* 6”\(^ {623}\)

This lecture described the effect on Aeneas of his various encounters in the Underworld with people from his past life. It also dealt with the political themes

---

\(^{622}\) 2/3 Unit Latin Syllabus, BOS, 1992, p. 17.

in Book 6: the pageant of Roman historical figures and the Augustan message delivered to Aeneas by Anchises.

1983: Patricia Watson (University of Sydney) took as her springboard the three sources of conflict in the *Aeneid* described by R.D. Williams\textsuperscript{624} in order to structure her lecture on *Aeneid* 4: Rome’s greatness as opposed to the pathos of human suffering, the Homeric world as opposed to the world of Rome, and finally, the world of gods as opposed to the world of men.\textsuperscript{625}

1995: Peter Toohey\textsuperscript{626} (University of New England) divided his treatment of *Aeneid* 10 into three sections, respectively titled “Voice”, “Concision” and “Tangibility”. In the first section he discussed *Aen.*10.794-832 (the death of Lausus), pointing out Virgil’s depiction of pathos and his empathy with his characters. Under the heading “Concision” Toohey discussed *Aen.*10.755-769 (the advance of Mezentius into battle) as exemplifying Virgil’s balanced structure, using adjectives, adverbs, word order and similes to create an expertly designed word-picture. The third section showed how Virgil used concrete, realistic imagery, as seen in *Aen.*10.885-898.

1998: Emily Matters\textsuperscript{627} (North Sydney Boys High School) presented *Aeneid* 12 as the culmination of the “agenda” Virgil had indicated in the opening lines of

---

\textsuperscript{624} Introduction to his edition of *Aeneid* I-VI, p. xx.
\textsuperscript{625} *Classicum*, October, 1983, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{626} 1995 Study Day Program (supplied to participants), CLTA.
\textsuperscript{627} 1998 Study Day Program (supplied to participants), CLTA.
the *Aeneid*. The lecture was structured into three sections, following the prescribed themes: “The Role of Destiny”, “Turnus and Aeneas” and “Elements of Tragedy”. Reference was made throughout to the Latin text to show how these themes were expressed by Virgil.

Lectures such as these provided an overview of the prescribed Book at a time of year (June) when students could be expected to have already worked through nearly all the lines set for translation and comment.

The Study Days also sought to provide more practical help with examination skills. Sessions on such matters were always conducted by secondary teachers. In 1981, Brother Dynes led a tutorial on the stylistic appreciation of Virgil; in 1995 Emily Matters gave some guidance on unseen translation, using a passage of Cicero and one of Virgil; in 1997 and 1998 workshops were held by Marika Jones and Denise Reading on answering techniques for examinations, demonstrating successful approaches to questions on passages from *Aeneid* 12.

**The Contribution of *Classicum***

Many of the lectures presented at the HSC Study Days were subsequently published in *Classicum*, a journal established in 1975 and supported jointly by the Classical Association of New South Wales and the Classical Languages Teachers Association. *Classicum* also published a number of other resources for teachers, including articles on aspects of Virgil directly related to the prescribed texts, of which the following are examples, grouped by author:
J. Duhigg (University of Sydney)  “Notes on the hexameter of Virgil (Aeneid 6)”628
“Notes on the language of Vergil”629
“Smooth hexameters: accident or design?”630

F. Muecke (University of Sydney)  “Foreshadowing and dramatic irony in the story of Dido”631
“Epic aspects of Aeneid Book 2”.632

R.I. Ross (Sydney Grammar School) “Virgil’s Twelfth: the similes”633
“Dido and Aeneas: the function of the similes”634

In addition, there were other articles on Virgil with more general application than the HSC prescriptions. These were valuable for teachers in acquainting them with major issues in Virgil scholarship. An example of such an article was a discussion by P.J. Davis of the University of Tasmania, “Pathos and pessimism in Virgil’s Aeneid”, 635 which concluded that, although pietas was Aeneas’ acknowledged guiding principle, it was furor that in reality triumphed in the Aeneid.

B.D. Hoyos (University of Sydney), while not writing specifically on Virgil, contributed two articles with a strong message for teachers of Latin texts: “Reading, recognition, comprehension: the trouble with understanding Latin”636 and “Translation in the teaching of Latin: too much of a bad thing?”.637 Hoyos’ view, namely that effective reading and

629 Classicum, April, 1983, pp. 6-9.
631 Classicum, October, 1977, pp. 2-5.
632 Classicum, July, 1979, pp. 7-10.
635 Classicum, April, 1988, pp. 8-11.
comprehension of a Latin text was impeded by the requirement to produce a literal translation, had strong implications for the traditional methods of teaching and examining Virgil. Discussions were held in meetings of syllabus and examination committees attended by the present writer about the feasibility of replacing direct translation of prescribed texts in examinations with other types of questions. Most teachers, however, were unwilling to abandon translation as the core task in the study of a prescribed text. To do so would be very risky; it would deprive students, especially those of average ability, of the sense of security they derived from the thorough learning of the translation. Such a change could turn away more students than it would attract to the study of Latin in the senior high school.

Through book reviews and bibliographies published in Classicum and sometimes in the CLTA bulletin, CVLTA, teachers could supplement their knowledge of scholarly literature on Virgil. Two Virgil bibliographies appeared. The first, compiled by J. Duhigg in 1977, gave special attention to the prescribed text of that year, Aeneid 4, and included some critical comments on the books listed. The second bibliography, compiled by B. Marshall, then at Trinity Grammar School, to support the teaching of Aeneid 8 in 1992, was especially welcome because since 1985 no official reading lists had accompanied the prescription of texts. Marshall’s list included some useful short handbooks on Virgil, such as The Art of the Aeneid, by W.S. Anderson (1969, reprinted Bristol 1989) and The Aeneid by K.W. Gransden (CUP 1990), in addition to many of the same books that had been recommended in earlier lists.

638 Classicum, April, 1977, pp. 5-6.

From 1998, it was the practice to publish in *Classicum* the winning essays in a competition for students established in that year by the CLTA to honour the memory of an outstanding classics teacher, Carol Manners. The competition was open to final-year students who were offered a range of questions on their prescribed texts. Many chose to write on Virgil. The publication of the winning essays made available to students and teachers a useful indication of what a very good student could do in response to questions which included both general thematic and “empathy” topics. For students these essays provided inspiration rather than information, as delays in publication often meant that the eventual readers were not studying the same prescribed Book as the one discussed in the essays.

**Professional Development and Resources**

In addition to their publications, the Classical Association and the CLTA both provided opportunities for teachers to meet for discussion and to receive information and support on the teaching of classics at all levels of schooling. The introduction of new Latin courses and methods and the creation of Classical Studies courses for junior high school

---

640 *Classicum*, October, 1985, p. 35.
641 *Classicum*, October, 1987, p. 44.
years dominated conferences and seminars held in the 1970s, but there were some sessions devoted to the authors read in the senior years. An in-service conference held at Ravenswood School, Gordon, on April 18, 1975, although mainly concerned with junior courses, included a lecture on Virgil by Lindsay Watson of the University of Sydney.\textsuperscript{642}

During the 1990s the CLTA became very active in organizing in-service training for Latin teachers. The new senior Latin Syllabus of 1992 stimulated a one-day training program held at The King’s School, Parramatta, on a Sunday in May, 1992. In 1993, seminars were held on HSC texts, the first session of which was “The themes of Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} Book 8”.\textsuperscript{643} A formal conference was organized in 1994, at which Peter Toohey (University of New England) gave a lecture with the title “Virgil, \textit{Aeneid} 10 and the theme of war”.\textsuperscript{644} In August 1996 the CLTA held a seminar on the prescribed texts, at which R.I. Ross, retired Head of Classics at Sydney Grammar School, lectured on “The similes of Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid}”.\textsuperscript{645}

From the 1970s, Latin teachers in New South Wales made increasing contact with the much larger professional organizations that existed in Britain and the United States. In 1974, the present writer became the New South Wales representative of the British organization, the Joint Association of Classical Teachers (JACT). Through this contact, a number of New South Wales teachers joined JACT and received its publications, most notably the JACT Review, which supplied useful information on new books, and

\textsuperscript{642} \textit{Classicum}, April, 1975, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{643} CVLTA, March, 1993.
\textsuperscript{644} \textit{Classicum}, April 1994, pp. 2-7.
\textsuperscript{645} \textit{Classicum}, April, 1997, p. 22.
Omnibus, a publication for senior school students. Both have been a source of general information on recent trends in Virgil scholarship.

The American Classical League (ACL) has since the 1980s provided a number of services to the Australian teachers who have subscribed to its membership. Its journal, The Classical Outlook, regularly publishes the marking details for Advanced Placement examinations in Latin, which always contain a section on a prescribed book of Virgil. It can be observed, for example, that the American examiners demand a very literal translation of the text. These reports provide New South Wales teachers with an interesting basis for comparing requirements and standards.

Another service of the ACL is the sponsorship of National Latin, Greek and Mythology Examinations for students, in which many schools in New South Wales have participated. These multiple-choice examinations provide students of classical subjects with a counterpart to the competitions held annually in English, Mathematics, Science, Geography, and Modern Languages. The Mythology examination contains an optional section on the Aeneid (in English) which has been popular with junior secondary students in many schools. It has stimulated the introduction of the Aeneid to Latin beginners.

Through the ACL Catalog of Teaching Materials Latin teachers in New South Wales have obtained a number of resources to support the teaching of Virgil. These include

- running vocabularies for Aeneid, Books 1 to 66

---

646 ACL Catalog, # B106
• a multimedia CD called *Aeneid I and the Trojan War*, containing the text in Latin and English, a dictionary, commentary and scansion quiz.\(^{647}\)

• an instructional audiotape on reading the *Aeneid* metrically.\(^{648}\)

• selections from the *Aeneid* presented on audiotape in English.\(^{649}\)

Membership of overseas classical organizations provided local teachers with a greater range of resources and with information on developments in countries facing similar challenges. In a few cases New South Wales teachers have attended conferences and travelled to meet colleagues and visit schools in the United States, Britain and New Zealand. A conference scholarship offered annually since 1996 by the local Classical Languages Teachers Association encouraged teachers to widen their experience through such overseas visits.

---

\(^{647}\) ACL Catalog, # W12
\(^{648}\) ACL Catalog, # T1
\(^{649}\) ACL Catalog, #T3205, T3206, T3207.
CHAPTER FOUR

Virgil Before the Final Examination Year

The Need for Transitional Texts

The most usual stage at which students encountered some authentic Virgil was in the senior pre-examination year. It was the practice throughout the twentieth century to recommend wide reading at this stage from a number of Latin authors. The following extract from the 1949 Latin Syllabus is typical of this kind of recommendation:

Pupils should be encouraged to read as widely as possible, in verse as well as in prose unhampered by the restrictions of an examination syllabus . . . Teachers may make their own selection of Latin texts to be read, excluding the books prescribed for the following year.650

Until 1975, most students651 had already read prescribed texts for the examination marking the end of the junior secondary course. The authors read at that stage were usually Caesar and Ovid, never Virgil.652 This experience meant that students beginning the senior Latin course were already trained in the preparation of a substantial amount of text and had made the transition from synthetic to authentic Latin. After 1975, however, a significant change can be observed: there was no longer a junior external examination in Latin requiring prescribed texts. At this time, too, reading courses like the Cambridge Latin Course and Ecce Romani were becoming widespread in New South Wales schools. Without the demands imposed by an external examination, it was now convenient for

651 The Intermediate Certificate offered alternative questions to those on prescribed texts, but most students attempted the prescribed texts.
652 Education Gazette, 1st August, 1951, p. 260. Texts for the Intermediate Certificate of 1953 were given as Caesar, Gallic War 2 (24 chapters) and Ovid, Selections, 185 lines.
teachers simply to follow the structured reading program in the textbooks and to introduce original Latin when it appeared in the later stages of the course they were using. This sensible approach, however, was often frustrated by the diminishing amount of teaching time for Latin in the junior secondary years, preventing teachers from covering the courses at the rate anticipated by the editors. It became difficult to get up to the original Latin by the end of the junior course. As a result of all these changes in the teaching of Latin in the junior years, many students made their first acquaintance with a substantial amount of authentic Latin text only if and when they undertook the senior course.

Regardless of their previous experience of original Latin, throughout the twentieth century students in the penultimate year of school were expected to read selections from several Latin authors, very often including Virgil. The texts, either selections from one author or anthologies comprising several authors, which were published to meet the needs of students at this stage, can be divided into two types. The earlier type was a simplified version of the traditional school editions of Latin authors, containing, in this order, a general introduction, the Latin text, notes on the text and an alphabetical vocabulary. From the 1970s, under the influence both of the new reading courses and of the growth of literary criticism, a new type of transitional reader appeared. These maintained the format of the reading courses, integrating vocabulary, grammatical help, cultural information, and exercises in comprehension and literary appreciation.
Teachers, however, were not bound at any period to follow any particular book or method at this stage. Many made their own selections, supplying their students with whatever additional support material they considered necessary. The increased use of photocopiers in schools from the 1980s made it much easier for teachers to assemble and distribute their selected reading material without being confined to any published book.

**Introducing Virgil in traditional style**

A fairly typical anthology was *Pax et Imperium*, compiled by J.M. Cobban and first published in 1938 (Methuen, London) as a “transitional Latin reader” for use in the third year of study.653 Thirty-two extracts from prose authors made up most of the content, but a separate chapter contained fifteen pieces of poetry to “serve as an introduction to Latin verse for those who will be passing straight to Ovid or Virgil”.654 In the Preface to the Sixth Printing of this anthology in 1961, reference was made to the many changes in education that had taken place in Britain since the book first appeared including the tendency to start Latin at a later age and the partial abandonment by universities of their Latin entrance requirement. It was hoped that *Pax et Imperium* would help teachers to meet the greater challenges imposed by the new circumstances.

Virgil was represented by five passages, the longest being 23 lines. Only the last two of these were continuous extracts from Virgil: *Aeneid* 12.823-840 and 6.847-853. The first three were collations of easier snippets, presented as if they were continuous: *Eclogue* 4

---

(lines 4-7, 18-25, 38-45), *Georgic* 2 (lines 493-504, 513-515, 519-522, 532-535) and *Aeneid* 2 (lines 21-28, 31-33, 39-45, 48-49). Each passage was supplied with notes at the back of the book offering simple explanations of names and references and giving some basic help with translation. Two short paragraphs introduced Virgil and his works, including the following justification for studying them:

To the Romans Virgil revealed the greatness of their destiny; to us his fame rests rather upon his subtle mastery of the Latin hexameter.\(^655\)

It is hard to imagine a less compelling reason for an adolescent to begin reading Virgil with alacrity.

A more substantial introduction to Virgil was provided in *Five Roman Poets*, an anthology compiled by H.E. Gould and J.E. Whiteley (Macmillan, London, 1941). As stated in the Foreward, the editors’ intention was to supply a “useful introduction” to Latin poetry for students with limited background in the language and no previous experience in reading Latin verse. This collection contained three continuous extracts from Virgil, totalling 187 lines: *Georgic* 2.136-176 (Praise of Italy), *Georgic* 4.460-527 (Orpheus and Eurydice) and *Aeneid* 8.190-267 (Hercules and Cacus). Each of these was a self-contained passage that could be enjoyed out of context.

The Introduction included an account of Virgil’s life and works, concluding with the following sentence:

It was perhaps the depth of feeling in Vergil which led him, in his anxiety to express himself, to certain audacities of phrase in which the meaning, though clear enough, is not expressed within bounds of normal Latin usage.\(^656\)

\(^{655}\) *Pax et Imperium*, p. 108.
The Notes, as shown below, were largely dedicated to explaining Virgil’s “audacities of phrase” and other deviations from “normal Latin usage”.

The second part of the Introduction offered an explanation of Latin metre, in particular the hexameter, and a guide to the process of scansion, set out in clear steps, easy to follow but purely mechanical. The student was told how to find and mark in the caesura with no explanation of its function. There was no mention of accent or ictus, nor any indication of the contribution of the metre to any poetic effect other than simple onomatopoeia.

The Notes at the back of the book explained Virgil’s many references and allusions simply and adequately, with the occasional gratuitous comment:

Nothing that we now hear of the Ganges justifies the adjective pulcher.657

On the whole the Notes gave useful help with translation at an elementary level. Agreements were pointed out, as were non-standard forms such as virum (genitive plural), fontis (accusative plural) and implerunt (for impleverunt). Missing words were supplied to fill out Virgil’s elliptical phrases. Case usages, particularly of the ablative (cause, description, separation, absolute, dependent on verbs) were regularly identified and explained. There were only two references to metre: the first was a reminder to determine by scansion the case of tarda . . . unda (Georgics 4.479)658 and the second pointed out that semihomi(nis) (Aeneid 8.194) was a dactyl.659

---

656 Five Roman Poets, p. xiv.
657 Five Roman Poets, p. 51 on Geo. 2.137.
658 Five Roman Poets, p. 58.
659 Five Roman Poets, p. 63.
The nature of these Notes was in keeping with the knowledge expected of students at the
time of the book’s publication; even at the final examination all that was expected of
standard level candidates was accurate translation, correct explanation of the various
references and allusions and the ability to mark the scansion of a hexameter line. Literary
analysis and appreciation were not expected of students, and were certainly not included
in an introductory anthology like *Five Roman Poets*.

A more ambitious introduction to Virgil was attempted in C.G. Cooper’s *Journey to
Hesperia* (Macmillan 1959, 2nd ed. 1963). This book contained forty-seven extracts from
the first half of the *Aeneid*, amounting to 753 lines, linked together by English narrative
to form a continuous story. In concept, if not in scope, it was similar to Jackson Knight’s
*Vergil – Selections from the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid* (Allen and Unwin 1949),
which had been prescribed as an examination text in 1951.660 The first chapter of
Cooper’s Introduction included an outline of the poet’s life and works, the sources for the
*Aeneid* and a summary of its enduring qualities. The second chapter enumerated some
characteristic features of Virgil’s style, emphasizing that “all these enrichments of
language are used with careful discrimination and unerring skill”.661 Virgil’s sensitive use
of familiar words and the flexibility of his expression were commended and illustrated
with examples. The rest of the Introduction was devoted to a detailed guide to the
hexameter, a subject of special interest to Cooper.662 Beginning with syllable division,

---

660 See pp. 124-130 of this study.
661 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. xxii.
662 His book, *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter* (Macmillan 1952), appeared on the list of
Recommended Reading that accompanied the N.S.W. Latin Syllabus of 1974.
liaison and elision, Cooper went on to explain feet, scansion, and the different kinds of pauses that could be identified in a hexameter. He illustrated the various ways in which the poet used sound to convey or enhance meaning, through pace, alliteration and assonance, and the coincidence or clash of accent and ictus.

The main body of Journey to Hesperia consisted of short Latin passages (the longest being 52 lines, the average 16 lines), linked by paragraphs of English narrative that interpreted as it related the intervening events. An example of Cooper’s narrative interpretation (on Aen 1.76-77) demonstrates his style:

    Aeolus haec contra: ‘tuus, o regina, quid optes 
explorare labor. mihi iussa capessere fas est.’

    On the surface this is a courteous reply, and it was accepted as such by Juno. But the emphasis of tuus and the choice of the word labor suggest that Aeolus shared an opinion not uncommon amongst men: a woman might find it extremely difficult to make up her mind, but no man in his senses would attempt to do it for her.663

So as to include more of Virgil than the Latin extracts, Cooper gave some passages, especially from Aeneid 4 and 6, in English translation.664 In doing so, he anticipated the practice of the closing years of the twentieth century, when candidates for the public examination were expected to read in English the parts of the Book not prescribed for study in Latin.665

663 Journey to Hesperia, p. 3.
665 1995 HSC Prescribed Texts, Topics, etc. p. 83.
Cooper’s Notes did not include explanation of simple proper names, as these were listed and identified in the Vocabulary. More complex allusions, such as *Threicius sacerdos* (Orpheus) were explained. Considerable help was given with translation, sometimes accompanied by admonitions, as seen in the following examples:

... don’t be a slave to words; translate ideas, and respect the different idioms of Latin and English.

