

LATIN

Paper 0480/01
Language

Key Messages

- Candidates should write their translations on alternate lines.
- Translations should be given in sensible English.
- In the comprehension section, candidates should follow the rubric carefully.
- Full detail should be given in response to comprehension questions.

General Comments

Candidates need to be reminded, probably in the examination room, that they should write on alternate lines. Writing on alternate lines allows space for candidates to revise and alter their translations and for the Examiner to see clearly what is intended on the answer paper. Candidates should also be encouraged to use their time wisely. A number of candidates, as happened last year, wrote out all the Latin and produced drafts before a final version was settled on. The consequence for some was that they did not complete the comprehension section, presumably due to a lack of time.

It is important that candidates read all the information that is given on the question paper and make use of the glossed words. As ever, some candidates still ignore this helpful information. It has to be emphasised that candidates are expected to translate into sensible English not rely on a word-for-word substitution translation. There may be cases where it is appropriate for the main verb to appear in the same position as its Latin counterpart in an English sentence, but this is by no means always the case. In a slightly different way, a mis-formation of a past tense, 'bursted' for example, may be acceptable as it shows that the candidate realises the tense but is unaware that 'burst' is an irregular past in English. On occasions, decisions have to be made about what is acceptable and what is not. If it is a decision based on vocabulary then this is informed by the Defined Vocabulary List, the words glossed for the passage and the context. The word '*porta*' might be considered in this context as it clearly refers, in the passage, to the city's gates. 'Doors' was not considered appropriate as a translation (nor was 'ports').

Translation

For the majority of candidates the passage proved accessible, at least through the main story line, and most candidates were able to regroup and get back on track if they had gone astray. Whilst candidates coped well with the main constructions, the *qui urbem proderent* proved to be a good differentiator, as did the first consecutive clause *ita animum Claudii occaecaverunt*. In fact this sentence proved quite challenging for many. The second consecutive clause *Romani tam perterriti erant* was recognised by most candidates and was generally well translated as part of a longer sentence.

Candidates need to look out for comparatives and superlatives, such as *divitissima* and *neglegentiores*, which should be translated in a way that shows they have been recognised as something more than the positive form of the adjective. The same is true for the various participles, showing that they are recognised as particular verbal forms.

The two usages of *primum* provided a challenge for some. Strong candidates translated *ubi primum* as 'as soon as' whilst 'when first' was also acceptable. The second, *primum impetum*, required an adjectival translation, 'the first attack'. Many candidates picked up the force of *ad castra munienda* but were less sure of the meaning of *munio*. Indeed, this whole sentence proved to be a good differentiator partly because of the sequencing and partly through the vocabulary, *inde* was not well known, as was the 'reporting' force of *rettulerunt*. There were confusions between *pono* and *possum*, *milia* and *miles*. *vix* was often confused with *vis*. As last year, *profectus* caused problems for a number of candidates both in meaning and its status as a deponent verb. The Examiners accepted both 'were made' and 'became' for translations of *facti sunt* but required a clear expression of the correct tense.

Both the translation and the comprehension passages required knowledge of numbers, both cardinal and ordinal. There were a number of interesting translations of *milia*. *quingentis* was not well known.

Notwithstanding the earlier comments about 'substitution translation', it was pleasing to see how many candidates continue to try to render the translation into good modern English, for example, candidates tried to avoid 'put' for *posuit* and found phrases like 'pitched camp', 'made camp' or 'set up camp'. The same was true of translations for *impetum* which varied in dramatic intensity from 'attack' to various forms of 'charge' or 'assault'.

Comprehension

Candidates of all abilities had some success on this part of the paper, aided by the directions to particular sections of the text. The same *caveat* as last year remains true: candidates will do well to order their thoughts, apply logic (is it really likely that an Athenian would have been able to build a siege engine 125,000 feet high or that an ancient city state had 10 million citizens?) and pick the right information for answers from the sections that are given. When these questions are broken down into sub-sections, candidates should pick the appropriate piece of information to answer each sub-section. The derivation question only requires two derivations. Candidates should follow the rubric and offer only two answers.

In general, as last year, candidates responded well to the passage. The sequence of events did not overwhelm most, although there were a few rather more creative answers. Most candidates gained a creditable score. It remains true that the more able candidates who expressed the full detail in answers were able to gain a high score. In **(b)** and **(h)** most candidates got some of the points, whilst fewer got full marks for all the details. The same was true for **(i)** **(i)** in which most got 'through all the night', but not nearly so many offered an expression for *magna copia*. As a question **(i)** supported candidates through the sequence of what happened to the siege engine and many candidates produced good offerings for '*consedit*'. In **(f)** *fili et filiae* were often incorrectly seen as 'boys and girls' and in some instances none of them, including the phrase *principum cum sacerdotibus*, were recognised as plurals. **(j)** required candidates to understand that Demetrius had been tricked by Diognetus' wisdom, not that he was necessarily a wise man. **(k)** required expression of the superlative form for full marks. The derivations were usually done well.