In translating, better make a separate sentence of these lines. And the treatment must be flexible, if the English is not to creak. (on *Aeneid* 2. 471ff.)

As often, we must use more words in English in order to reproduce the emphasis which Latin conveys by the order of words. (on *Aeneid* 2. 521-2)

Cooper took every opportunity to alert the student to Virgil’s skill in manipulating language, sounds and metre to convey not only meaning but emotion and atmosphere. He commented on the effect of tenses:

The effect of the different tense is to suggest the instantaneous nature of the settling: it is done before we are aware of it.

He identified in detail metrical effects:

First, in two harsh spondaic words, we hear the powerful snapping of the oars – 

\[frān-gūn-|tūr rē-|mī\]. Then the precarious state of the ship is reflected in the teetering feminine caesura-pause – \[tūn| prōra_ ā|vēr-t|-|t\]. The sharp diaeresis-pause \[dāt lā-tū|s\] clears the way for the climax. And finally, amidst clash of word-accent and verse-accent, a great sweep of rhythm explodes in an unexpected monosyllable – 

\[s īn-sē-qui-|tūr cú-mū-|lō|\] \[prāe-|rūp-tū-s ā-|quaē mōns\]

like the crash of a mountainous sea upon a ship unprepared (on *Aeneid* 1.104-5)

---

666 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 118.
667 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 63.
668 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 79.
669 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 81.
670 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 65. The comment refers to *Aeneid* 1.84: *incubuere.*
The contribution of similes in Virgil was generalized from the example found in *Aeneid* 1.148-153:

A good simile, such as we have here, gives clarity and vigour to the narrative. It brings with it, too, a sense of excitement – the excitement of discovering a common thread, an unsuspected unity, in widely different experiences. And it imports, from beyond the strict boundaries of the author’s theme, additional colour and new interest.672

*Journey to Hesperia* offered an introduction to Virgil that was satisfying as a narrative, helpful in its aids to translation and comprehension and, above all, insightful in its comments on the literary features and techniques used in the poetry. It was never prescribed for public examination in New South Wales, but was used quite widely as a source of excerpts to read with students in the pre-examination year. The book’s Australian connection (Cooper, although British himself, served for many years as Professor of Classics in the University of Queensland) may have made it especially attractive to local readers: its no-nonsense style, demonstrated in some of the quotations given above, was refreshingly un-academic. The Notes even contained an occasional reference to Australian idiom, as in “those who are accustomed to speaking of a mob of horses . . .”673 Cooper himself used *Journey to Hesperia* to teach first-year undergraduates at the University of Queensland in the 1960s.674

671 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 66.
672 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 68.
673 *Journey to Hesperia*, p. 89. In trying to render Virgil’s pun on *armantur/armenta* (*Aeneid* 3.540), Cooper suggested *mob/mobilized*.
674 I am indebted for this information, as well as other material related to Professor Cooper, to Garry Uebergang, of Sydney Church of England Grammar School, who was taught by Cooper at university.
The de-throning of translation and the growth of literary criticism

... the habit of translating every word we read is I believe damaging. It impedes fluency, and by continually transferring Latin into inadequate English equivalents we fail to appreciate the nuances and sound and rhythm of the original. 675

The idea that evaluation, rather than translation, was the ultimate goal in studying classical texts at school was presented in a textbook called Aestimanda - Practical Criticism of Latin and Greek Poetry and Prose (OUP, 1965), the work of two teachers at Harrow School, M.G. Balme and M.S. Warman. Aestimanda contained 69 exercises, each based on one or more extracts from Greek or Latin authors. Ten pieces from Virgil were included in the selection.

The Introduction confirmed that Aestimanda had been produced as a counterpart to textbooks in “other literary disciplines” which were offering training in practical criticism. 676 Nothing of the kind had existed for Latin and Greek, but now that linguistic ability, the focus of traditional school courses and editions, was no longer seen as an end in itself, a different form of training was necessary. Balme and Warman acknowledged the particular difficulties presented by literature that was “foreign, old and literary”, 677 but asserted that these difficulties made critical analysis even more essential for classical literature, to prevent the unthinking acceptance of “traditional valuations”.

676 Aestimanda, p. 5.
677 Aestimanda, p. 7.
The teacher was advised that the passages should be “prepared” before discussion (presumably by the students themselves) and that reading aloud and translation should be the first tasks. This procedure would have been familiar to teachers. The next step advocated by Balme and Warman was oral discussion based on the questions they supplied. Written answers were to be required only as in response to a final question in each exercise, as too much emphasis on writing could prove “wearisome” and would suggest the existence of a “right or wrong answer”, a suggestion the authors wanted to avoid. Wilkinson’s *Golden Latin Artistry* was strongly recommended as a reference for teachers on matters of technique, sound patterns and rhythm. The influence of *Aestimanda* on the teaching of Virgil can be appreciated from a description of some of the pertinent exercises.

The second exercise in *Aestimanda* presented eight questions on *Aeneid* 2.203-11 (the serpents from Tenedos). These questions required examination of individual words, a strong awareness of sound effects, and an analysis of the passage into “shots”, using the analogy of film-technique. The first six questions were designed to stimulate oral discussion and classroom research, culminating in a written response that would synthesize all the aspects covered by the preceding questions.

More advanced exercises on Virgil followed later in the book. Exercise 24 invited students to compare the battle-scene of *Aeneid* 12.289ff. with a fight described in prose

---

678 *Aestimanda*, p. 9.
679 *Aestimanda*, p. 18.
680 This analogy was used by Quinn in his 1968 critical study of the *Aeneid*: see p. 156 of this study.
681 *Aestimanda*, p. 52.
by Livy (7.10.9). The questions drew attention to the function of coordinate and subordinate clauses, the effect of frequent present participles and the manipulation of word-order. Especially challenging was the suggestion to “rewrite one of Virgil’s fights as Livy might have written it.” More practice in comparing Virgil with other authors was given in Exercise 32 which presented storm-scenes from Homer, *Odyssey* 5.291-318 (with translation), Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.82 ff., and Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 5.597ff. Still more ambitious was Exercise 48 in which students had to compare the foot-races from *Iliad* 23.754-83 (in Greek) and *Aeneid* 5.315-42. This exercise was inspired by the discussion of the same passages in Brooks Otis’ *Virgil – a study in civilized poetry* (1964), to which the student was referred.

A very useful type of exercise pioneered by *Aestimanda* was the comparison of a Latin passage with one or more respected translations. Exercise 41 presented *Aeneid* 6.298-314 followed by translations by C. Day Lewis in verse and Jackson Knight in prose. Statements by both translators were quoted, giving their own criteria for success, and students were asked to evaluate each version according to the criteria supplied by their respective translators.

*Aestimanda* was described by an expert in the pedagogy of classics as “a landmark in classical teaching”. One of its authors, M.G. Balme, was a member of the Advisory Board.

---

682 *Aestimanda*, pp. 64-67.
683 *Aestimanda*, pp. 98-100.
684 *Aestimanda*, p. 82.
Panel formed to direct the early days of the *Cambridge Latin Course* Project, and the influence of the critical process advocated in *Aestimanda* can be observed in the approach to reading Virgil followed in the more advanced Units of the *CLC*. The present writer personally observed the use of *Aestimanda* in English schools in 1974, and recommended the book in a lecture delivered to Sydney teachers and other members of the local Classical Association. This introduction was timely: the Higher School Certificate syllabus and examination were undergoing revision, and the new format, first examined in 1976, had not only less emphasis on translation of the prescribed books, but also integrated literary analysis with the traditional questions on proper names and allusions. To train their students in literary analysis, a number of teachers in New South Wales used the easier exercises in *Aestimanda* in the pre-examination year. Much of the book, however, was found too sophisticated for local students, who rarely knew Greek, and whose acquaintance with Latin authors was more limited than that assumed by Balme and Warman. An easier book by Balme, *Intellegenda* (OUP, 1970), proved more appropriate for use in the pre-examination year. It was aimed more specifically at literal comprehension of the passages included, but also led the student towards literary analysis. “There is no hard and fast line between comprehension and critical questions”, Balme stated in his Introduction.

Once literary analysis had become an established part of the final examination in New South Wales, teachers began to prepare younger students to approach their Latin reading

---

688 See p. 63 of this study.
689 *Intellegenda*, p. xii.
in this way. Those who had adopted the *Cambridge Latin Course* found that literary criticism was very much in keeping with its aims and methods. Led by the CLC, textbooks of a new style, different in format and emphasis from the traditional anthologies, were published to introduce students to original Latin authors.

**The new style of transitional texts**

A new generation of Latin texts for comparative beginners followed the introduction of the *Cambridge Latin Course* in 1970. The aim of the CLC was to bring students from the very basics to original Latin through constant practice in reading a carefully graded narrative set in a familiar context. This narrative began in Pompeii in A.D. 79, followed the fortunes of some of the original characters in Britain and Egypt, and returned to Italy in Unit 3 to visit Rome. The “Silver Age” ambience led naturally to the reading of Pliny and Tacitus in Unit 4, supplemented by some verse from an earlier period, selections from Catullus and Ovid. In its first edition, the CLC introduced some Virgil at the very end of the whole course, in Unit V (published in 1974). This unit included two pamphlets, one an adaptation of Tacitus, called *Nero et Agrippina*. The other, called *Dido et Aeneas*, contained 255 Latin lines from *Aeneid* 4. The events of *Aeneid* 4 were presented as a continuous narrative with a brief introductory summary (in English) of preceding events and short sentences (also in English) linking the separate sections. The Latin lines were numbered as in the original text, thus indicating that selections, not the whole Book, were being read. Two passages (*Aeneid* 4.362-392 and *Aeneid* 6.450-476)
were given in English translation to complete the story without adding more lines to be read in Latin.

The Latin text was printed on the left-hand pages; the facing pages contained two columns of running vocabulary, offering contextual meanings for the words. The words were listed in the form in which they appeared in the text, followed by the infinitives of verbs, and by the nominative singular forms and genders of nouns. Adjectives and participles were supplied with the masculine form of the nominative singular. More difficult expressions were translated: *quem sese ore ferens* (*Aeneid* 4.11) was rendered as “what a noble look he has” and *si non pertaesum fuisset* (*Aeneid* 4.18) as “if I had not grown weary”. Words with a range of meanings were supplied only with those deemed to fit the context: thus *culpam* (*Aeneid* 4.172) was rendered as “wrongdoing”, *quin etiam* (*Aeneid* 4.309) as “even worse”, and *premit* (*Aeneid* 4.81) as “hide, put out”.

No commentary or exercises were supplied with the student pamphlets but these requirements were contained in the Unit V Teacher’s Handbook, published in 1977, the work of a committee headed by D.J. Morton. The notes specific to *Dido et Aeneas* were composed by R.M. Griffin. This Handbook provided a detailed guide to a teaching approach that was very different from that assumed in the older generation of introductory texts. It was written in the spirit of the new kind of educational thinking, namely, that it was essential to engage the students’ interests and emotions, to encourage them to “relate” to the text and discuss the subject-matter at a personal level, at the same time as, or even before, tackling the challenge of unfamiliar and often baffling language.
The introduction to the Teacher’s Handbook outlined the procedure to be followed: students should not be expected to “prepare” a section of the text themselves before class in the time-honoured way, but were better off approaching a new passage together with the teacher.\footnote{Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 2.} Two stages in this approach were identified: superficial comprehension (not necessarily through translation) and discussion of the content and effectiveness of the passage.\footnote{Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 3.} Caution was urged: it was easy, because of lack of time, to neglect one or other of these two stages. Concentration on translation and grammatical analysis could make students think “that the only achievement of Latin authors was to provide difficult linguistic exercises”, while, on the other hand, discussion based on poor understanding of the Latin was worth very little. Thus both aspects were equally important, but the teacher was the one to decide which emphasis was more appropriate on a particular occasion.

The teacher was encouraged to guide the students to an understanding of the Latin through carefully graded questions, and by simplifying complex sentences into their basic structures. The notes in the Handbook provided help in relating Virgil’s structures to the grammatical jargon used by the \textit{CLC} in its first edition (e.g. “Form A” for the nominative case). It was emphasized that the notes were not to be regarded as a commentary in themselves, but were to be used in conjunction with the commentaries of Austin and R.D. Williams.\footnote{Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 28.}
The reading of *Dido et Aeneas* was to be presented initially as a story of two people, with the hope that the wider issues of the conflict between love and duty, and the different demands of heroic achievements and personal relationships would be appreciated by students at a later stage. Some aspects which had featured strongly in traditional introductions to Virgil, such as his debt to earlier literature and his Augustan message, were left very much to the discretion of the teacher, with the expectation that these issues were generally too sophisticated for the intended students. The teacher, however, was encouraged to offer “a glimpse of interesting vistas left unexplored for the moment” in the hope that students would develop a desire to learn more about Virgil in the future.

The freshness of this approach to the teaching of Virgil is illustrated below by a selection of examples. An attempt was made to single out some of the main difficulties experienced by the novice reader of Virgil in tackling the language. Emphasis was given to Virgil’s use of the “split phrase”. From simple assistance with such phrases, the notes proceeded to point out their effective use, for example, in *Aeneid* 4.134-5, 137, 139 (to strengthen the impact of colour and magnificence) or in *Aeneid* 4.165 (“enclosing” Dido and Aeneas with the words *speluncam . . . eandem*) . Where the structure of a sentence was particularly complex, it was important not to let the difficulties dominate the progress of the class. Thus with reference to *Aeneid* 4.15-19, the note simply stated:

---

693 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 25.
In order to maintain pace and morale the teacher will probably have to do most of the work himself. 698

The constructions in this passage were explained, but the concluding remark was, “There is no need to explain this to pupils”.

In explaining Virgil’s similes, the teacher was given both detailed guidance and considerable latitude. With respect to Aeneid 4.68-73 (Dido/deer), four points of comparison were listed, as given by Pöschl and Quinn in their cited works,699 but the teacher was urged not to follow this list rigidly. Students were to be allowed to form their own opinions, to offer other views, and even to remain unimpressed. More advanced students could be introduced to the idea of the simile as a feature of epic tradition developed by Virgil to include psychological as well as external points of comparison. A later simile at Aeneid 4.437-49 (Aeneas/oak tree)700 could be presented through a series of suggested questions, ranging from “In what way does Aeneas resemble this oak tree?” through questions on details, such as “Why does Virgil lay stress on the tree’s deep roots?” to the concluding questions, “What does this simile add? Nothing whatever? Pure ornament? Or something more?” In all this, importance was laid on the reader’s response rather than on the techniques used by the poet.

To awaken students to Virgil’s creation of different moods and scenes, the analogy of film-making could be used701 to assist in visualizing Aeneid 4.129-42 (assembly for the hunt). The cave-scene (Aeneid 4.160-72) was a further opportunity for discussion of

699 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 32.  
700 Teacher’s Handbook V, pp. 59-60.  
701 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 37: the inspiration may be Quinn, Virgil’s Aeneid, p. 94.
mood and atmosphere: “What is the effect of the storm?” The students were expected to go beyond the literal – “to get Dido and Aeneas into the cave together” – and to discuss the “grandeur of the scene” and its “ominous overtones”.

The conflicts and moral dilemmas faced by the characters were to be discussed whenever they arose:

The pupils might be asked for their impression of the vehement language in 24-9: does it suggest the firmness of Dido’s resolution? Or does it strike them as over-emphatic, suggesting quite the opposite of firmness?  

After reading fifty lines of the selection, students could be invited to consider whether or not the love-affair depicted was a happy one. This might lead to a discussion of any hints of a tragic outcome and a debate on the culpability of Dido’s conduct. Aeneas’ speech (Aeneid 4.331-61) was, naturally, a great opportunity for intense controversy, and considerable space was given to suggesting approaches to this section. The teacher might begin by asking a series of concrete questions aimed at sorting out the different points made by Aeneas, but the eventual question had to be, “How adequate is Aeneas’ reply?”. The teacher could ask how Aeneas could have acted differently, or how he was feeling. Several subsidiary questions on this passage were suggested, providing material for substantial oral and written responses to the major issue of Aeneid 4.

Unit V of the Cambridge Latin Course anticipated the multimedia pedagogy of a later period by providing a set of 30 slides to illustrate the text, each described in the Teacher’s Handbook V.

---

702 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 32.
703 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 35.
704 Teacher’s Handbook V, pp. 53-55.
Handbook. These were to be shown at points indicated, sometimes with appropriate music. Although no technical aspects of scansion were addressed in Unit V, aural experience of the poetry was emphasized, both by the provision of a tape-recording of the text and by reminders in the Teacher’s Handbook of the importance of reading aloud to enhance understanding and to foster appreciation of Virgil. As a follow-up activity, it was suggested that students could rehearse and perform a full recitation of *Dido et Aeneas* themselves.

The final suggestion of a follow-up activity was that students should compose their own poems in response to Virgil. Two examples were given as a stimulus. The writing of original poetry as a response to literature was being practised in the 1960s and 1970s in junior secondary English teaching, and had spread from English to Classical Studies, in which students were encouraged to write poetry in response to myths and legends. The term “verse composition” had taken on a whole new meaning in the study of classics.

*Dido et Aeneas* demonstrated a method of introducing Virgil that captured the interest of adolescents and presented the poetry as having immediate appeal in a modern context. Several New South Wales teachers have spoken warmly of the Teacher’s Handbook, as presenting an excellent guide to the appreciation of Virgil. But despite the thought, care and innovative ideas that had been put into the creation of Unit V, and its undoubted

---

706 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 41.
708 Teacher’s Handbook V, p. 66.
appeal to teachers and students, this Unit did not survive beyond the first edition of the
The decision to discontinue Unit V may have been caused by the ever-decreasing time
allocated for Latin in schools, in Britain and in Australia alike.

To compensate somewhat for the loss of Unit V, in the second edition the *Nero et
Agrippina* section was transferred in a simpler form to Unit IVB, and a new selection
from Virgil, taken from *Aeneid 5*, was added to that Unit.\(^{711}\) The demands were far more
modest than those of the old Unit V. Only 67 lines of Virgil were included in Latin,\(^{712}\) an
indication of the diminished time allowed. The extracts were interspersed with passages
in translation to provide a continuous story. The Latin extracts were followed by graded
comprehension questions, increasing in subtlety from “Where is the rock?” to “What
psychological advantages do Mnestheus and his men have?” A generous vocabulary list
was given for each extract, and some assistance was provided with “split phrases” by
underlining words which were in agreement with each other. Two Language Notes
explained two common characteristics of Latin verse: the omission of prepositions and
the use of plural for singular. An extra dimension was added by the inclusion of an
extract from *Iliad 23* (in translation, of course) followed by questions requiring
comparison of Virgil’s account of the boat-race with its Homeric model, the chariot-race
in the *Iliad*.

\(^{711}\) *CLC* Unit IVB, pp. 128-148.

\(^{712}\) *Aeneid* 5.124-127 and 129-131; 139-141 and 151-158; 172-3 and 175-182; 201-204 and 207-209; 210,
212, 220-224; 225-243.
The *Cambridge Latin Course* became widespread in New South Wales not long after its introduction in the early 1970s and for the rest of the twentieth century remained the most popular course in schools.\(^{713}\) Not all teachers, however, persisted with the *CLC* beyond Unit 3; this was often as far as they could go by the end of the junior years. For these teachers, following the *CLC* was less important in the senior pre-examination year than completing the grammar quickly and reading some selections from original Latin authors chosen to suit the interests and aptitudes of their students. Those who wished to teach Virgil had, by the 1980s, a choice of other books that were compatible with the approach pioneered by the *CLC*.

Following closely on the *Cambridge Latin Course* was a series of abridged texts known as the *Cambridge Latin Texts*, three of which comprised selections from Virgil. These were *Selections from Aeneid II*, ed. C.H. Craddock (CUP 1975), *Selections from Aeneid IV*, ed. J. Muir (1977) and *Selections from Aeneid VI*, ed. A. Haward (1983). The first of these is described below.

C.H. Craddock was a practising teacher, the co-author of a traditional Latin course, and a member of the original Advisory Panel of the *Cambridge Latin Course*.\(^{714}\) His edition of *Selections from Aeneid II* was the first text to be issued in the new series, and followed the format adopted for *Dido et Aeneas* in Unit V of the *CLC*. The student text appeared as a slim booklet containing Latin lines linked by short paragraphs of English narrative.

\(^{713}\) according to an informal survey of CLTA members.

A very full word-order vocabulary was printed on the facing page. The accompanying Handbook contained all the supporting material, and was primarily aimed at the teacher.

The Preface advocated the inductive method of asking questions on a Latin passage before embarking on a translation. Such questions were to be related both to the action and circumstances and to the expression used to convey these.\textsuperscript{715} The major themes of the \textit{Aeneid} were to receive some mention as well, so that students would realize something about the place of Book 2 in the work as a whole.

The seventeen pages of the Introduction contained all that a teacher would need for a class who were now meeting Virgil for the first time. It covered the historical background, Virgil’s intentions, both public and private, the structure of the \textit{Aeneid} as a whole and of Book 2 in particular detail.\textsuperscript{716} About half of this Introduction was devoted to aspects of Virgil’s literary technique: his use of similes,\textsuperscript{717} his depiction of the major characters of Book 2,\textsuperscript{718} and, in considerable detail, his use of language, metre and sound-effects.\textsuperscript{719} In this last section, Craddock stressed the importance of reading aloud and drew attention, with acknowledgement to Jackson Knight and Quinn, to Virgil’s skill in creating special effects both through his manipulation of metre and through his flexible word-order within the hexameter.

---

\textsuperscript{715} Handbook, pp. vi-vii.  
\textsuperscript{716} Handbook, pp. 1-8.  
\textsuperscript{717} Handbook, p. 9.  
\textsuperscript{718} Handbook, pp. 10-11.  
\textsuperscript{719} Handbook, pp. 11-17.
The Commentary itself followed, divided into sections dealing with about twenty lines or fewer, each presumably designed to provide material for one lesson. The contents were organized so that they could easily be presented as a structured lesson. There were four components in each section:

a. a short summary of the content of the section
b. Notes – brief help with translation only
c. Discussion – about one page in length
d. Questions.

The Discussion made frequent references to authorities such as Austin, Page, Williams, Henry, Conington, Putnam, Hornsby, Knox and Quinn. The material drew attention to the mood, atmosphere and general effects created by Virgil through syntax, word order, sound, vocabulary and manipulation of the metre for pace and emphasis. Important allusions were also explained. The Discussion material may be described as a synthesis of observations made by the commentators and critics cited, and as such was a useful and time-saving summary for the teacher. Craddock succeeded in combining his source-material into a readable account, enhanced by his own exposition and occasional remarks.

The Questions on each section were aimed at the students, and could be used as points for either oral or written discussion. Most were designed to draw attention to the effects Virgil achieved through his choice and placement of words and by his employment of the hexameter. There were also questions on characterization and empathy, and some seeking clarification of mythological and cultural allusions. At the end of the Commentary, a list
of fourteen general questions provided essay topics on the major themes, incidents and qualities of *Aeneid* 2 as a whole.

The assumption underlying the format of the Cambridge Latin Texts was that students would gain their understanding and appreciation of the Latin text primarily from the teacher’s presentation in the classroom. The student text, with its generous and user-friendly vocabulary, would enable them to focus on the Latin poetry before them; the teacher, following the material presented in the Handbook, would guide them to a fuller understanding and literary appreciation of the text, and introduce them to the wider historical and moral themes of the *Aeneid*.

One of the Latin courses similar in aims and methods to the *CLC* was *Ecce Romani*, the product of the Scottish Classics Group, a working party of teachers and education lecturers. First published in 1971 by Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, *Ecce Romani* presented a continuous narrative about a Roman family living in A.D. 80, integrating the acquisition of grammar, vocabulary and cultural background with the reading material. It was more conservative than the *CLC* in that it used traditional grammatical terminology and offered more exercises. A second edition, released in 1982, reduced the number of books from six to five and incorporated more exercises, in response to requests from teachers who had found the first edition too challenging for their students. In both editions, the final book contained selections from original Latin prose authors.

---

720 Emily Frenkel, “*Ecce Romani*: reflections from the classroom”, *Hesperiam*, #2, 1979, pp. 34-40.
An innovation in the first edition of Ecce Romani was the early introduction of Latin verse, through a booklet called Versiculi, issued in 1975. Designed to be used from the very beginning of the course, Versiculi began with especially composed elegiac couplets at the most elementary level, featuring the family members from the main narrative:

ambulat in muro Sextus spectantque puellae

“non timeo muros!” clamat, humumque cedit.

Some synthetic verses on mythological themes paved the way to the first pieces of authentic Latin, selections from Phaedrus, Martial and Catullus. Thus through a graded series of verses that paralleled the prose narrative in the main coursebooks, students could become familiar with Latin metre and verse idiom, such as the “split phrase”. The text in Versiculi was printed on alternate pages, with facing vocabulary, translation help and occasional explanatory notes.

A “follow-up reader” with the title Ecce Aeneas was produced by Henry L. Philip in 1986 (Oliver & Boyd), “by permission of the Scottish Classics Group”. Ecce Aeneas contained 332 lines taken from Aeneid 1 and 520 from Aeneid 2, in two sections, “Arrival in Carthage” and “The Last Days of Troy”. The lines in each section were numbered continuously, although in fact difficult passages had been omitted and small changes had been made by the editor. A list at the end of the book indicated which lines of the original text had been included. A brief introduction, “To the Teacher”, opened with the now familiar remarks about the decreasing time available for Latin in schools, and asserted that an edited text such as Ecce Aeneas would overcome the danger of having to omit the study of Virgil altogether. Philip suggested three possible levels of study, the choice of which was left to the teacher.
The Latin text in *Ecce Aeneas* was printed on the right-hand pages; the notes took up the left-hand pages and usually part of the right-hand pages as well, under the Latin text. The notes included basic help with translation and grammatical explanation, mythological allusions, and indications of literary devices and metrical effects. Cross-references were made to the Language Notes at the back of the book which explained poetic idioms and forms and also the most common figures of speech. Under the heading ”Miscellaneous”, Philip assembled examples of a few common Virgilian idioms which often cause difficulty: the predicative use of adjectives and appositional nouns (e.g. *capita alta ferentes* – “holding their heads high”, or *hos cape comites* – “take these as companions”), some uses of *et, -que, ac, and atque*, when these conjunctions were used to add an additional or explanatory component, and the use of conventional expressions such as *talia reddit*, or *sic fatus* to begin and end a passage of direct speech.

*Ecce Aeneas* was very much intended to be read as a transition to unadapted Virgil. The extent of the adaptation can be assessed by comparing an extract from the original with the adapted version:

```plaintext
Aeneid 1.12-20 urbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
ostia, dives opum studiisque asperrima belli;
quam Iuno fertur terris magnis omnibus unam
posthabita coluisse Samo: hic illius arma,
hic currus fuit; hic regum dea gentibus esse,
si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque foietque.
progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
```
audierat Tyrias olim quae verteret arces.

Ecce Aeneas urbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
quam Iuno coluit terris magnis omnibus unam.
progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat, Tyrias olim quae verteret arces.

Not only were lines omitted, but a word was changed to accommodate the omission within a simpler construction than used in the original. With this approach *Ecce Aeneas* did succeed in providing an introduction to Virgil, and was used in some New South Wales schools during the 1990s. The first edition, however was not reprinted, and by the end of the century its use in schools was limited to photocopied sections.

The Scottish Classics Group produced an anthology in 1993 (Oliver & Boyd) with the title *Ecce Scriptores Romani*, intended to introduce a range of original reading material to those who had completed *Ecce Romani* or a similar course. The extracts from a number of prose and verse writers were arranged thematically, under headings such as “Love and Devotion”, “Master and Slave” and “Honour and Glory”. This arrangement allowed teachers to select particular themes for study and to draw comparisons between the treatment of the themes by different authors. Three pieces from Virgil were included: *Georgic* 4.464-506 (Orpheus and Eurydice), *Aeneid* 6.298-316 (Charon) and *Aeneid* 9 (selections from) 176-445 (Nisus and Euryalus). The text was printed on the right-hand pages with a vocabulary list, and the notes were on the facing page.
The introductory “Notes for the Teacher” indicated that the editorial committee was aware that comprehension and interpretation were now prominent in the teaching of Latin texts, and accordingly, each selection of Latin was followed by “Points for Discussion”, a list of questions requiring literary analysis and a degree of personal response. Straight comprehension questions were left to the teacher to compose as required. Some examples of the questions on *Georgics* 4.464-506 are given below, with line references to the original text:721

- What effect do you think Virgil is trying to create by using *te* four times (in lines 465-6)?
- In lines (485-7), almost all the feet are dactyls, whereas in lines (492-3) there is a preponderance of spondees. In what way does the rhythm of the metre echo what is being said?
- How appropriate do you think the simile of the birds is in line (473)? What do the birds and the shades have in common? How appropriate is the adjective in each example?
- Do you feel greater pity for Orpheus or for Eurydice? Give reasons.

Very perceptively, the Notes for the Teacher pointed out that such discussion of the text provided opportunities for students who were not necessarily the most gifted at Latin to give “sensible and shrewd comments on the human issues once they have grasped the meaning of the Latin”.722 Such an observation indicates an awareness that Latin now had to be taught in such a way that students of a wide range of ability could participate and benefit from reading some masterpieces of literature. It was worthwhile to accelerate the transition to original texts by providing substantial help with the linguistic difficulties.

---

721 *Ecce Scriptores Romani*, p. 79.
722 *Ecce Scriptores Romani*, p. 6.
The most recent of the modern Latin “reading courses” to arrive on the educational scene was the *Oxford Latin Course*, by M. Balme and J. Morwood (OUP 1987, 2nd ed. 1996). The *Oxford* sought to improve on the *CLC* by including more grammatical explanations and exercises and by setting the narrative in the lifetime of the poet Horace, a convenient introduction to the writers of the Augustan age. The reading of the *Aeneid* was anticipated in Part 1, which included elementary stories and short plays (“The Fall of Troy”, “Polyphemus”, “The Meeting of Dido and Aeneas”, “*Infelix Dido*”) based on parts of the *Aeneid*, even incorporating some words and phrases directly from Virgil. The final book in the course, the *Oxford Latin Reader*, contained the story of Dido and Aeneas in the actual words of Virgil.

The *Oxford Latin Reader* included among its six Latin authors a substantial selection from Virgil: 81 lines from *Aeneid* 1 (“Aeneas arrives at Carthage”) and about 260 lines from *Aeneid* 4 (“The love of Dido and Aeneas” and “The death of Dido”). There was a short introduction to Virgil and the *Aeneid*, indicating both Virgil’s public role and his “private voice” of human compassion.²²³

The Latin text was presented in the modern format, with facing notes, linking English narrative and an abundance of pictorial illustrations. The notes were designed only to help with translation, and did not include any literary comment. The literary aspects were dealt with in the Teacher’s Book, which offered a short bibliography and referred the teacher to the editions of *Aeneid* 1 and 4 by Page, Williams and Austin. Concise information was given on Virgil’s sources for this part of the *Aeneid*. The notes provided

background, explained allusions and unusual grammar and offered interpretations. Descriptions of the illustrations in the Reader were also included. The teacher was thus given ample material to extend the students’ understanding and to stimulate discussion at any level deemed appropriate for the class. Some examples of the notes are given below to illustrate their range and their potential for arousing interest.

- (*Aeneid* 4.1) *cura* suggests the anxious pain of love. Throughout the book, Virgil presents Dido’s love as a torment, as something that consumes her. Contrast the usual modern view of love (propagated above all by Shakespeare) as life-enhancing.\(^\text{724}\)

- (*Aeneid* 4.305-319, 327-330) *dissimulare* . . . the enormous range of emotions spanned in this speech calls for discussion. You might ask your pupils if they feel that it is very much a woman’s speech and, if so, why?\(^\text{725}\)

- (*Aeneid* 4.393) *pius*: now that Aeneas is acting in accordance with his destiny, he can have his epithet *pius* restored to him. It has not been used since 1.378. His *pietas* is the reason for - indeed the only justification for - his departure. There is a sense in which Virgil is here emptying the word *pius* of any laudatory or condemnatory association. He is simply telling us the fundamental truth about the man we now see. Ask your pupils how they respond to this word at this stage of the story.\(^\text{726}\)

- (*Aeneid* 4.402ff.) *ac velut* . . . the simile Virgil uses elsewhere in the poem to suggest a happily cooperative community, that of bees in a sunlit and flowering countryside . . . is here transformed into a description of efficient ants. Effortfully provident as ants proverbially are, they summon up a picture of communal discipline for Dido and for us to behold. It is in this bleak light that we are asked at this moment to view the destiny of Rome.\(^\text{727}\)

\(^{724}\) *Oxford Latin Reader Teacher’s Book*, p. 35.

\(^{725}\) *Oxford Latin Reader Teacher’s Book*, p. 37.

\(^{726}\) *Oxford Latin Reader Teacher’s Book*, p. 38.

\(^{727}\) *Oxford Latin Reader Teacher’s Book*, p. 38.
The above examples serve to indicate how insightful these notes were. By confining the literary commentary to the Teacher’s Book, the authors of the course demonstrated their belief that the driving force in the study of Virgil at school was the teacher in the classroom, stimulating discussion and interest among the students, and increasing their desire to read more of Virgil’s works. Balme and Morwood provided material for interesting lessons, rather than just enough information to enable the student to translate the Latin text and understand the allusions.

The Teacher’s Book also included a sample test, on *Aeneid* 4.688-705, with a marking scheme and sample answers. In this test only three lines had to be translated, but the meaning of several others had to be explained in answers to the questions. One question required reference to enjambment and alliteration. The last question sought a free response, for which “impressionistic marking” was suggested:

‘After the unbearable climax, the book ends in tranquillity.’ Do you feel that this is the right ending? Give reasons for your answer.\(^{728}\)

This sample test was a good indication of the emphases of the new style of transitional reading text.

All three reading courses, the *Cambridge Latin Course, Ecce Romani* and the *Oxford Latin Course*, had their adherents in New South Wales from their respective first years of publication. Teachers did not necessarily use one course exclusively, especially at the “transitional” stage. The *Oxford Latin Reader*, for example, was used by classes who had progressed through the *CLC* or *Ecce Romani*. Accustomed to continuous reading

\(^{728}\) *Oxford Latin Reader Teacher’s Book*, p. 91.
supported by conveniently placed vocabulary and language information, students expected to proceed fairly rapidly and to become engaged with the subject matter they were reading. When they encountered authentic Latin for the first time, they would not expect to have to “prepare” in the traditional way, looking up the vocabulary and consulting notes at the back of the book. This process would destroy the notion of continuous reading, and accentuate the gap between elementary and “real” Latin.

But despite the students’ greater experience of continuous reading, the difficulties of encountering original Latin for the first time were not removed:

The transition from adapted Latin to unadapted texts is always traumatic and many courses fail at this point. 729

What we can also observe was that, as the general level of linguistic and grammatical expertise had decreased (largely because of diminished teaching time), the level of sophisticated literary discussion and analysis expected of senior students had increased considerably. The new style of transitional texts tried to compensate for the students’ lack of linguistic grounding by supplying more help. At the same time they sought to engage their interest through attractive presentation and careful selection of material, while developing their skills in literary appreciation by providing substantial points for discussion and practice in detailed literary analysis.

All the transitional texts discussed so far in this section were usually read in the pre-examination senior year, as preparation for the prescribed examination text. By the 1980s, constraints of time had made it practically impossible to read any Latin poetry

before the commencement of the senior course. This state of affairs meant that the majority of students who took Latin only in the junior years never read any Virgil at school. It was in an attempt to improve this situation that the present writer produced a *Virgil Starter Pack* in 1998, intended for use in Year 10, before the end of the junior course. It was an experiment with moderate success; the novel format of the *Virgil Starter Pack* makes it worth including in this survey.

The *Virgil Starter Pack* was presented in a small (A5) ring binder containing a student text, three types of coloured cards, a teacher’s guide, and a cassette tape. The student text, with the title, “Aeneas and the Harpies” contained a map of Aeneas’ journey, a re-telling in fictional style of preceding events in the story, the Latin text (*Aeneid* 3.192-269) divided into six sections, and a short essay on Virgil and the *Aeneid*. The Latin extract, chosen for its simple language and self-contained events, was set out with wide spacing between the lines, without vocabulary or notes. These aids were supplied on the coloured cards. A word-order vocabulary for each section was provided on six yellow cards, while notes and discussion points appeared on the six blue cards. The intention was to enable students to place the cards alongside the relevant section of poetry as needed, but then to be able to focus on the text alone, once it was familiar, without the distractions of vocabulary and notes. The yellow cards also enabled students to revise the vocabulary in convenient instalments. The third set of cards (pink) was known as “Sound Cards”, and provided a step-by-step course in aural appreciation of the verse:

1. Latin pronunciation - consonants, vowels (long or short), diphthongs, Greek sounds;
2. syllables - light and heavy;
3. stress in words;
4. poetic metre in Virgil – dactylic hexameter;
5. scansion - elision, feet, caesura;
6. Virgil’s skill - alliteration, assonance, enjambment, coincidence.

A reading of the extract on the accompanying tape gave the students some opportunity to appreciate the aural impact of the verse.

The Teacher’s Guide explained the use of the cards, which could be photocopied for distribution and also for use as tests. The few verbal forms in the extract other than the present and perfect indicative active were listed. A short passage from the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes, describing the Harpies, was included.

The Virgil Starter Pack was made available to members of the Classical Languages Teachers Association and proved popular, especially as teachers were able to obtain one set and photocopy the contents freely. It is interesting, however, to learn that what was specifically designed for use in the junior course was eventually used by some teachers to introduce Virgil in the senior pre-examination year.

Introducing Virgil through recitation
In 1937-8, as already discussed in this study,\textsuperscript{730} there was a short-lived attempt on the part of the Latin examiners to encourage memorization of Latin poetry. This was done by offering candidates in the higher-level final examination the option of quoting twelve lines of verse from memory, as an alternative to a question on scansion. Teachers protested at the unheralded appearance of such a question, and the examiners responded by protesting, in their turn, “against what had evidently been the almost universal neglect of one of the most valuable aids to the appreciation of Latin poetry.”\textsuperscript{731} At any rate, this type of question did not feature ever again.

In 1981, there was an organized move to re-introduce the practice of recitation of Latin poetry from memory. The Classical Languages Teachers Association launched an annual Year 9 Latin Reading Competition that included, not only solo readings, but a specific division for choral recitation from memory of a passage of verse, almost always from Virgil. This was a bold initiative: the reading competitions established in 1955 by the Classical Association of New South Wales offered a platform for talented individuals, but never before had there been an opportunity for whole-class participation.

To prepare Year 9 students for a serious attempt at this competition required considerable teaching time, but justification for allocating the time could be found in the junior Latin syllabus current in 1981:

\textsuperscript{730} See p.70 of this study.
\textsuperscript{731} 1938 Leaving Certificate Examiners’ Comments, p. 253.
Since Latin literature was commonly designed to be read aloud, the full impact of the language will not be felt by pupils unless they have frequent practice . . . Memorization of Latin passages could be more frequently employed to advantage.\textsuperscript{732}

A revised syllabus produced in 1988 was less prescriptive, but did include reading aloud (of prose) and correct pronunciation among its list of “Student Objectives”.\textsuperscript{733}

The Year 9 Reading Competition included prose and verse solo sections (for which the pieces, prepared in advance, could be read from an unmarked copy), and a group section in which the whole class recited a memorized piece of verse about seven to ten lines in length. To ensure uniformity of presentation, the rules of the competition forbade action, props or costumes. The whole piece had to be spoken in unison by the whole group.