LATIN

Paper 0480/02
Literature

Key Messages

- The strongest candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature.
- Successful answers to the 10 mark questions included references to a range of literary techniques and specific examples from the set text.

General Comments

Candidates are required to answer questions on the prescribed texts. Questions test their comprehension, translation and appreciation of the literature. Candidates are expected to demonstrate an understanding of some of the elements of Roman civilization and an awareness of the motives and attitudes of people of a different time and culture, while considering Rome's legacy to the modern world with the aim of helping them to develop a greater understanding of a range of aesthetic, ethical, linguistic, political, religious and social issues.

Candidates should be able to describe character, action and context, select details from the texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts and explain matters relating to the social and historical context. In addition, candidates should be able to analyse and evaluate style, tone and metre, select evidence to make judgments on the social and historical context and make a reasoned personal response to the literature.

The overall standard was quite high, and most candidates showed an agreeable level of understanding regarding both Virgil and the prose authors: Livy, Nepos and Seneca. The majority of candidates translated the prescribed texts with confidence and precision and answered competently on the questions. The vast majority of candidates were able to scan competently. To judge from the general level of response from candidates, both the verse and prose selections were well understood and candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Examination technique was on the whole very good and there were few who did not appear to know how to approach the 10 mark questions. It was a shame when candidates with significant understanding in other areas left some questions completely unanswered as any attempt has the potential to gain marks while a blank space definitely gains none.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid* Book 2

Question 1

- (a) Generally answered well with most candidates giving a fluent translation. There was a plethora of acceptable renderings of line 1 while a common error was to miss the translation of *umbra magna*.
- (b) (i) was answered in many interesting ways with some candidates referring to the chiasmus as well as those discussing the nature of the moon's light. There were also many varied personal responses to (ii).
- (c) Generally answered well with the majority of candidates able to scan including those who were weaker on translation.
- (d) The majority of candidates were successful in discussing the insertion of the epithets and description.

- (e) Candidates were, on the whole, able to comment with confidence on the style features within these lines.

Question 2

- (a) Many successful answers referred to both Aeneas' and Creusa's actions within these lines.
- (b) Candidates were able to translate fluently although some missed *periturus*. There were many interesting and equally valid renderings of *expertus*.
- (c) The majority of candidates gave the correct answer.
- (d) Answers frequently identified *vociferans* or *gemitu* or *tectum omne*.
- (e) Alliteration of *m* was mentioned frequently as was the word order.
- (f) Almost every candidate was able to give the correct answer.

Question 3

The question was generally answered well and provoked some interesting responses which were very well considered. Successful answers referred to a range of literary techniques and gave specific examples from/references to the set text. Some candidates wrote a great deal, but there were plenty of succinct answers which received full marks. A few candidates interpreted the question as referring only to the passages printed on the question paper but if they answered well using the techniques from the passages they could still score respectably.

Section B: Two Centuries of Roman Prose

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates identified snow.
- (b) This question was answered well with the majority of candidates discussing Hannibal noticing the troops' despondency and his choice of words in order to boost morale.
- (c) Candidates were commonly able to refer to the conquering of Rome.
- (d) Many answers correctly divined that the journey was made easier due to the enemy only making small attacks.
- (e) Successful answers referred to both steeper and shorter.
- (f) Most candidates were able to translate fluently.

Question 5

- (a) The use of direct speech was discussed by great many candidates as well as *O*, the repetition of *tam* and the hyperbolic *mortem*.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify stoicism.
- (c) Most candidates were able to translate fluently.
- (d) The majority of candidates explained clearly how the two discrete types of interruption affected Seneca differently.
- (e) Almost every answer included three things learnt about everyday life in Rome, although the examples had to come from the correct lines in order to gain credit.
- (f) Generally answered well.

Question 6

Many candidates approached this question with vigour, giving an abundance of detail about Aristides and arguing with zest about whether or not he can be considered to have had a successful life. Many answers referred to the ostracism and its repeal, as well as Aristides' military achievements and his death in poverty. There was some erroneous suggestion that his daughters being provided for by the state was something to be proud of.