Marks were awarded for correct pronunciation, expression and group cohesion.

Preparation for this competition gave teachers the opportunity to leave the otherwise all-encompassing coursebook they were following and to introduce the story of the \textit{Aeneid} (if they had not already approached it through a re-told version) and the principles of Latin versification. Some taught formal scansion and found students very ready to grasp the mechanics of the process at this stage. While most teachers supplied a literal translation of the Virgil passage, still the students had to be guided through the words to be able to speak them intelligently. The development of appropriate expression required some analysis of the language; for example, to match separated adjectives and nouns, to identify significant words placed in enjambment, and to recognize special sound effects.

\textsuperscript{732} Syllabus in Latin, Years 7-10, Secondary Schools Board, undated (but must have been issued after the re-naming of Forms to Years in 1976), p. 4.

\textsuperscript{733} Latin Syllabus, Years 7-10, Board of Secondary Education, 1988, p. 7.
In 2000, an important decision was taken to select the passage for group recitation from the Virgil text to be studied by that group when they were in Year 12. This gave an additional incentive to the students in Year 9 to memorize the passage for the competition. Preparation for the competition could be clearly seen as an introduction to the Latin literature to be read in the senior years.

The Year 9 Reading Competition proved to be a most effective and enjoyable way of introducing the study of Virgil, well before the students were ready to read such poetry at any length. It gave them both a frame of reference and several lines of memorized poetry which, experience showed, they were able to retain into Year 12. It endowed them with a sense of confidence and familiarity with respect to Virgil. Although participation in the competition was, of course, voluntary, it was usual to have about twelve schools competing each year - a significant minority of the forty or so schools teaching Latin.

The reading competitions organized by the Classical Association of New South Wales were aimed at older students, originally (in 1955-65) at those in the pre-examination senior year. Following the introduction of the six-year secondary course, two divisions were instituted for Latin, Form 4/Year 10 and Form 5/Year 11, while the small number of Greek competitors formed a third division of mixed ages. From the early 1990s, as a result of the large numbers of entrants, schools were urged to pre-select no more than five students for each division of the preliminary round held at Sydney University. A small number of finalists in each division competed at an evening function before an audience.

734 CVLTA, March 2000, p. 5.
The details of arrangements varied over the years, and are not relevant to this study. What is significant is that this Reading Competition could be used as a stimulus to introduce original Latin prose and verse to students who were not yet reading such literature in class. Some teachers embarked on a study of the prescribed passages with the whole class, requiring all students to “audition” to represent their school in the preliminary round. The Latin verse passages were usually, but not always, taken from Virgil. From the early years of the 21st century, schools with finalists in the Year 10 Latin division were encouraged to enter their whole Year 10 class in a choral recitation of a passage of Virgil, to be performed at the Finals before an audience.

While describing the introduction of Virgil to students through recitation, we may also consider the contribution of the play, *Dido*, a dramatization of *Aeneid* 4 that was publicly performed in 1992 by a cast of fifty students from ten Sydney schools, under the direction of David Raeburn. The script, an abridgement of *Aeneid* 4 arranged by the present writer, divided the narrative passages between an actor portraying the poet and a female chorus, whose role accentuated the Book’s resemblance to a Greek tragedy. The principal actors were individually tutored in the delivery of the Latin verse, and most of them achieved an expressive, correctly-pronounced performance.

The play was clearly an outstanding learning experience for the participants, but its influence extended to many other Latin students as well. The script was made available to schools in advance of the performances, so that the text could be introduced, at least in
part, before the students came to see the play. There were three performances, one of which was aimed particularly at school audiences. All were well attended, but the schools performance was filled to capacity by Latin students of all ages. Most of them were encountering Virgil’s poetry for the first time. The production was recorded on videotape, and in this form reached many who had not attended. The video was bought by most schools with Latin as a permanent teaching resource, both for the teaching of *Aeneid* 4 as a prescribed text, and to illustrate the reading of passages contained in popular transitional books like the *Oxford Latin Reader*. There is little doubt that *Dido* provided an excellent example of the oral delivery of Virgil which was to influence the teaching of the poetry in the years that followed the production.
“Classics in Translation” was never a regular feature of the curriculum in New South Wales in the twentieth century, although some works, mainly Greek dramas, were sometimes read at school as part of the study of English or Ancient History. Virgil’s *Aeneid*, however, was taught in English at two levels in the schools: as part of an official senior course for beginners in Latin, and at an elementary level for juniors in school-based Classical Studies courses. Both types of course arose during the 1970s, at a time when dwindling numbers in traditional Latin courses brought about initiatives to broaden the appeal of classical subjects.

Virgil’s *Aeneid* featured more prominently in these courses than any other work of Latin literature. It appealed, at different levels, to all age-groups. The dramatic story and the emotions aroused and depicted by the language and imagery could be communicated vividly and passionately, even in a translation, paraphrase or re-telling of the original.

**The 2 Unit Z Latin Course**

In 1978 the Board of Senior School Studies approved a syllabus for a two-year course in Latin for late beginners, to be known, like the corresponding courses in other languages,
as “2 Unit Z”. Students of this course were not expected to learn enough Latin to read original texts, but were expected to reach approximately the standard of Unit 4 in the Cambridge Latin Course and so be able to comprehend and translate unseen passages of synthetic or modified Latin. In addition, the syllabus indicated that the reading of a substantial amount of Latin literature in translation should form an important part of the course:

In Year 12 a variety of titles will be prescribed, one of which will be studied. The syllabus listed, as examples of the type of prescription, Virgil, *Aeneid* 1, 4, 6 and 12, or Livy, Preface and Book 1, or Plautus, *The Prisoners* and *The Swaggering Soldier*. In the final examination, 25% of the marks were to be allocated to the reading of literature in translation.

The texts prescribed for reading in translation were changed approximately every two years. Plautus, Livy, Tacitus, Horace and Juvenal all had their turn. From 1980 to 1987, three options were offered, one of them Virgil. In 1988 only two were offered, Virgil and Tacitus, and from 1989 to the last examination in 1993, only one. In 1989 and 1992 it was Virgil.

Four Books of the *Aeneid* were prescribed at one time, to be read in the prose translation by W.F. Jackson Knight (Penguin, 1969). The style of examination questions never varied from the format established in the first paper, set in 1980. There were two

---

736 *Latin Syllabus, Years 11 and 12, 2 Unit Z Course*, p. 2.
737 *Latin Syllabus, Years 11 and 12, 2 Unit Z Course*, p. 2.
questions. The first had two parts: in each part an extract from Knight’s translation was followed by three questions. In the first two years of the course the questions required only knowledge of characters and events, as seen in the following example:

(1980) Question 5(b)

“Sister”, he said, “at this very moment Fate is prevailing over us. Think not to cause delay. Let us follow where God and our own hard fortune call. I am resolved to meet Aeneas hand to hand, and bear whatever bitterness death may hold for me. Sister, never again shall you see me forget my honour. But first, I entreat you, let me do this one mad deed before I die.”

(i) Whose sister is addressed here? What is her name?
(ii) How has she tried to delay the single combat?
(iii) What event made the speaker decide to face Aeneas?

Marks for each separate part were not given on the 1980 paper. By 1984, some questions had become a little more searching and the difference in depth and length of the expected responses was indicated by showing marks on the examination paper:

(1984) Question 5(b)

Next appeared Augustus Caesar as he drove in a threefold triumph past the buildings of Rome and made to the Gods of Italy his solemn, deathless vow to build three hundred mighty shrines throughout his City. The streets were roaring with joyful merry-making and applause. In every temple mothers were dancing and in every one were sacrifices at the altars, before which slain bullocks lay stretched on the ground.

1 (i) In what context does this passage occur?
1 (ii) Who is “Augustus Caesar”?
3 (iii) Explain the relevance of this passage to the theme of the Aeneid.
The second question on Virgil required an essay. Candidates were given three questions from which to choose one. There was usually one question on the character or role of the hero:

(1981) “The Aeneid is the epic of Rome, not of Aeneas. He is the instrument rather than the hero.” Discuss.

(1984) The opening words of the Aeneid refer to “arms and a man”. To what extent is Aeneas depicted as the warrior hero of epic tradition?

(1989) Consider the strengths and weaknesses of Aeneas as an epic hero.

Another type of question focused on the major issues of the particular Books prescribed:

(1984 – Books 2, 3, 8, 10) Book III is sometimes regarded as one of the less important books of the Aeneid. Discuss the contribution of Book III to the poem as a whole.

(1989 – Books 1, 4, 6, 12) What parallels do you see between the character and fate of Dido and those of Turnus?

A third type of question required an overview of the whole Aeneid:

(1981) What Roman values find expression in the Aeneid?

(1984) To what extent is the Aeneid a work of patriotic propaganda?

It remains to discuss what teaching was required to prepare students for the Virgil questions in the 2 Unit Z examination. In some years a reading list specifically for the
2 Unit Z course was issued. In 1983 it included seven books (Bowra, Camps, Dudley, Knight, Otis, Putnam, Quinn), all of which have been discussed earlier in this study. In 1985 a new list was issued: it included the books by Camps, Dudley, Knight and Putnam from the 1983 list, but added three journal articles and three books, the latter being *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Virgil’s Aeneid*, by M. Di Cesare (Columbia University Press, 1974), *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*, by G.K. Galinsky (Princeton University Press, 1969) and *An Introduction to Virgil’s Aeneid* (ABC, Sydney, 1977). The extent and nature of these reading lists suggest that an advanced level of academic preparation was expected of the teachers and students undertaking the 2 Unit Z course. But it is doubtful whether those students, while endeavouring to learn the Latin language in a short time, would have devoted themselves to the literature part of the course so intensively.

The teaching of classical epic in translation can be done well. Such a course was described with enthusiasm by Catherine Hobey in an essay, “The teaching of Classical Civilization”. Hobey discussed the requirements of the very popular Classical Civilization courses offered by two British examination boards, at both junior (GCSE) and senior (A level) standards. She outlined the teaching of epic: first, the recounting of the Trojan War background, and, for the *Aeneid*, the end of the Roman republic and the rise of Augustus; second, the reading and summarizing of the whole epic, in order to understand its structure, prominent themes and stylistic techniques.

---

738 *1983 Prescribed Texts, Topics, Projects, Works etc.*, Board of Senior School Studies, p. 35.
When a class turns to the examination of individual books, it will have at the outset an idea of what to look for: elements of style, themes, the structure of the narrative. Students will, for example, be familiar with epithets and extended similes...\textsuperscript{740}

Hobey proceeded to suggest teaching techniques for the set books, including reading aloud, presentation by students of a scene from different points of view, debates on characters and their actions, and discussion of themes such as “the idea of heroism, the role of the gods, visions of the underworld, battles with monsters, similes and structure”.\textsuperscript{741}

To follow a course such as that described by Catherine Hobey would be an enriching and enjoyable experience. The 2 Unit Z Latin course, however, had an essential problem: it was trying to do two different things in too short a time. The teaching of Latin language from the beginning, especially to students with little or no knowledge of any other European language and no experience of grammatical analysis, is a challenging task in itself. The level to be reached in less than two years was at least comparable to that reached at the end of the junior course, but without the reassurance of seen texts in the examination. The unseen passages in the 1981 examination contained examples of purpose clauses (with \textit{ut} and \textit{qui}), ablative absolute, \textit{cum} with the subjunctive, and indirect statement and command. At the same time as learning the language to this level of complexity, the student was expected to read substantial amounts of a demanding work of literature so as to acquire both a close knowledge of detail and an overview of the major themes. As the study of literature in translation was worth only 25% of the

\textsuperscript{740} Morwood (ed.) \textit{The Teaching of Classics}, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{741} Morwood (ed.) \textit{The Teaching of Classics}, p. 127.
examination mark, the time needed to teach it effectively could not be justified at the expense of the very demanding language requirements.

There has never been a separate examination course in New South Wales in Classical Civilization or Classics in Translation, although such courses have existed in other Australian states. The 2 Unit Z Latin course, optimistically designed to bring the benefits of Latin to a broader range of students, never attracted enough to make it economically viable. The last examination, in 1993, was attempted by only two candidates, and the course was discontinued after that year.

**Classical Studies in the junior years**

The introduction of Classical Studies as a separate subject in New South Wales schools came about as a direct result of a study trip made by the present writer to England in the early months of 1974. With the assistance of John Sharwood Smith, then Head of the Classics Department at the University of London Institute of Education, I was able to observe classes in a variety of schools in the London area in which children aged eleven to fourteen were being introduced to the classical world through non-linguistic “Foundation” courses. Most, but not all, of these courses were described as “story-centred”. In these classes, the teacher took the role of the traditional bard, and recounted to the class a version of a short Greek myth or, in serial-fashion, a longer epic tale, such as the voyage of the Argonauts, the story of the Trojan War, the wanderings of Odysseus, the curse of the house of Cadmus, or the adventures of Aeneas. Many of the teachers were exemplary story-tellers who could improvise with great skill. Following the story,
the class would pursue a number of learning activities: creative writing (prose or verse),
drama, research, art and craft, to name only the most common. This kind of teaching
process was described in an excellent practical guide, *Teaching Classical Studies*,
Curriculum Bulletin 6 produced by the (British) Schools Council (Evans/Methuen
Educational, London, 1975). This handbook suggested that the story of the *Aeneid*
could be treated either as an extension of the Trojan War or as a Roman story, and placed
accordingly in the structure of the course.\footnote{742} Sharwood Smith, himself a great believer in
the educative importance of mythology, described such teaching methods in a chapter of
his book on classical pedagogy.\footnote{743}

The story-based Classical Studies course fitted in well with the educational trends of the
1970s. It could be taught to unstreamed classes; it suited children of all abilities; it was
easily linked to other subjects in the curriculum; it encouraged active student
participation and learning by discovery; it produced impressive projects and artefacts for
display; finally, it emphasized “process” and “skills” more than factual knowledge. For
those classics teachers who had an aptitude for diversified teaching methods, Classical
Studies gave an opportunity to reach many children who would not have taken Latin and
to brighten the image of Latin and Greek in the school community. Many saw it as a
recruitment ground for the classical languages, especially when it was incorporated into
the curriculum for the first year of secondary school.

\footnote{742} *Teaching Classical Studies*, p. 34.
On my return to Australia, I found that a number of colleagues were interested in implementing Classical Studies. These were not only teachers of classics but also other subjects, such as English and History. The progress of Classical Studies in its early years is well documented: there were inservice courses, articles, and an official pamphlet. The program which I drew up for my own use, and which was adopted and modified by other schools, did contain a small amount of Greek and Latin language study in the first year. A two-year Classical Studies course was introduced by one Sydney independent school: the first year (compulsory) contained story-based work and language study, while the second year (elective) offered a sort of junior course in Ancient History. Other schools introduced one year courses, or incorporated some of the content and methods of Classical Studies in their Latin programs, especially for students of lower linguistic ability.

The aims, methods and content of junior Classical Studies were made available in a textbook, Discovering the Classical World, Pergamon, Sydney, 1977, designed to meet the needs of Australian students. It attracted favourable Antipodean reviews and was re-issued in a British edition in 1980. The first eight chapters dealt with Greek culture, beginning with creation myths and proceeding through hero-tales to the story of Troy. The second part of the book offered a discovery of the Romans, beginning with the

---

Aeneid which was introduced with the sub-heading “A sequel to Homer?” This chapter, like all the others, contained a short bibliography. In this case the list included two junior versions of the Aeneid story, \(^{748}\) two collections of Roman myths, and a general book on Roman culture. No full translation of the Aeneid was included; the assumption was that the teacher would re-tell the story at an appropriate level. The bibliography was followed by eight Activities, labelled “Art”, “Research”, “Oral”, “Essay” or “Composition”, according to the particular skill that was developed through each Activity.

The first Art Activity invited the student to “imagine the atmosphere of complete panic, death and destruction” as Aeneas escaped from the sack of Troy.\(^{749}\) The task was to produce a painting to express “the atmosphere of Aeneas’ departure”. The second Art Activity instructed the student to read Virgil’s description of the Underworld, classify the different sections, and finally to design a map of the Underworld with drawings to illustrate each section.\(^{750}\) The Research Activity was the mundane but essential task of compiling a table of Greek and Roman deities and their functions. Another Activity required a formal Essay to explain why Juno hated the Trojans and why Venus supported them. The Oral Activity was the creation and enactment of “Aeneas’ last conversation with Dido”, to be done with a partner, and tape-recorded. Three tasks were set for written Composition. The first presented an extract from Virgil’s account of Aeneas’ meeting with Anchises in the Underworld, and required the student to write a short poem “expressing the thoughts of either Aeneas or his father about this reunion.” The second


\(^{749}\) Discovering the Classical World, p. 61.

\(^{750}\) See Appendix 7 for an example of a student’s work.
written composition asked for a speech, such as Turnus might have delivered to his people before his final duel with Aeneas. The third and final written Composition was prefaced by an explanation of the word *pietas*, “such a very Roman quality that there is no real name for it in English”. The student was required to find three examples of *pietas* from the *Aeneid* and to write an explanatory paragraph on each example.

It can be observed that through a story-centred Classical Studies course students would acquire a basic knowledge of the Greek mythology underlying nearly all Greek and Latin literature. When meeting the *Aeneid* after some months spent on Greek myths and legends and the Homeric epics, the students would be already familiar with the background, characters, conventions and ethos. Since they were not required to grapple with the Latin language, or even with a full translation of Virgil’s text, they could very quickly absorb the story, discuss the themes and characters, and then pass on to the Activities through which they would develop both their creative imaginations and a number of valuable practical skills, while at the same time learning “a good deal about the Romans, their character and values and attitudes”. It is very interesting to see that the same concept, applied to the *Odyssey*, formed the basis for a year’s learning program for an American Grade 5 class, and was described by its creator in an inspiring book for teachers.

---

751 *Discovering the Classical World*, p. 64.
752 *Discovering the Classical World*, p. 61.
In New South Wales, Classical Studies was overshadowed in the late 1980s by increasing demands on the junior secondary curriculum. It remained a discrete subject in only two Sydney independent schools for the rest of the century. Its influence, however, on the teaching of Latin in the junior years must not be underestimated. Many teachers now incorporated Greek and Roman mythology into their Latin courses. The Trojan War stories and the *Aeneid* were widely taught, especially by teachers using the *Oxford Latin Course* and by those who took part in the Mythology Examinations introduced in 1990 by the American Classical League.

As mentioned earlier,\(^{754}\) the *Oxford Latin Course* included in Part 1 some stories in elementary Latin based on episodes of the *Aeneid*. Three essays introduced the poet Virgil and Aeneas’ escape from Troy, a comparison of the adventures of Aeneas with those of Odysseus, and a recount of the earlier ordeals of Dido.\(^{755}\) Another essay linked the settlement of the Trojans in Italy with the legendary founding of Rome.\(^{756}\) The 1995 edition of the *Ecce Romani* course, now produced in the United States with Gilbert Lawall as Revision Editor, also included a summary of the *Aeneid* early in its first book.\(^{757}\) A Latin passage for comprehension called “Aeneas Leaves Troy” was included in the Review section a little later in the same book.\(^{758}\) Both the *Oxford Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* contained full-colour reproductions of artworks to illustrate the *Aeneid* for beginning Latin students.

---

\(^{754}\) See p. 246 of this study.


\(^{758}\) *Ecce Romani* Book 1, pp. 50-51.
From 1990 the American Classical League, through its Elementary Teachers of Classics division, sponsored an annual Mythology Examination for primary and junior secondary students. The examination, in multiple-choice format, included general questions, a prescribed topic each year, and, for Grades 6 to 9, a literary sub-test. This last section offered a choice of one of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid*, Native American Myths and Legends, and African Myths. For the *Aeneid* questions, students had to read a prescribed Book in the Fitzgerald translation. The questions themselves were simple to answer, as can be seen from the following example, taken from the 1995 paper:

“The women scattered here and there in fear... ashamed
To face the daylight, face what they had done,
For now they knew their own, and their shocked hearts
Were free of Juno.” (5:875-880)

In the passage above, the women had
A set fire to the ships
B offered a human sacrifice to Jupiter
C given their needed supplies to a neighboring tribe
D renounced loyalty to Aeneas and his mission.

The hardest part of the task was the reading of the often complex and literary Fitzgerald translation. Many teachers found that they needed to re-tell the story themselves or to encourage students to read a much simpler version, such as the present writer’s *Aeneas – Virgil’s Epic Retold for Young Readers*. In any event, the ACL Mythology Competition stimulated the incorporation of the *Aeneid*, in some form, into the teaching of junior Latin. Australian students’ participation in this Competition began early in its

---

history; it was publicized in its inaugural year by the Classical Languages Teachers Association,\textsuperscript{760} thanks to a visit by a Sydney teacher, Denise Reading, to the 1990 American Classical League Summer Institute.

In summary, the teaching of Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} in English to students of different ages was introduced in New South Wales in the 1970s both to complement the teaching of Latin and to provide a stimulus for the development of knowledge and skills that could be applied in any discipline. More than any other work of Latin literature, the \textit{Aeneid} offered possibilities for many kinds of creative work as well as controversial topics for serious discussion. While it was always the hope of classics teachers that the students would eventually be able to appreciate the poem in Latin, there was much educational benefit to be derived from a well-designed program of studying the \textit{Aeneid} in English, as is demonstrated in the following poem written by a young student:

Inside the walls of Troy,
A blackened charcoal horse,
Like a wrecked ship.
Its head lies alone.
Its painted eyes stare at Troy
And the fire over the city
And the scattered bodies
And the Greeks in triumph.

Helen, Year 7, Sydney, 1982.

\textsuperscript{760} CVLTA, November, 1990 - unnumbered pages.
CHAPTER SIX

Into the Twenty-first Century

The Revision of the Higher School Certificate

In 1997, as a result of the McGaw Report, the New South Wales government published a White Paper proposing reforms to the Higher School Certificate, to be implemented in Year 11, 2000, and to be examined for the first time in 2001. Among the changes was the reduction of the minimum number of subjects to four, comprising at least ten “units”, with English retaining its compulsory status. Higher-level courses (to be known as “Extension”) were offered only in English, Mathematics, several languages (including Latin and Classical Greek), History and Music. New syllabuses were to be written in all subjects.

Latin came under the supervision of the Inspector of Languages at the Office of the Board of Studies, who was responsible for thirty-nine different languages, some of which offered as many as four separate courses. Some acknowledgement was made of the special needs of classical languages by grouping Latin, Classical Greek and Classical Hebrew together. A committee of experts in each of these collaborated to produce a “Classical Languages Framework” to set the pattern for parallel syllabuses to be written in all three languages. The distinguishing feature of the classical languages was their

---

focus on prescribed texts, works selected for their excellence, their timeless relevance and their essential role in shaping both “Western civilization” and “Australia’s cultural identity”. Work on the new syllabus for Latin Continuers, as the standard course was now re-named, began in the early months of 1999. The writing team comprised five experienced teachers (including the present writer) who worked under great pressure from the NSW Board of Studies to produce a syllabus for a two-year senior course to commence in 2000.

The Latin Continuers writing team decided to maintain the tradition of prescribing two texts, one prose and one verse, for the final year of study. A canon of texts was included in the Syllabus itself (a departure from previous practice), with a system of rotation to ensure that each text would be examined for two consecutive years and that one new text would be introduced each year. The verse prescription was always to be a Book of Virgil’s *Aeneid* and Books 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 were listed in the canon. The members of the writing team agreed that, if there was one work that every Latin student should experience at least in part, that work was the *Aeneid*. They also agreed that the even-numbered Books were more appealing to school students and more familiar to teachers; thus these Books were included in preference to the others. Poets other than Virgil could be studied in the pre-examination year, now known officially as the Preliminary Course. There was also to be a Latin Extension Syllabus, providing a higher-level additional

---

course; lyric, elegiac, satirical and didactic poetry would feature in that Syllabus.\textsuperscript{764} The standard course, then, would always require the study of a Book of the \textit{Aeneid}.

The Latin Continuers Syllabus, like all the syllabuses for the “new” HSC, contained a statement of its Aims, in this case ten in number. They covered the ability to understand the meaning and ideas of Latin texts, the appreciation and enjoyment of such texts, a range of linguistic and analytical skills and an awareness of the contribution of Latin to later cultures. These rather general Aims were compressed into three more concrete Objectives, all concerned with the reading of original Latin texts:

Students will achieve the following Objectives:

Objective 1 – understand seen and unseen texts written in the original Latin;

Objective 2 – understand the linguistic and stylistic features and the cultural references in prescribed Latin texts;

Objective 3 – understand the prescribed text as a work of literature in terms of the author’s purpose.\textsuperscript{765}

Objective 1 included the traditional exercise of “unseen translation”. Apart from this, all three Objectives covered the treatment of prescribed texts; the reading of prescribed texts was the means of achieving the Aims of this syllabus.

The 1992 Latin Syllabus had already featured “Objectives”, (then classified into three types: Knowledge/Understanding, Skills, and Values/Attitudes), and also “Outcomes”,\textsuperscript{766} but the new Continuers Syllabus was much more succinct in its expression of these requirements. “Values and Attitudes”, although alluded to in the Aims of the Continuers

\textsuperscript{764} \textit{Latin Extension Syllabus}, BOS, 2000, pp. 13-14.

\textsuperscript{765} \textit{Latin Continuers Syllabus}, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{766} \textit{Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus}, BOS, 1992, pp. 6-10.
Syllabus, did not appear in its Objectives. These Objectives were, in turn, subdivided into Outcomes, which were practical tasks a student would perform to demonstrate competence in the Objectives. Outcomes were to be the basis for assessment.

The Outcomes listed in the Latin Continuers Syllabus were essentially the same as the tasks that had become the usual components of the final examination in Latin by the end of the twentieth century. They included translation of extracts of unprepared text and from the prescribed text, and work on the prescribed texts requiring grammatical analysis, knowledge of context, explanation of cultural references, identification of literary features and their effects and scansion of the hexameter. There were also to be questions of a broader nature, emanating from Objective 3, concerned with the ideas and beliefs, the structure and the significant themes of the prescribed texts.

The prescription itself was specified in greater detail. The number of lines was to be no less than 380 and no more than 420. Of these lines, the first 300 were to be studied for grammatical analysis. The rest of the prescribed Book was to be read in English, from a specified translation. Three to five “thematic focus areas” were to be set as a guide to the comment questions, following the practice established in 1993. These focus areas, and the lines of text to be studied for each form of assessment, were published not in the syllabus itself but in the Board Bulletin.767

The modest length of the prescriptions, compared to those of the past, continued the trend begun in 1990, surely the result of decreased time in schools for the study of Latin. The 1995 requirement that students should be acquainted with the rest of the prescribed Book in translation was now formalized in the Continuers Syllabus. The grammatical analysis that had been examined first in 1983 (as an alternative to prose composition) was now required only for the first 300 lines of the prescription. The uncertainties about the grammatical questions as to what terminology was accepted and whether manipulation of the Latin was expected were resolved by including a list of required grammatical forms and terms in the Continuers Syllabus, and by testing the grammar by means of multiple-choice questions which required students only to identify the correct form or construction from a list of four alternatives.

In keeping with the intention of the new HSC syllabuses to be as explicit as possible, the Latin Continuers Syllabus included a list of thirty stylistic features, giving for each its technical name, a definition and an example. Sixteen of the examples were cited from Virgil. Although it was not mandatory for students to use these terms in examinations, a list such as this was a guide to the identification of literary features. A glossary of “literary terms” was also included to assist students in interpreting questions which often referred to aspects like “tone”, “pathos” or “imagery” in the expectation that students would be familiar with these terms. Equally explicit were the instructions for
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768 See p. 48ff. of this study.
769 See p. 82ff. of this study.
770 Latin Continuers Syllabus, pp. 32-34.
771 Latin Continuers Syllabus, p. 36.
scansion of the hexameter, even supplying examples of marked lines to indicate a standardized, but not mandatory, way of showing elisions and the main caesura. Doubt over the quantity of the final syllable was resolved, generously, by allowing all final syllables to be marked as X.

The new HSC continued the practice of assigning equal weight to the mark attained in the external examination and to an internal assessment mark awarded to each student by the school. For the first time now the components of the internal assessment were specified; they were meant to include tasks that were not tested in the external examination. For Latin Continuers, 10% of the internal assessment mark was allocated to knowledge of the published English translations of the whole of the prescribed Books. This knowledge was assumed but not tested by the external examination. Some teachers responded to this requirement by testing the students’ knowledge of the translation before beginning work on the Latin, thus establishing a background and context for the prescribed Latin reading. This procedure also meant that the students would not approach the translation without prior knowledge of the content and, as a result, would find the Latin easier to grasp.

The Latin Continuers Syllabus offered some practical guidance to teachers by suggesting tasks of various kinds that could be used for internal assessment. The intention was to encourage the use of tasks different from those of the external examination. Thus we find the following suggestions for tasks related to commentary on the texts:
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discussion, oral presentation, quiz, report writing, debate, research (Internet et al.), exposition writing, empathy writing.\textsuperscript{773}

The same list appeared as applying to the testing of the knowledge of the English translation. This list might well inspire teachers to diversify their classroom methods, but it is doubtful whether in practice much change occurred in assessment methods. Many schools found it less disruptive and stressful to set aside “assessment blocks” – in other words, two or three examination periods during the year, during which written tasks could be done under secure conditions. Oral assessment tasks, while very much the practice in modern languages and now applied in English and some other subjects, were seen by many Latin teachers as dangerously subjective. Written tasks done away from the classroom were hard to guarantee to be the students’ unaided work. The need for equitable assessment imposed its own conditions which could conflict with a desire to use a variety of tasks. The inclusion in the syllabus of different suggested tasks, however, brought to the attention of Latin teachers the possibility of employing a variety of classroom activities in the teaching of prescribed texts.

The external examinations based on the Latin Continuers Syllabus did not appear to differ greatly from those of the 1990s. There was a return to the pre-1976 format in one respect: the passages for translation were presented separately from those for comment, as it was felt that students benefited from being able to deal with one task at a time. The specifications for the three questions to be asked on Virgil were set out in the syllabus in the following terms:\textsuperscript{774}

\textsuperscript{773} Latin Continuers Syllabus, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{774} Latin Continuers Syllabus, p. 46.
Question 4 (15 marks)
Students will translate into English two extracts from the lines prescribed for translation. The two extracts combined will be 18 to 22 lines.

Question 5 (5 marks)
Students will answer 10 multiple-choice questions on the grammatical features of another extract of minimum 10 to maximum 15 lines, taken from the 300 lines prescribed for grammatical analysis. These questions will use the terminology given in this syllabus.

Question 6 (20 marks)
Students will answer several short-answer questions and one extended-response question based on two or three extracts from the prescribed lines. Students will comment on some of the following: stylistic features, cultural references, content, literary qualities, structure and the specified focus areas. The marks allocated to each question will reflect the length of response required. In addition students will scan one or two lines of dactylic hexameter, and may be asked to comment on notable metrical effects.

The four examinations that have been held to date have contained straightforward questions on Virgil ranging from the simple “Who is Hector?” to extended response questions allowing candidates to show their capabilities in literary analysis:


The Notes from the Examination Centre, commenting on the responses to this question, remarked that candidates needed to be more specific in selecting examples from the text and in explaining how the example contributed to the ominous atmosphere. In contrast with Examiners’ Reports in the past, the new style of Notes contain little criticism and much useful advice, a trend that began in the 1980s and indicated a move to a less censorious and more educative role for the examiners.

---

The use of information technology has now made many aspects of the HSC requirements easily accessible to students and teachers. The syllabuses, past examination papers and the Notes from the Examination Centre are all readily available on the Board of Studies website. A recommended reading list to support the prescribed Latin texts, the first official list since 1985, is also available. The Board of Studies also issued to schools a “Standards Package” for each subject in CD-ROM format. These contained actual student answers to examination questions, selected to indicate the minimum standards required to qualify for each of the six “bands”, as the levels of achievement were now known. Schools made a practice of installing the standards packages on their internal computer networks, enabling any student to access these themselves. Unfortunately for Latin, the regular changes in the prescriptions make it difficult for students to apply the sample answers from a previous year to the current texts, and the Standards Packages were not re-issued after 2002.

These electronic resources have the potential to reduce students’ reliance on their teachers for all information relating to the syllabus or the examination. They illustrate the increased role for independent learning in modern education. Information technology, with consistently and carefully updated software, opens unprecedented possibilities for the third millennium of the teaching of Virgil.
The New Recommended Reading List

The appearance of the first official reading list since 1985 indicates some reversal of policy regarding the teaching of Latin texts. The 1992 Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus tended to discourage the study of secondary material, insisting that commentaries were to be limited “to those which serve to illustrate or illuminate an understanding of the text” and that students were “not required to memorize historical or erudite literary information.”

The appearance of a reading list in 2000 to support the new Continuers Syllabus suggests that it was now considered beneficial for teachers and students to have resources beyond the prescribed texts themselves. The reading list, along with a list of internet sites, comprised the Latin Stage 6 Continuers Syllabus Resources. It was made easily accessible through the Board of Studies website. Unfortunately, despite the preamble that described the list as “developed by practising teachers of Latin, in the light of the new syllabus”, the content and arrangement of the reading list made it of little practical use, at least as far as the teaching of Virgil was concerned.

The list contained twenty-five titles on Virgil, listed alphabetically by author. There was no annotation, comment, description or recommendation on any book. The earliest work to be included was *Roman Vergil*, by Jackson Knight, published in 1944 by Faber & Faber, London, but listed here in the Peregrine edition of 1966. This book was familiar to teachers from previous lists, as were eight other titles which have already been discussed in this study. They included works by Brooks Otis (1963), Putnam (1965), Commager
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776 1992 Latin 2/3 Unit Syllabus, BOS, p. 17.
(1966), Quinn (1968), Camps (1969), Dudley (1969), and R.D. Williams (1973). The 1995 English translation of Heinze’s *Virgil’s Epic Technique* (1928) was also listed – the first time this seminal work on Virgil was drawn to the attention of teachers in New South Wales. All the books mentioned so far contained useful guidance on literary analysis or on Virgil’s major themes, central aspects to the teaching of Virgil as required by the Continuers Syllabus.

For some reason, two commentaries were included, both relevant to *Aeneid* 8: one on *Aeneid* 7 and 8 by C.J. Fordyce (OUP 1977) and the other on *Aeneid* 8 alone by K.W. Gransden (CUP 1976). As this Book was not due to be prescribed until 2007 (assuming the intentions of the original syllabus writers were to be followed?), it seems strange that two commentaries on this Book, but none on any other, were listed in 2000.

The remaining books on the reading list included a number of different works, written for different purposes and for different kinds of readers. Six of the titles could be classified as introductory handbooks, suitable in both level and length to be read by students themselves. In addition to the books by Camps and Williams mentioned above, this category included *The Art of the Aeneid*, by W. Anderson (Bristol Classical Press, London, 1969), *Virgil: the Aeneid*, by K.W. Gransden (CUP, 1990), *Virgil* by J. Griffin (OUP 1986) and *Classical Epic: Homer and Virgil* by R. Jenkyns (BCP 1992). All of these were good introductions for the first-time reader of the *Aeneid*, containing summaries of the narrative, discussion of the major themes and, in most cases, an explanation of Virgil’s re-working of Homer and an illustrated guide to his stylistic

?? Latin Continuers Syllabus, p. 15.
features. Of all these, Gransden was the most “modern” in his approach and jargon, referring to Virgil’s re-working of Homer as “intertextuality” and to his use of recurrent motifs as “self-referential”. Gransden also acknowledged that his readers might be reading the *Aeneid* in translation, and drew a distinction between those aspects which could be understood from a translation – themes, structural patterns, Homeric references, even imagery – and those, namely Virgil’s style and literary techniques, which could be appreciated only through study of the Latin text. It is interesting to note that a book specifically written for students of the *Aeneid* in English, R. D. Williams’ *Companion to the Translation of C. Day Lewis* (BCP 1985), was also included in the reading list.

The other books on the reading list were too lengthy or too advanced for most students to use. Some might prove frustrating for teachers, too, if they sought out the most recent titles in the hope of finding useful guidance for teaching the prescribed text. The latest book on the list, for example, was *Virgil: his life and times* by Peter Levi (Duckworth 1998), a discursive account, written for a literary readership, of Virgil’s works seen through the events of Virgil’s lifetime, what little is known of Virgil’s own character, and the Italian countryside in which he lived. The personal, idiosyncratic quality of the book can be illustrated by the following extract:

> The characters in the *Aeneid* hardly exist. They may be made of the best materials, but these materials are only like the March Hare’s best butter that would not make a watch work. You could poke a finger through any of them, Aeneas and Turnus included. The elderly country kings are
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very nice, and there is something real about Juno, the demon queen, and about Allecto, whose
disappearing act always reminds me of the devil’s fart in Dante, which may be based on it.  
Levi’s book is an entertaining and often insightful diversion for the literary amateur, but
would provide little help for the teacher. Some passages, like that quoted above, might be
enjoyed by students, but could prove dangerously misleading if regarded by them as
authoritative.

_The Cambridge Companion to Virgil_, a collection of essays edited by C. Martindale
(CUP 1997), could appear attractive to teachers because of its recent date of publication
and its content of short articles on different aspects of Virgil. Closer inspection would
reveal that many of the essays deal with the reception of Virgil, in accordance with the
view expressed by the editor, that “reception and interpretation are closely
intertwined”. Some Latin teachers who might also teach the “new” English syllabuses
would find familiar views expressed in familiar terms:

> How Virgil’s works are interpreted varies in accordance with the way they are contextualized.

The Latin Continuers Syllabus, however, did not embrace the post-modern approach to
literature. Fortunately for teachers seeking help with the demands of that syllabus, _The
Cambridge Companion to Virgil_ contained a variety of material and was “designedly
pluralist” in its content. Part 4, entitled “Contents and Forms”, made more familiar
reading. James J. O’Hara’s essay, “Virgil’s Style”, began by identifying the typical reader
of Virgil at the end of the twentieth century as one who either reads in translation or with
such little Latin that Virgil’s words must be mentally translated, or at least re-arranged, in
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order to be understood.\textsuperscript{785} On the other hand, he pointed out that the small minority of fluent readers are better equipped, by the results of recent scholarship and even by annotated computer-readable texts, to understand Virgil more profoundly than ever before. O’Hara’s purpose in this essay was to bring to the reader’s attention the aspects of Virgil accessible only through study of the Latin words. Thus his purpose was in sympathy with the aims of most Latin teachers preparing to analyse Virgil with a senior class. He discussed word order, arrangement of clauses, sentence structure, the use of metre and Virgil’s frequent violations of “the norms of prose, or even of Latin”.\textsuperscript{786} The ambiguity in many of Virgil’s lines was analysed at some length and treated as a deliberate device. The various forms of repetition, including alliteration, assonance, anaphora and epanalepsis (repetition of word or phrase from one line to another, for emotional effect), were discussed in connection with Virgil’s creation of emotional response and empathy with different characters.\textsuperscript{787} Finally, O’Hara identified the different types of vocabulary in Virgil – epic, archaic, poetic or unpoetic words – with reference to some modern electronic tools for classifying vocabulary.\textsuperscript{788}

Another useful essay in the \textit{Cambridge Companion to Virgil} was “Virgil and Tragedy”, by Philip Hardie, which contained material that would have particular relevance to the study of \textit{Aeneid} 4 in 2003-4. One of the prescribed thematic focus areas for this Book was “Virgil’s depiction of Dido as a tragic figure”.\textsuperscript{789} Hardie discussed Virgil’s depiction of Dido with reference to the many allusions in \textit{Aeneid} 4 to various Greek tragic dramas,

\textsuperscript{785} O’Hara in \textit{Companion}, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{786} O’Hara in \textit{Companion}, p. 248.
\textsuperscript{787} O’Hara in \textit{Companion}, pp. 251-254.
\textsuperscript{788} O’Hara in \textit{Companion}, pp. 254-257.
which in combination produced a “theatricality of the story”\textsuperscript{790}. He also pointed out Virgil’s debt to Apollonius’ depiction of Medea, itself derived from Attic tragedy, and to the tradition of Roman tragedy that was still vigorous in Virgil’s lifetime. For those seeking to link \textit{Aeneid} 4 with the tradition of tragedy in the Greek and Roman theatre, this section of Hardie’s essay would prove relevant. His concern, however, was with tragedy as a formal genre rather than with the tragic elements in Dido’s personal situation or psychological make-up, issues that have tended to dominate classroom discussion of \textit{Aeneid} 4.

The Recommended Reading List of 2000 does contain material that would support the teaching of Virgil for the Latin Continuers course. The selection and presentation of the items on the list, however, does not encourage teachers to use them. An alphabetical list of twenty-five books of such disparate types is not helpful. It would have been better to separate the introductory handbooks for students from the more advanced reading, aimed primarily at teachers. The latter group of books should have been listed with a short description for each, preferably indicating the most relevant sections. The reality is that budget restrictions in schools prevent most Latin teachers from purchasing more than the most necessary books. Obtaining resources from libraries is a time-consuming process, especially unwelcome when there is uncertainty about their usefulness. Teachers would therefore be inclined to continue using the books already available to them rather than to explore more recent publications. Thus it is clear that the reading list in its present form would not encourage teachers to update their reading on Virgil, nor would it assist in

\textsuperscript{790} Hardie in \textit{Companion}, p. 322.
identifying suitable books for students to read. It is hoped that the list will be revised so as to provide a useful and influential resource to support the teaching of Virgil in the Latin Continuers course.

**Non-Print Resources**

The Latin Continuers Resource List offered a list of internet sites as well as the Recommended Reading List discussed above. An attempt to explore the sites connected with Virgil has revealed the need for such resource lists to be compiled carefully and updated regularly. One site called “Virgil Project” proved on investigation to have nothing to do with the Latin poet or his works at all. Another site called “The Aeneid of Virgil” offered an (unacknowledged) English translation of all twelve Books, which transpired to be that of John Dryden. Only one site proved relevant: [http://virgil.org](http://virgil.org). This website, compiled by David-Wilson Okamura, offered a biography of the poet, a useful search engine for words and phrases in Virgil, a bibliography, and links to three sites offering Latin texts and translations: the Perseus Project, the Project Gutenberg and the Classics Archive.

There is no doubt that, for the advanced scholar, the internet offers great opportunities to save time in accessing secondary material. For teachers, the availability of texts to download, vocabulary lists and translation aids can be a great help, but these must be used with caution. Teachers can download extracts of Latin text to use in examination papers and class assignments, but need to check them for variations from the prescribed edition. Vocabulary lists and other student aids are not always accurate. Students must be
warned against copying translations offered on the internet; not only is this practice ethically questionable, but the translations offered may be outdated, too liberal, or incorrect.

One example of a useful and comprehensive classics website, not included in the Board of Studies resources list, is “The Oracle of Loxias”: (http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~loxias/search.htm), the work of Andrew Wilson, an English classics teacher who recently translated a Harry Potter novel into Classical Greek. His website offers a wealth of interesting material for both teachers and school students of Latin and Greek. On Virgil’s Aeneid, he provides a full summary of the narrative, with substantial sections of the Books most popular as school texts available in both Latin and English translation. An alphabetical vocabulary of the Latin and a glossary of proper names occupy separate frames, to be viewed at the same time as the Latin text. 791 This site could support the comprehension and translation of Virgil in a useful way for students who enjoy electronic resources, and could provide a welcome change in the method of preparation for a lesson. It is not, however, a substitute for classroom teaching and discussion.

There is a great need for a thorough, annotated electronic resource list on Virgil and other Latin authors read in schools. Such a list would require substantial time spent on investigating all likely sites, selecting the most suitable and trialling them with students.

791 See Appendix 9. Appendix 10 contains 2005 catalogue listings for software on Virgil. I have not yet had the opportunity to test these.
Only then could a list of recommendations be published which would inspire the confidence of teachers. This work remains to be done.

**The Changed Role of Public Examinations**

The description, analysis and discussion of the requirements of the final public examinations in Latin have constituted a major part of the present study of the teaching of Virgil. This emphasis is not surprising in view of the fact that, for the whole of the twentieth century and now beyond, Virgil’s poetry has been regularly prescribed for such examinations. Consequently, the content, format and general orientation of the questions have always influenced the teaching of Virgil, as most teachers were anxious for their students to succeed in examinations which were not only regarded as necessary qualifications but also as highly publicized competitions, especially in those schools where Latin was a significant subject.

The role of the final examinations themselves, however, has evolved since the beginning of the twentieth century from that of barrier designed to admit only a select few (as was the purpose of the Senior Public Examination) to that of a tool in the educational process. The evolution began with the vision of Peter Board in the first decade of the century. When he proposed the Leaving Certificate, which was first examined in 1913, it was to be the culmination of a properly structured secondary education that offered courses to meet the different needs of all students. He insisted that the course of study should determine the nature and content of the examination, and not the other way around. As far as Latin was concerned, however, the Leaving Certificate did not bring much change, although the instructions to teachers in the first *Courses of Study* (1911) recommended
wider reading with the aim that the student would acquire “a more intimate acquaintance
with and a truer appreciation of Roman life and literature”\textsuperscript{792}. Despite these laudable
aims, the actual Latin examination for the Leaving Certificate was very like that of the
Senior Public Examination it had sought to replace. Even the introduction of the six-year
Higher School Certificate course saw little change in the way Latin was examined. The
censorious comments in the Examiners’ Reports, quoted earlier in this study, indicated
clearly that the Latin examinations were designed to single out the gifted students, not to
encourage the average.

Changing social, economic and educational expectations in the 1970s affected the public
examination system in general, and Latin in particular. With more students completing
the secondary school course, the junior credential (School Certificate) lost much of its
importance and ceased to be a full external examination. For Latin this change caused the
disappearance of the study of prescribed original texts until those set for the final
examination. The Higher School Certificate courses, too, were re-structured, and the
external examination was no longer the supreme arbiter of success or failure. From 1977
school “estimates” supplied by teachers were worth 50\% of the final marks. In 1986 this
process was formalized further, and separate “school assessment” marks were issued to
students as well as their examination marks, the two components having equal value.
Teachers now had as much say as the external examiners in assessing the students’
achievements, although the school assessments of a school group were moderated against
their examination performance to ensure parity. This process officially recognized the
importance of the students’ progress at school.

\textsuperscript{792} Courses of Study for Public High Schools, NSW Dept of Public Instruction, 1911, p. 59.
The Examiners’ Comments from the 1980s on were more constructive in content and more complimentary in tone than they had generally been in the past. This may indicate a change in official policy, a stronger role for teachers, rather than university staff, in the setting and marking of the examination, or simply the fact that Latin was now increasingly confined to a small candidature from more privileged schools, resulting in a higher average standard of proficiency. The introduction, in 1985, of centralized examination marking for Latin gave to the many teachers employed in this task a close knowledge of the examination requirements and showed them how students had to be directed if they were to achieve good marks.

The “new” Higher School Certificate took the educational role of the assessment process a step further. The standards-referenced approach introduced in 2001 meant that students in the Latin Continuers course were placed in one of six attainment “bands”, according to the degree to which they fulfilled the pre-determined standards of these bands. Thus, in theory, all the candidates, if they did well, could be placed in the highest band and receive 90 or more marks out of 100. Latin candidates tended to be able students, and, to the gratification of their teachers, in 2004 74% of them were placed in the highest band. The examination process could be seen to be rewarding all students who learned the subject well, not just those few who did better than all the others.
In order to demonstrate to students and teachers how the standards-referenced assessment worked, the Board of Studies issued a “Standards Package” in CD-ROM format,⁷⁹³ to be made available to all students through any school’s internal network. This information had a three-fold purpose: to establish standards for the reference of the official judges of future examinations, to give teachers and students an understanding of the level required to achieve each of the six bands, and to provide teachers with examples of answers which had gained full marks. The Latin Standards Packages which were issued after the 2001 and 2002 examinations contained the syllabuses and papers for both the Continuers and the Extension courses, the marking guidelines for each question, and some representative student scripts. There was also an explanation of the judging process used to decide the cut-off point for each of the bands. Never before had so much information about the examination procedure been made available to teachers and students.

The marking guidelines were composed by the Examination Committee responsible for setting the papers and indicated what qualities an answer had to show to be awarded a particular mark. They did not supply exact answers to all questions, but were descriptive in nature. The following example shows the marking guidelines applied to a question, worth six marks, requiring translation of an extract from the Virgil prescribed text:⁷⁹⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translates the extract into fluent, coherent and accurate English</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a consistent and perceptive understanding of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷⁹³ See p. 276.
| 3-4 | Demonstrates a sensitivity to the tone and style of the author |
| 3-4 | Translates some of the extract into accurate English |
| 3-4 | Demonstrates an understanding of the relationship between the words and structures of most of the extract |
| 3-4 | Demonstrates an awareness of the tone and style of the author |

| 1-2 | Translates some structures into accurate English |
| 1-2 | Demonstrates a limited understanding of the intent of the author. |

Some teachers, influenced by this marking system, abandoned the traditional practice of marking their own students’ translations word by word in favour of “impression marking” which gave credit for overall meaning and style rather than deducting a mark for each error. The adoption of this approach aroused controversy. The argument in favour of impression marking was that translations which were excellent and fluent despite some minor errors would not be given lower marks than literal, awkward but accurate versions. The argument against this approach was that it was too subjective and could encourage students to be slapdash. Again one can observe the potential influence of the examination process on teaching methods.

Teachers anxious to advise their students on the best techniques to apply to literary analysis questions could use the information supplied on the following question from the 2002 Latin Continuers paper. The question was attached to *Aeneid* 2.718-29:
How does Virgil use language and narrative technique in this extract to emphasise Aeneas’ new responsibilities?

The Marking Guidelines for this question, worth seven marks, were as follows: 795

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates both depth and breadth of treatment through the selection of a range of appropriate examples from within the passage</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains the examples in detail, commenting on how they emphasise Aeneas’s new responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates breadth of treatment through the selection of appropriate examples from within the passage</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains the examples, commenting on how they emphasise Aeneas’s new responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selects one or two appropriate examples and attempts some explanation of their effect</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Notes from the Marking Centre gave the following extensive comment on this question:

The best responses made a clear statement of the specific responsibilities of Aeneas alluded to in this extract and gave a lucid explanation of how Virgil’s use of language and narrative technique emphasised them. Many candidates demonstrated their depth of understanding by citing a wide range of relevant examples and explaining how those examples added emphasis. A number of candidates appreciated the symbolism conveyed through contrast of such religious words as *sacra*, *patrios penates* and *abluero* with such pollutant-suggesting words as *nefas* and *caede recenti*. The significance of such words as *subiecta*, *succedo* and *oneri* was referred to by many. Many noticed the attention to detail within the narrative and commented how these were suggestive of Aeneas’s new responsibilities. 796

From this comment students could learn what degree of sensitivity to detail could be shown in the answer to such a question. To reinforce their awareness of the characteristics of an excellent answer they now had available to them an actual student response which had been awarded full marks in the examination. The fact that this response was reproduced in the student’s own handwriting made it all the more impressively authentic.

The teaching possibilities afforded by the Standards Packages are many. Teachers could distribute copies of answers and ask their students to grade them themselves. The ensuing discussion could clarify for some students exactly what was expected of them and what to avoid. Unfortunately for Latin teachers, no Standards Packages were issued after 2002. This would not matter greatly in subjects with unchanging content, but in Latin, with its changing prescribed texts, the content of one Standards Package could not be applied fully in a different year. As a result, this excellent teaching resource could have only limited application in Latin. To influence and improve the teaching of Virgil, it would have to be re-issued at least every second year.

**Virgil in the 21st Century Classroom**

The practices of teaching Virgil in the twentieth century have been discussed on the basis of inferences from public documents and records, from the textbooks, commentaries and scholarly literature in use at different times, from studies of Latin teaching by
professional educators and from the personal experience of many individual teachers, including the present writer. For the very early years of the twenty-first century an analysis has been attempted of the changes caused by the revision of the syllabuses and public examinations that came into force with the new century. For this recent period it has also been possible to record how Virgil is actually being taught in the schools of New South Wales by observing a representative sample of lessons in schools and by surveying practising teachers about their methods and preferences.

**a. Classroom Observation**

Ten Sydney schools were visited, and a total of eleven Year 12 lessons were observed. The schools were selected to offer a sample of both government and non-government (including Catholic), boys and girls, selective and non-selective, and male and female teachers of different lengths of experience. All the classes were observed within a three-week period in November, so that it can be assumed that all students were roughly at the same stage, that is, in the first few weeks of studying their prescribed text. Two of the classes were preparing for the International Baccalaureate rather than the Higher School Certificate: the IB classes were studying *Aeneid* 2, while the HSC prescription was *Aeneid* 6. One of the HSC classes had not yet commenced reading *Aeneid* 6; the lesson observed was on tackling an “unseen” from *Aeneid* 1.
Here is a summary of the types of schools observed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government selective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government selective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government non-selective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys only</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls only</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No government comprehensive high schools nor any Catholic systemic high schools could be included, as no advanced Latin (such as Virgil) is currently taught in any such schools. Three independent Catholic schools were included among the non-government schools.

Eleven teachers were observed, five female and six male. Four worked as the sole Latin teacher in their school. Two had fewer than five years of teaching experience; one had more than forty years; the rest ranged from fifteen to thirty years. All but three had been schooled in New South Wales themselves; two had been educated in other Australian states, and one was from Britain.
Class sizes ranged from one student to sixteen, with a mean size of 5.8. A total of 64 students were observed (roughly one-third of the final year cohort in New South Wales). In two of the schools an additional Latin class existed in Year 12, separately timetabled from the class observed.

The observation took place in a normal, scheduled class at a time agreeable to the teacher. Students had been forewarned of the visit. The observer sat a short distance from the students, usually at the back or side of the classroom, followed a text of Virgil and took written notes, without participating in the lesson. On some occasions the teacher asked the observer a question on the text; the observer answered these briefly without expanding. Only on one occasion did the observer speak spontaneously; this was to point out that a word in the Study Guide being used was different from the reading in the official (Williams) edition.

In almost all the lessons the students participated with spontaneity, ease and apparent enjoyment. The exception was the class with a lone student; in this session the teacher talked continuously; the student only occasionally asked for a word or phrase to be repeated or clarified, but otherwise was fully occupied in transcribing the translation and notes given by the teacher. This teaching method was quite possibly the result of there being only one student with a shy personality, rather than an indication of the teacher’s preferred method.

All the lessons included comprehension and translation of a passage of Virgil, analysis of the grammar encountered, and explanation of allusions, especially proper names. Several
lessons included scansion of a line or two. Some attempted literary criticism either orally or in writing. Three teachers consulted extra commentaries or encouraged the students to do so in the course of the lesson. In all the lessons, the Virgil text was read aloud, using the Restored Pronunciation, usually by the teacher but often by students individually.

Most of the lessons were conducted in linear fashion, the discernible object being to “get through” a stated number of lines of the text. Beginning at the first line of the passage, a student was asked to translate, a task which usually required considerable help from the teacher. In some cases, the teacher fed the student one Latin word or phrase at a time, in English word order. Points of grammar, especially functions of the ablative case, were usually explained by the teacher. One class received a hand-out which listed almost every word with a grammatical definition and a space for additional notes. Mythological and other allusions were dealt with as they occurred.

Four teachers took a more inductive approach. They encouraged their students to take an overview of an extract of ten lines or so, by introducing them to the context and then asking them to form some impression of both the meaning and the atmosphere of the passage from any words or phrases they could immediately recognize. Most students were able to contribute something useful at this stage, especially in response to carefully-phrased questions, such as, “What feeling do you get about Charon?” “Which words gave you that feeling?” “What is the reaction of Aeneas?” “How do you know?” From this general impression, the teacher led the students to more specific details in the passage, first identifying the main subject and verb and then filling in the “outline” created by
these significant words. The final English translation was reached after a process of
adding and refining, and was the culmination of a discussion that took into account
literary effects such as word order, enjambment, alliteration and repetition. There was an
attempt to convey these effects in the English translation.

The inductive approach is very much in the spirit of the Teachers’ Handbooks of the
*Cambridge Latin Course* and the associated Cambridge Latin Texts. It generates a lively
lesson and conveys an impression to the students of the literary value of the text. The
process of refining the translation reveals nuances and layers of meaning which might not
be explored by a literal rendition. It does demand, however, a different type of
preparation by the teacher and a degree of confidence that the examination requirements
will be covered in the time available. Students could find the inductive approach
unsettling if they have not been accustomed to it in earlier years. There is no doubt that it
must be reinforced by oral recapitulation and regular written exercises to ensure that the
students feel secure about their knowledge.

Only one of the eleven classes appeared to have “prepared” the translation before class,
as traditionally expected. In two other classes some students appeared to have worked
ahead and were able to respond promptly and more or less correctly to the teacher’s
request to translate a line. Although these lessons took place very near the beginning of
the year’s work, when the prescribed texts were new to the students, the overwhelming
impression is that prior preparation of the translation is not expected by many teachers.
The task of looking up and writing out vocabulary lists before class is now rarely
imposed; teachers either supply a word-order vocabulary or refer to one in an HSC workbook available for sale.

Observation of these lessons confirmed the impression that students find the translation of Virgil quite difficult. Two types of problems kept recurring. The first stemmed from failure to recognize the inflected forms of words – *vulnere*, for example, was taken as an infinitive. Nouns in any cases except the nominative and accusative singular appeared to cause confusion. The second problem was in matching separated words which were in agreement (“split phrases”). One teacher drew a diagram to indicate the agreements in *Aeneid* 6.285:

\[
\text{multaque praeterea variarum monstra ferarum}
\]

a line in which the agreements were at least indicated by the same endings. In another school a student could not match the nouns and adjectives in *Aeneid* 6.290-1:

\[
\text{corripit hic subita trepidus formidine ferrum}
\]

*Aeneas*

while in a third group a student asked about the agreement in *Aeneid* 6.407, a line in which there is genuine ambiguity due to an elision:

\[
\ldots \text{tumida ex ira tum corda residunt.}
\]

Indirect statement was often not easily recognized, especially when Virgil’s expression was elliptical, as in *Aeneid* 6.456-7:

\[
\text{infelix Dido, verus mihi nuntius ergo}
\]

\[
\text{venerat extinctam ferroque extrema secutam?}
\]

Simpler indirect statements like that in *Aeneid* 6.292-3 still caused difficulty:

\[
\text{et ni docta comes tenuis sine corpore vitas}
\]

\[
\text{admoneat volitare} \ldots
\]
More difficult or unusual forms, such as *superum* (genitive plural), and constructions like the retained accusative were invariably identified and explained by the teachers, even though such usages are usually recorded and explained in Williams’ commentary. Teachers do not appear to expect the students to have made any acquaintance with the notes prior to the lesson.

Two of the classes were preparing for the International Baccalaureate. This alternative to the Higher School Certificate was first introduced in one school in New South Wales in 1987 and has been adopted by about eight independent schools to date. (Unlike their counterparts in other states, government schools in New South Wales are not allowed to introduce the International Baccalaureate program.) In the Latin standard course, two literary genres must be selected for study from a list of five. One of the genres is Roman Epic, for which the prescribed text is *Aeneid* 2. The examination presents two extracts from the Virgil, each with attached questions, one of which requires translation of only two or three lines. The other questions deal with context, scansion (without comment) and general literary appreciation. In addition, candidates must write an essay on one of their texts, discussing a general aspect of the work with supporting examples.

The fact that translation of the prescribed text earns comparatively few marks in the examination (4/15 for each extract) gives a different emphasis to the teaching of Virgil, or so the IB teachers claimed. Both said they spent less time on translation and more time on discussion and interpretation than in the HSC course. The absence of grammar questions in the IB paper also means that the constructions do not have to be known
literally as long as the meaning is understood. The student’s grasp of the Latin is tested not only by translation but by questions which require close reference to the text, for example:

How and why does Virgil emphasis the effect of *contorsit*? (*Aeneid* 2.52)

It must be stated, though, that despite the difference in emphasis, the IB lessons observed did not seem essentially different in approach from many of the HSC classes in the sample.

It is interesting to note that when it was suggested, in the 1999 discussions of the proposed new Latin syllabus, that fewer marks should be allocated to translation of the prescribed text in the Higher School Certificate examination, many teachers were very much against such a move. Some asserted that, if there was such a change, students would not study the Latin text at all. Another view was that, as the translation takes so much work and time, it should be rewarded with a significant proportion of the total mark. Some teachers argued that the predictability of the translation questions gave confidence to the weaker students and encouraged them to continue with Latin. As a result of these discussions, the “new” HSC Latin Continuers examination gives an even stronger identity to the translation questions by separating them from those on grammar and literary study.

The overall impression produced by these observations is that, insecure as most students appeared to be with the language and in spite of their struggles to arrive at a translation, they seemed confident with the discussion of literary features and cultural references. Their handling of scansion was competent enough to indicate that the hexameter had
been taught at an earlier stage, and they were ready to point out the contribution of sound to the sense and atmosphere of the poetry. The teachers in all the classes observed seemed to be dealing with the same situation in varying degrees, namely that they had to teach at two different levels with respect to language on the one hand, and literary and cultural discussion on the other. The language of Virgil was too advanced for the students, and had to be explained at the most basic level. At the same time, the students showed quite a sophisticated grasp of literary techniques, were sensitive to the writer’s tone and were aware of a range of cultural connotations.

**b. Survey of Teachers on the Teaching of Virgil**

A questionnaire was distributed to Latin teachers, mainly, though not exclusively, at meetings of the Classical Languages Teachers Association. Of the forty questionnaires issued, twenty-four were completed and returned. Neither teachers nor schools were identified, although general questions were asked about the type of schools and the experience of the teacher. As the questionnaires were answered by teachers as individuals, some from the same school, the number of different schools involved is fewer than 24. The aim of the questionnaire was to find out the practices and preferences of teachers themselves, with respect to the teaching of Virgil at three levels: as the Year 12 prescribed text, as optional Latin reading before Year 12, and in the form of the *Aeneid* in English as a background study for junior classes.

The teachers who responded were active in the following types of schools:

---

797 See Appendices 1 and 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys only</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls only</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government schools</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-government schools</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selective or partly-selective schools | 13 |
| Non-selective schools*                | 11 |
| TOTAL                                | 24 |

*senior Latin classes are usually, but not always, composed of the most able students in a non-selective school.

The experience of the teachers ranged from recently qualified to post-retirement (but still teaching part-time):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 years +</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of these teachers were using the *Cambridge Latin Course* in the junior years; all were using a “reading approach” course, including one who used a self-composed coursebook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursebook Combination</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Latin Course</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Latin Course</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC + OLC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce Romani</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce + OLC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own book</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess what experience from other related subjects the teachers brought to their Latin teaching, they were asked to indicate their prior experience in English, French, German, Classical Greek, Ancient History and Classical Studies. Some teachers had experience in a number of the nominated subjects, while two claimed no experience in any of them. The most common additional subject was Classical Greek, followed by French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. with this experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical Greek</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparatively high number of respondents who had taught Classical Greek suggests that the teachers who returned their surveys may be more specialized in Classics than are most Latin teachers in New South Wales. It is possible that those experienced in English may be more confident in teaching literary appreciation, or that those with Greek may be inclined to approach Virgil in the light of the Homeric tradition. Those who also taught French or German might see themselves primarily as language teachers, with less interest in the traditions of the classical world. On the other hand, those with Ancient History or Classical Studies experience might offer a range of teaching methods unfamiliar to language specialists. These are all generalizations and suppositions, and cannot be proved from this survey. However, they serve to point out that most Latin teachers have experience of other subjects that may directly influence or enhance their teaching of Latin.

Part 1 - The Teaching of Virgil as Prescribed Text in Year 12

The questions in this section were answered by twenty respondents.

i. Edition and Commentaries

All used the Williams edition in class, and all claimed to consult other commentaries as well. Frequently listed were Austin, Page and Fletcher (for *Aeneid* 6). Regarding the Williams commentary, four teachers found it too advanced and lacking in basic help, and only two said its grammatical explanations were useful. On the other hand, seventeen commended its explanations of references and allusions, ten liked its literary comments and nine its metrical explanations.

ii. Virgil Preferred?
All but one of the respondents said they preferred teaching the Virgil prescription to the Cicero, and, with reference to their students’ preferences, five said that all preferred Virgil, eleven that most did, and one thought the preference was equal. The teacher who preferred Cicero said that most of the students did so too.

iii. Teaching Methods

• Respondents were about equally divided as whether they taught the whole of each prescribed text continuously, in series, or whether they taught them both in some parallel arrangement.

• As the Williams edition contains no vocabulary list, respondents used various sources for vocabulary: ten used a dictionary, either solely or as an adjunct to other sources, four used a school edition with a list at the back, three compiled their own list. Eight used a published word-order list, most of them naming an HSC workbook written and distributed by a local teacher, Elizabeth Stephenson. Ten teachers said it was not necessary for their students to look up vocabulary themselves, whereas four encouraged the finding of vocabulary as a group endeavour.

• “Preparation” before class in the traditional way is by no means universal now. Thirteen respondents said they expected students to attempt the translation before the lesson, five said they “sometimes” expected this to be done as specific homework, while two did not expect prepared translation at all. Those who expected preparation seemed to do so in spite of their own experiences: nine of the thirteen admitted that some students made little attempt, or that very few could
manage it on their own, or that they (the teachers) expected to do most of the work themselves in class. Only four teachers said that most students could achieve a reasonable translation by themselves: two of these taught in a selective school and one in a partly-selective school. Of the seven respondents who sometimes or never expected prepared translation, six pointed out the positive aspects of tackling the text together in class, while four also said that the text was too difficult and discouraging for the students to do on their own. Only two of the twenty respondents corrected the written versions after they had been worked through in class. Six issued a correct version to the students to learn for examinations; of the thirteen who did not do so, eleven felt there was no need because the version had already been checked in class. Three said specifically that they preferred each student to have an individual translation, rather than an agreed class translation.

- In the teaching of grammar, the multiple-choice format of the examination question has been influential: fourteen of the twenty respondents said that they gave practice questions in this format. All but one said they regularly practised grammatical questions orally in class. Five said they gave separate grammar lessons. No teacher assumed that the grammar was already known.

- With respect to scansion and oral/aural appreciation, fourteen of the twenty respondents said they spent occasional minutes on scansion, three of them with the feeling that the small number of marks for scansion did not warrant the spending of much time on it; six dedicated whole lessons to scansion and metre. Fifteen teachers described themselves as confident about reading Virgil aloud,
one as not confident about Latin pronunciation and three as not confident about expressive reading. One said he/she was reasonable confident, but found that the students were poor listeners! Nine teachers said they read Virgil aloud in class with attention to metre, six asked students to read aloud individually or in chorus and two played recordings of the Latin verse. In contrast, five said they preferred to focus on the written text and did not spend class time on aural appreciation.

- Of the twenty respondents, only one said he/she did not much enjoy teaching literary appreciation. Nineteen made positive responses, fourteen saying they looked forward to this aspect, as their students enjoyed it, and thirteen enjoyed the opportunity provided for students with different talents to shine.

- Eighteen teachers responded to the question on the prescribed thematic focus areas. Only one found the topics too simplistic and an extra imposition on teaching time. Sixteen found they stimulated discussion and gave students an overview of the main issues. Two teachers found them helpful in structuring their teaching.

- Nineteen respondents expected students to read the English translation, either of the whole Aeneid or of the prescribed Book, as required for the internal assessment of the HSC. None discussed the merits of the translation, two compared the prescribed (D. West) translation with other versions, and five used the translation to help with the meaning of difficult passages of the Latin.

Some conclusions emerge from this survey about the teaching of Virgil as a prescribed examination text.
1. Virgil is far more popular than Cicero with teachers and students.

2. The Latin text of Virgil is too difficult for most students to translate on their own.

3. Private preparation of vocabulary and translation is much less prevalent than in the past.

4. The translation studied for examination is usually not an individual one, but an agreed version either issued by the teacher or reached by common effort in class.

5. The grammatical content of the text is specifically taught so as to meet the examination requirements.

6. The aural aspects of Virgil are treated by most teachers through practice in scansion as required. Most teachers feel confident about reading Virgil aloud, but others prefer to deal with it as a written text only.

7. The literary appreciation of Virgil is popular with both teachers and students.

8. The prescription of thematic focus areas is generally welcomed.

9. The prescribed English translation is generally used to obtain an overview of the Aeneid; while it may be used as an aid to translation, there is little discussion of its merits compared with other translations.

**Part 2 – Teaching Original Virgil Before Year 12** Twenty-one teachers responded to Part 2, indicating that they taught Virgil before Year 12. Seven taught more than 100 lines in Year 11, and four less than 50 lines. The most commonly cited sources for these lines were Units IV and V of early editions of the *Cambridge Latin Course* and the
*Oxford Latin Reader.* The “Virgil Starter Pack” designed by the present writer, *Ecce Aeneas* and *Ecce Scriptores Romani* were also mentioned. Some teachers made their own selections. Six teachers said they taught some Virgil in Year 10 or earlier, two using the “Virgil Starter Pack”, two the selections for a Latin Reading Competition, and two using other short extracts.

Almost all the teachers gave a general introduction including a description of Virgil’s role in Augustan Rome, an explanation of the epic tradition and an account of the Trojan War story and its connection with the origins of Rome. The teaching methods employed, listed in order of popularity, are revealed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING METHOD</th>
<th>NO. OF TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Virgil aloud to the class</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the grammar to identify case, agreement etc.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing alternative translations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking comprehension questions before translating</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expecting students to copy down an agreed translation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-arranging the Latin words in translation order</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expecting students to memorize some lines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing several published translations  4
Instructing the class to read aloud in chorus  1

These responses indicate an emphasis on the process of translation. Analysing the grammar and re-arranging the words are techniques used to “de-code” the Latin. Some use is being made of inductive methods in asking comprehension questions before translation. The frequent practice of reading Virgil aloud to the class suggests a desire to impart a sense of the aural impact of the poetry, but this is not often reinforced by getting the students to memorize the lines or to chorus them.

Few teaching aids are used to help with the text. Six use an overhead projector; ten distribute enlarged photocopies to be marked, one uses a data projector attached to a computer; four use books only; two supplemented books with enlarged photocopies. One mentioned coloured pencils for student use to indicate agreements and parts of speech, a technique similar in concept to that used with the overhead projector. The purpose of all the teaching aids is to assist students to work out the construction of the Latin text.

All but one of the teachers begin scansion at this stage, most of them because they think it helps students to appreciate the verse. All but two set exercises in literary appreciation, indicating a desire to impart more than the ability to translate the text of Virgil.
The introduction of Virgil before Year 12 is an opportunity to enjoy the poetry without the pressure of examination requirements. The general impression given by the above responses, however, is that most teachers use this time to prepare students for their future examinations, concentrating on the techniques of translation, scansion and answering literary appreciation questions. Few take the opportunity to have students recite the poetry or commit it to memory for future enjoyment. Only two teachers mentioned additional activities, such as writing a verse translation, composing an English poem in response to Virgil, or drawing a picture to express a scene or emotion from the Latin poetry. Such creative activities, which could include drama, music, visual arts and written composition, could make the students’ first encounter with Virgil a personal and memorable one, and could motivate them more strongly to work on elucidating the meaning of a challenging Latin text.

**Part 3 – Introducing the Aeneid in English**

Nineteen teachers indicated that they included the *Aeneid* story, nine of them in Years 7 or 8, the others as part of the Latin course in later years. Seven teachers prepare students for the *Aeneid* option of the American Classical League Mythology Examination, which requires the reading of a specified Book in Fitzgerald’s translation. As many as eighteen teachers tell the story of the Trojan War in the classroom themselves and eleven tell an improvised version of the story of Aeneas, showing that the oral tradition continues to this day. Three read aloud from a simplified version of the *Aeneid*, and six expect students to read the story for themselves.
Simplified re-tellings of the *Aeneid* are used by fifteen of the respondents. Eight mentioned *Aeneas* (Bristol Classical Press 1986) by the present writer, two *The Trojan Prince* by E.G. Miller (University of Newcastle, 1996) and one *In Search of a Homeland* by P. Lively (Frances Lincoln, U.K. 2001). Five teachers mentioned the re-telling in simple Latin in the *Oxford Latin Course*, Part 1. Seventeen teachers encourage keen students to read a full English translation of the *Aeneid*, only one saying this task is too complex for younger students. Not surprisingly, twenty teachers said it was advantageous for Year 12 students to have had a background in mythology and the Trojan War story in earlier years before approaching the Virgil prescription.

It appears that an early introduction to the Trojan War story and the story of Aeneas is widespread. This may indicate the residual influence of courses in Classical Studies, publicised in the 1970s and 1980s, which emphasized the teaching potential of mythology, especially through the medium of oral story-telling. The American Classical League Mythology Examination provides a focus for inclusion of these stories in the junior Latin classroom today. It would appear that few students begin the prescribed Virgil text in Year 12 without some background knowledge of the epic stories of the Trojan War and their Roman sequel.
CONCLUSIONS

The works of Virgil, particularly the *Aeneid*, were taught to senior Latin students in New South Wales secondary schools throughout the twentieth century and continue to be taught as the twenty-first century begins. During this period the teaching of Virgil has been strongly affected by two factors: first, by the diminished status of Latin as a school subject in a rapidly changing educational environment, and secondly, by the development of literary criticism as a major approach in Virgilian scholarship.

In the nineteenth century, Latin had held a dominant position in the curriculum of Australian schools, (particularly boys’ schools), which followed the traditional academic curriculum imported from Britain. This dominant position was seriously challenged in New South Wales from the early years of the twentieth century. The establishment of a state curriculum gave recognition to a wider range of courses designed to encourage more adolescents to complete at least a junior secondary education. The gradual removal of Latin as a requirement for university entrance opened the way to tertiary studies for many more young people. The results of these developments were very evident by the late 1940s: many more students were completing high school but a much smaller proportion of them were studying Latin. The 1960s brought further changes: the Roman Catholic Church relinquished the Latin liturgy and, as a consequence, began to drop the teaching of Latin in its schools, and the “Wyndham Scheme” introduced a comprehensive secondary curriculum with a list of mandatory subjects that marginalized the study of
languages. Latin was seen by many as no longer relevant, and its traditional teaching methods appeared rigid and old-fashioned.

Loss of status was demonstrated by the diminished time allowed for teaching Latin in those schools in which it continued to be offered. This inevitably affected the students’ ability to master the language well enough to read Virgil competently. Though the new courses that were introduced from Britain in the 1970s brought greater enjoyment, more meaningful cultural knowledge and a modern ambience to the teaching of Latin, they did not instil a thorough knowledge of accidence and syntax, at least not in the lesson time available. Original Latin could rarely be attempted before the senior years. Some effort was usually made to introduce Virgil in the penultimate year, but, despite the use of transitional reading material to pave the way, students needed a great deal of help with the language. By the end of the twentieth century, even final-year students studying Virgil as an examination text approached the task with far less confidence in the language and little experience in independent preparation. Teachers needed to provide word-order vocabularies and guided the students word by word through the syntax.

The second factor that proved a major influence on the teaching of Virgil was the development of literary criticism and academic discussion of Virgil’s poems as integrated works of conscious artistry. Questions requiring literary analysis of passages of Virgil began to appear in examinations in the 1950s, and became a regular feature during the next two decades. This approach to Virgil was inspired by the work of W.F. Jackson Knight and Brooks Otis and by textbooks like Balme and Warman’s *Aestimanda*, which employed techniques familiar to teachers of English, but new to most classicists.
Careful perusal of public examination questions set over the twentieth century has provided ample evidence of the developments described above. The amount of text prescribed for reading in Latin dropped by as much as half, reflecting the diminished time available and the increasing difficulty of the task for students. After 1975, the changes gathered momentum as compulsory prose composition was abandoned. Grammar questions on Virgil were introduced to ensure that students understood the accidence and syntax. Comprehension and appreciation of the poetry itself became paramount, and questions on references and allusions explained in the commentary fell out of favour. Essays on historical and general topics related to Virgil were dropped. The mechanical demonstration of scansion was developed to include discussion of Virgil’s skill in conveying meaning and atmosphere through sound effects. The appreciation of Virgil’s poems as integrated works was assisted by the prescription, from 1993, of “themes” appropriate to the prescribed Book.

The reading lists on Virgil recommended by the examining boards naturally both reflected and influenced the teaching. In the first half of the twentieth century, the lists contained reference works on literary history from which students could derive enough material to write essays on Virgil’s place in the literary tradition, his role as patriotic and Augustan propagandist, his sympathy for human tragedy and his skilled use of the hexameter. The information was general and did not necessarily relate to any particular prescribed text. From the mid-1970s a number of works of literary criticism were recommended, drawing attention to the integrated structure of Virgil’s poems, especially
the *Aeneid*, and tracing themes, motifs and recurrent imagery. The influence of these scholars can be seen in the prescribing of “themes”, as mentioned above, and in the increased interest in Virgil’s stylistic techniques and metrical effects, which students were expected to identify and comment on.

The sophisticated level of literary criticism expected of students by the end of the twentieth century contrasted sharply with their diminished linguistic confidence. A curious dichotomy arose in teaching practice: explanation of the most basic accidence and syntax took place in the classroom alongside discussion of complex imagery, rhetorical techniques and metrical effects.\(^{798}\)

As the popularity of Latin declined, so did sources of official support for teachers. From the 1970s, the only regular help for Latin teachers and students in their preparation of Virgil came from lectures, seminars, study days and publications sponsored by the Classical Association of New South Wales and the Classical Languages Teachers Association Inc. Through extra-curricular activities such as reading competitions and drama productions, teachers and students were inspired to re-interpret Virgil’s poetry as a living aural experience. Some study guides were produced by practising teachers for general use, focused particularly on the demands of the Higher School Certificate examination.

\(^{798}\) This trend was not confined to Australia. In 2004, *Vergil*, the first volume in an American series of “transitional readers”, *Legamus*, (Bolchazy-Carducci) was released, edited by Thomas J. Sienkewicz and LeaAnn A. Osburn. It set out to introduce original Virgil to students with little Latin, but the capacity to engage in advanced literary analysis.
Some attempts were made to acquaint students with Virgil’s *Aeneid* in English. A course designed for senior beginners in Latin included several books of the *Aeneid* to be read in translation, but this course was not well supported and lasted only a short time. The most successful application of Virgil in English was seen in junior classes introduced to the *Aeneid* through retellings and creative activities derived from the story. Such work provided an enriching experience for younger students and gave them a sound background for understanding the *Aeneid* when they came to read it in Latin.

As the twenty-first century began, with new syllabuses and examinations, Virgil’s *Aeneid* was adopted as a mandatory part of the standard final-year Latin course. While the overriding classroom concern was still the translation of the prescribed text, this translation was now likely to be reached by consensus, after the teacher had guided the students through the vocabulary and structures of the Latin. There was some attention paid to mythological and other allusions as they occurred, but in most classes there was a stronger focus on Virgil’s literary techniques, with students being expected both to identify literary devices and explain their effects. Little time was devoted to Virgil’s life or his place in the literary tradition of Greek and Latin writers. There was the expectation that students had read the rest of the Book they were studying in a published English translation, and that they were able to discuss major themes featured in the prescribed Book, with reference to the *Aeneid* as a whole. The teaching of scansion was now related closely to the identification of poetic techniques, and, in many schools, was reinforced by practice in both oral reading and aural appreciation. In short, many of the methods used in the teaching of English literature were now regularly applied to the teaching of Virgil.
At the start of the twenty-first century, despite many pressures on the curriculum and many attractions competing for their attention, up to two hundred final-year students every year read about four hundred lines of Virgil in Latin. A greater number of younger students make some acquaintance with Virgil through shorter extracts in Latin and through English translations and re-tellings. As it was in 1900, the study of Virgil is, in practice, offered only to a privileged minority of the adolescent population of New South Wales. It yet remains a matter for wonder that students separated from Virgil’s world by 20 000 kilometres of geography and 2000 years of history still read his poetry in its original language, with dedication, insight and enjoyment.
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SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

A useful chronological guide to the evolution of the public examination system is published in Appendix 11 of Government Schools of New South Wales 1848-2003, published by the NSW Department of Education and Training (6th ed. 2003). The following information is extracted from that Appendix, as a guide to interpreting the various official publications consulted as part of this study.

1867 Junior and Senior Public Examinations established, set and marked by University of Sydney. The examinations defined the secondary school course and tested the efficiency of its teaching. The last Senior Examination was held in 1916, as its functions had been taken over by the Leaving Certificate examination.

1911 Qualifying Certificate first set, conducted by Department of Education to select students for public High Schools. Courses of Study for High Schools was published under the auspices of Peter Board.
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1987  Board of Secondary Education replaced both the Secondary Schools Board and the Board of Senior School Studies.

1990  Education Reform Act. Board of Secondary Education was replaced by the Board of Studies, with responsibility for curriculum for both primary and secondary school years (K-12) and the administration of the Higher School Certificate.


Appendix 1

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE TEACHING OF VIRGIL

The purpose of this research is to examine the methods used throughout the 20th century to teach the works of Virgil in the schools of New South Wales, and to make comparisons with methods used in the early years of the 21st century. Material has been collected to demonstrate approaches used in the 20th century, especially with reference to the prescription of Virgil’s poetry for public examinations.

Teachers are aware that the “new” HSC syllabus, examined for the first time in 2001, made some changes to the study of prescribed texts, including Virgil. This questionnaire has been designed to provide an overview of how teachers approach Virgil in the classroom today. There is no need to identify individuals or schools, although some general information about the type of school and the experience of the teacher is relevant.

If you are willing to share your experiences, please fill in the following questionnaire. Many questions offer more than one possible choice: feel free to select as many answers as you think appropriate.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. TYPE OF SCHOOL
   o boys only
   o girls only
   o co-ed
   o government high school
   o independent non-Catholic
   o independent Catholic
   o other

   Is the school academically selective in intake?
   o entirely
   o partly
   o not at all

2. COMPOSITION OF LATIN CLASSES
   a. At what level do students begin Latin? (Ignore introductory courses lasting less than one term):
      o Year 7
      o Year 8
      o Year 9
   b. How many Latin students are currently in
c. What course is followed in Years 7/8 to 10?

- Cambridge Latin Course
- Oxford Latin Course
- Ecce Romani
- Other (please specify)

```
Year 10 ____________________________________
Year 11 ____________________________________
Year 12 ____________________________________
```

d. Do you read any authentic Virgil before the HSC prescribed text? Please specify.

```
Below Year 10 ......................................................................................................
Year 10 .............................................................................................................
Year 11 .............................................................................................................
```

e. Do you use any adaptations of the Aeneid in Latin or English as introductory or background material for classes not yet reading Virgil? Please specify.

```
TEACHER EXPERIENCE

When did you begin teaching Latin?

- before 1965 (i.e. before the Wyndham Scheme)
- 1966- 1975 (i.e. the HSC “levels” system)
- 1976- 1985
- 1986- 1995
- 1996 or later

Have you also taught any of the following subjects?

- English
- French
- German
- Classical Greek
- Ancient History
- Classical Studies
```
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THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE SO FAR. THE VIRGIL QUESTIONS BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE.

PART ONE- VIRGIL AS PRESCRIBED FOR HIGHER SCHOOL CERTIFICATE

1. How have you chosen to organize the study of the Virgil text for the HSC of 2004?
   
   - all the Virgil text first
   - all the Cicero text first
   - alternate blocks of each text, for one week or longer on each
   - parallel lessons on each text within each week

   Any particular reason for this arrangement?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

2. Which edition of the Virgil text do your students use in class?
   
   - R.D. Williams
   - other (please specify) ________________________________

3. How do your students access the vocabulary of the Virgil text?
   
   - alphabetical list supplied by the teacher
   - alphabetical list at the back of a school edition
   - word-order list compiled by teacher
   - published word-order list
   - Latin dictionary

4. Do you expect your students to look up the words they need and to compile a list?
   
   - Not necessary
   - Yes, as a group endeavour
   - Yes, as an individual

5. Do you expect your students to attempt a translation of the Virgil text before it is treated in class?
   
   - Yes
   - Sometimes, as specific homework
   - No

6. If you answered “Yes” to Question 5, indicate any of the following which reflect your own experience (feel free to select more than one response):
Some students try conscientiously, while others rarely or never make an attempt. Most students can achieve a reasonable translation on their own. Very few can manage the translation on their own. Because most students are prepared, the translation can be completed quickly, leaving more time for discussion. Although I expect students to make an attempt, I am realistic and expect to do most of it myself in the lesson.

7. If you answered “Sometimes” or “No” to Question 5, indicate any of the following which reflect your own experience (feel free to select more than one response):

- The text is so difficult that students are very discouraged if they attempt the translation on their own.
- The students get so much of the translation wrong that there is little point in their attempt.
- The students get more benefit if they approach the text with my guidance.
- The students become confused when they try to correct their version in class.
- I do not think it is good for students to have an incorrect version in front of them.
- Approaching the text in class gives me the opportunity to teach techniques for unseen translation.
- Approaching the text in class gives the weaker students the chance to participate and to learn from their peers.

8. Do you expect students to hand in their translation of the prescribed Virgil for you to mark?

- No
- Yes, after it has been done in class
- Yes, before it has been done in class

9. How helpful do you find the notes in the Williams edition?

- Helpful with translation of difficult passages
- Useful for grammatical explanations
- Useful for explanation of references and allusions
- Useful in identifying literary features
- Useful in explaining metrical features
- Off putting, because too advanced for HSC students
- Not enough basic help with translation

10. Have you consulted additional commentaries yourself when preparing the Virgil text?
11. Do you issue a correct translation to students to learn for examinations?

- Yes, because then I know they have a correct version
- Yes, I do this to save time as there is so much to get through
- No, because we have already checked the version in class
- No, because they can consult a published translation
- No, because I want them to have individual translations

12. How do you use the prescribed English translation by David West (Penguin)?

- I expect students to read the whole *Aeneid* and I quiz them on it
- I expect students to read the rest of the prescribed Book, as required for internal assessment
- We discuss the merits of this translation in class
- We compare this translation with others
- We use the translation to help with the meaning of a difficult passage
- Other applications (please specify)

13. Do you give your students practice in grammatical analysis?

- as part of regular oral work in class
- as separate grammar lessons
- in multiple-choice format, as in the HSC
- in assessment tasks only, as they know the grammar already

14. Which of the two Continuers texts have you preferred teaching this year?

- Virgil
- Cicero

15. Which of the texts have your students enjoyed more?

- most prefer Virgil
- most prefer Cicero
- all prefer Virgil
- all prefer Cicero

16. How much time do you devote to scansion in Year 12?
occidental minutes, because students are familiar with the hexameter
occidental minutes when there is time, because it is not worth spending much time for so few marks
we spend some time every lesson as we read the text
we have whole lessons dedicated to scansion

17. How confident are you about reading Virgil aloud?

- Not confident about Latin pronunciation
- Not confident about expressive reading in Latin
- Reasonably confident, but find students do not listen well
- Confident and happy to share my enjoyment

18. Do you spend time in class on aural appreciation of Virgil?

- Yes, I read the text aloud with attention to metre
- Yes, I play a recording of passages
- Yes, I ask students to read aloud in chorus
- Yes, I ask students to read aloud individually
- No, I prefer to focus on the written text
- No, because there is not enough time
- No, because students can listen to a tape out of class

19. How much do you enjoy teaching literary appreciation of Virgil?

- Not much, as my students do not relate to it well
- Not much, as I see myself as mainly a teacher of Latin language
- I look forward to this aspect, as my students enjoy it
- I enjoy the opportunity for different talents to shine in my class

20. How helpful do you find the “focus areas” in your teaching of Virgil?

- They stimulate good discussion
- They help students to gain an overview of the main issues
- I find them too simplistic
- They help me to structure my teaching
- They are unnecessary and an extra imposition on teaching time.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT. NOW ONE LAST QUESTION REQUIRING AN OPTIONAL FREE RESPONSE:
Have you successfully employed any teaching methods in your Virgil lessons which you consider unconventional? If so, please describe them below:

NOW PLEASE PROCEED TO PART TWO.

PART TWO- TEACHING ORIGINAL VIRGIL BEFORE YEAR 12

1. Do you teach any original (unadapted) selections from Virgil before Year 12?
   - Yes
   - No
   If you answered No please leave the rest of this Part and go on to Part 3.

2. How many lines of Virgil do you teach in Year 11 (Preliminary Course)?
   - none
   - 1-50
   - 51-100
   - more than 100 lines

3. If these lines are taken from a published Latin reader, please give its name and author:

4. If you teach any Virgil in Year 10 or earlier please specify what selections you choose:

5. Has your choice of extracts been prompted by the need to prepare students for a Latin Reading Competition?
   - No
   - Yes, the CLTA Year 9 competition
Yes, the CANSW Year 10/11 competition

6. What kind of introduction do you give the students?
   - an account of Virgil’s time and his role as national poet
   - an explanation of the epic tradition going back to Homer
   - the Trojan War and the Roman connection with the gods and heroes
   - general mythology
   - not much introduction, as I prefer to get straight into the text

7. What teaching procedures do you follow in class?
   - re-arranging the Latin words in translation-order
   - reading the Latin lines aloud to the class
   - analysing the grammar to identify case, agreement etc.
   - expecting the students to copy down an agreed translation
   - instructing the class to read aloud in chorus
   - expecting students to memorize some lines
   - comparing several published translations
   - discussing alternative translations
   - asking comprehension questions before translating

8. Do you use any of the following teaching materials to enable students to follow the text?
   - overhead projector and coloured marking pens
   - chalkboard/whiteboard copy of passage to be marked by teacher or student
   - printed text in books only
   - enlarged photocopy to be marked by students
   - any other (please specify)

9. Do you teach scansion at this stage?
   - No – one thing at a time
   - No, it is too specialized for this stage
   - Yes, because it helps students to appreciate the verse
   - Yes, because students are intrigued by the pattern

10. Do you set exercises in literary appreciation at this stage?
    - Yes, there are some exercises in our textbook
    - Yes, I make up simple questions
    - No, the translation is more important at this stage
PART THREE- INTRODUCING THE AENEID IN ENGLISH

1. Do you include the Aeneid story, either in a separate subject (eg Classical Studies) or as part of your Latin course?
   - No
   - Yes, as part of Latin in Year __________
   - Yes, in a separate course in Year _________

2. Do you prepare students for the American Classical League Mythology Examination?
   - No
   - Yes, and we do the Aeneid option
   - Yes, but we do not do the Aeneid option

3. Do you present the story of the Aeneid orally in the classroom?
   - Yes, I improvise the story myself
   - Yes, I read a simplified version aloud
   - No, I expect students to read it themselves
4. Do you include the story of the Trojan War as background?
   - Yes, I tell the story myself
   - Yes, I expect students to read a version themselves
   - No, the Aeneid is enough.

5. Do your students read a simplified re-telling of the Trojan War and/or the Aeneid?
   - No
   - Yes (please specify)

6. Do your students read any simple Latin narrative based on the Trojan War or the Aeneid?
   - No, they do not study Latin at this stage
   - No, their Latin course does not include anything like this
   - Yes (please specify)

7. Do you treat the Aeneid story as part of a “theme” eg. Heroes, Men and Gods etc.?
   - No
   - Yes (please specify)

8. Do you encourage students to read an English translation (not an adaptation) of the Aeneid?
   - No, it would be too complex for them
   - No, it would put them off
   - Yes, if they are keen to do so
   - Yes, I help them to read what is required for the ACL Mythology Examination

9. Have you used a taped reading from the Aeneid in translation in your classroom?
10. Have you found it advantageous for Year 12 Latin students to have had a background in mythology and the Trojan War story when approaching the prescribed Virgil text?

- Occasionally, with reasonable success
- Occasionally, without success
- Regularly
- Never

- Not particularly, as we have to do this at the time anyway
- Yes, in a general way, eg. they understand allusions better
- Yes, it saves us a significant amount of time

GRATIAS MAXIMAS TIBI AGO!
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

The responses to the questionnaire are discussed on pages 297-307 of this study. The actual responses are tabulated for reference on the following two pages.

The first column, numbered vertically 1 to 24, lists the 24 questionnaires that were completed and returned. Types of school are not identified in this table.

The two pages should be read as if they form one continuous table, providing the responses to all questions from left to right.
## Appendix 2 Responses to Questionnaire

*Q*  |  **Beg Lat** |  **Yr 10** |  **Yr 11** |  **Yr 12** |  **V Yr 10** |  **V Yr 11** |  **Teach begun** |  **Add. Subj.** |  **1.1** |  **1.2** |  **1.3** |  **1.4** |  **1.5** |  **1.6** |  **1.7** |  **1.8** |  **1.9** |  **1.10** |  **1.11** |  **1.12** |  **1.13** |  **1.14** |  **1.15** |  **1.16** |  **1.17** |  **1.18** |
1 | 7 | 20 | 8 | 10 | CLC | n | n | y | 76-85 | EFCCg | na | W | back | n | y | 5 | na | n | 1 | y-4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | na | mV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
2 | 7 | na | na | na | CLC | n | n | y | 96- | GCg | 1 | W | Step | 3 | y | 1245 | na | n | 13 | 45 | 2 | 35 | 145 | 13 | na | na | 1 | 4 | |
3 | 8 | 20 | 19 | 4 | OLC | n | A3(70) | A2(25) | 96- | FCg | 4 | W | dic | n | y | 15 | 1 | n | 67 | y-2 | 2 | 2 | 13 | V | aV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
4 | 7 | 18 | 1 | 4 | CLC | n | n | y | 86-95 | EFG | CsA | 4 | WS | Sdic | 23 | y | 4 | na | n | 3 | y | 3 | 1 | 123 | V | mV | 34 | 4 | 2 | |
5 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | CLC/ OLC | n | A3 | na | 76-85 | F | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | |
6 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 9 | CLC | n | n | CLC5 | 66-75 | F | 2 | W | S | 3 | y | 15 | na | n | 35 | y-1 | 3 | 15 | 1 | V | mV | 14 | 4 | 4 | |
7 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 13 | ER | com | comp | A3 | -65 | EF | CsA | 3 | W | dic | 2 | y | 24 | na | n | 13 | y-6 | 3 | 2 | 13 | V | mV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
8 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 13 | ER | com | comp | A3 | 66-75 | - | 3 | W | 3 | 2 | y | 14 | 13 | 67 | n | 13 | 45 | y-1 | 5 | 2 | 13 | V | mV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
9 | 8 | 15 | 6 | 2 | CLC | n | A3 | A2/ A4 | 76-85 | EFG | 1 | W | 3 | 2 | 2 | na | 1357 | n | 134 | 57 | y-2 | 2 | 1245 | 123 | V | mV | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
10 | 8 | 21 | 7 | 7 | own | n | A1/2 | 86-95 | - | 1 | W+ | S | 1 | n | 3 | 2367 | n | 367 | y-4 | 12 | 25 | 13 | V | aV | 14 | 2 | 5 | |
11 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 3 | CLC | n | n | A2 | 86-95 | EFCs | 3 | W | dic | 3 | y | 125 | na | n | 13 | 45 | y-3 | 12 | 25 | 13 | V | aV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
12 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 4 | CLC | n | n | n | 66-75 | EFA | 1 | W | 4 | 1 | 2 | na | 137 | n | 12 | 34 | y-1 | 3 | 2 | 123 | C | mC | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
13 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 4 | CLC | n | n | A2/4 | 86-95 | EFA | 1 | W | 3 | 1 | 2 | na | 367 | n | 134 | y-3 | 35 | 2 | 123 | V | mV | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
14 | 8 | 32 | 9 | 12 | OLC/ ER | n | n | EeAc | 66-75 | CgACs | 4 | W+ | back | 3 | y | 15 | na | n | 13 | 457 | y-1 | 3 | 12 | 13 | V | mV | 24 | 4 | 1 | |
15 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 4 | CLC | n | n | A2/4 | 76-85 | FCgA Cs | 1 | W | dic | 1 | 2 | na | 3 | n | 123 | 45 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | V | aV | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
16 | 7 | 20 | 5 | 2 | CLC | n | n | CLC4 | 66-75 | GCg | 1 | St | back | 1 | n | na | na | n | 134 | 5 | y-1 | 5 | 2 | 12 | V | mV | 3 | 1 | 5 | |
17 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 14 | CLC | n | n | A1,1- A3 | 96- | FGCg | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | |
18 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 14 | CLC | n | n | A1,1- A3 | 66-75 | FCg | 3 | W+ | List dic | 3 | y | 2 | na | n | 13 | y-1 | 3 | 2 | 13 | V | mV | 1 | 4 | 4 | |
19 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 14 | CLC | n | n | A1,1- A3 | 96- | Cg | 3 | W | back dic | 1 | y | 3 | na | n | 7 | y-1 | 3 | 1 | 6IB | 1 | na | na | 2 | 2 | 5 | |
20 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 0 | CLC | n | n | n | 76-85 | FCgCs | 1 | W | List dic | 1 | y | 2 | na | 2 | 3 | y-1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | V | mV | 2 | 3 | 5 | |
21 | 7 | 55 | 16 | 24 | OLC | n | OLC | y | 86-95 | ECG | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | |
22 | 7 | 55 | 16 | 24 | OLC | n | OLR | y | 76-85 | ECG | CsA | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | na | |
23 | 7 | 55 | 16 | 24 | OLC | n | OLR | OLR | 96- | Cg | 4 | W | dic | 3 | y | 15 | na | n | 123 | y-2 | 35 | 1 | 1 | V | = | 3 | 4 | 1 | |
24 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | CLC | n | n | OLR | -65 | EFCA | 3 | W | List,dic | 1 | 2 | na | 167 | 2 | 1345 | 1 | 35 | 2 | 13 | V | aV | 1 | 4 | 1 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>1.19</th>
<th>1.20</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>2.8</th>
<th>2.9</th>
<th>2.10</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>3.7</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>3.9</th>
<th>3.10</th>
<th>additional</th>
<th>additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OLR, CLC</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-yr11</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2yr8</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLC4, CLA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1-4, 4, 6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2yr7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Internet videos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2yr8/10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yM</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 LP</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr11</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communal shared by email</td>
<td>Purcell D&amp;A; CM essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A1 Beg. Comp</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>unse</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng Verse trans of fav passage</td>
<td>Write poems Draw pict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A3, EcSer comp</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Write poems Draw pict</td>
<td>Purcell D&amp;A; CM essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLC5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4789</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr9</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>30wn</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data projector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr8</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yHomelnd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2yr9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr10</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>Whee</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EcA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3yr7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr10</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CLC4b</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr11</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>A2/4/6</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3489</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2yr9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2yr7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OLC1</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OLR</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2yr7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>OLC</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OLR</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>