

# LATIN

Paper 9788/01  
Verse Literature

The standard of the questions on the set texts, both commentary and essay, was the same as last year. Arguably, though, the Unseen Literary Criticism question was a little more doable this year.

No Centre did anything other than Virgil as their set text; and only one candidate wrote a Theme essay.

The standard overall was very similar to last year, though there were both fewer really exceptional marks and fewer lower ones. The marks candidates achieved were spread slightly more evenly across the questions. That means that there were fewer very high marks scored on the commentary questions and fewer very low marks scored on the Unseen Literary Criticism.

It was clear that all the candidates knew the texts very well, though there was a greater range when it came to organising an argument. Pleasingly, there were fewer Unseen Literary Criticism answers dominated by a discussion of sound effects, enjambement and so on.

## Question 1

- (i) Translations were accurate, though a couple of candidates left out the last half line.
- (ii) While most candidates were able to pick out the various key pieces of text (e.g. the imagery of fire and wound, *vagatur* and *furens*, the simile of the wounded deer), few managed to deploy those quotations in relation to what the question asked, namely, how Dido's feelings are portrayed as destructive. The best answers discussed how the text leads us to know who is, or is going to be, destroyed by Dido's feelings for Aeneas. Dido herself will die, but what of Aeneas and of Carthage? There were many good observations made: the juxtaposition of *mollis* and *flamma* in line 7, the (difficult) juxtaposition of Dido as *furens* and the wounded deer.
- (iii) This question was well handled. Well observed was the pathos of Dido showing Aeneas around her city (this is what Aeneas should be doing; Dido is doing it but will stop; the future of Carthage/Rome relations). Candidates also commented on Dido obviously being affected in Aeneas' presence: she starts to speak but stops, she starts asking questions, she becomes repetitive (*iterum*) and unstable (*demens*); her lonely grieving, the pathetic image of Ascanius.

## Question 2

- (i) This was very well done by most. Dido is clearly angry, bewildered, sarcastic, hurt, desperate, pathetic. Candidates observed all of this, and the various changes of tone. They also rightly commented on the colourful and sometimes extreme nature of Dido's diction (*perfide* etc.).
- (ii) Translations were very accurate.
- (iii) Candidates handled this question fairly well. Most saw the pathos in Dido's contemplation of her possible futures: on the one side, the loss of her city and her capture by Iarbas; on the other, the impossible wish for a son by Aeneas who would remind her of the departing hero. Candidates also noted the moving *omnino capta ac deserta*.

## Questions 3 and 4

No candidates answered the questions on Juvenal.

### Question 5

This was the more popular of the Virgil essay questions. Most candidates showed a good knowledge of the text, and were able to consider the relevant episodes carefully. The episodes and issues chosen were – rightly – Aeneas' sojourn in Carthage, in particular his adoption of Carthaginian, and certainly non-Roman, clothing; the status of his relationship with Dido; the need for the gods to instruct him to leave; his preparations for departure; his speech to Dido before leaving. There was some consideration of what it means to be an epic hero – though this could on occasion have been more sharply expressed and better used. There was also some better consideration of the nature of Aeneas' *pietas*, and how it might consist of obeying the orders of the gods even when that is personally undesirable. Some wanted to put this in the context of (Roman) stoicism, which was fine; others tried to portray Aeneas as Greek, which needed more subtle argumentation. It was surprising to see very few references to Antony and Cleopatra.

### Question 6

Fewer candidates attempted this question, which surprised the Examiners. Those that did wrote fairly good essays, which covered most of the episodes and issues which one would expect. At the broadest level, it could be argued that not much happens – Dido falls in love with Aeneas; they have an affair; Aeneas leaves; Dido commits suicide. At first sight it seems as though Virgil spends much more time on Dido's, though not Aeneas', state of mind and, to that extent at least, he seems more interested in psychology rather than narrative. However, one might be able to question that claim by determining – if this is possible – the extent to which Virgil's interest in Dido's state of mind is as much literary as it is genuine. For instance, the model of Euripides' *Medea* seems to lie behind much of the way Dido is portrayed.

### Question 7 and 8

There were no answers to these questions.

### Question 9

It was pleasing to see this year that there were fewer answers which asserted arbitrarily that certain sounds had certain effects, and which made unwarranted assumptions about the effects of e.g. enjambement.

- (i) This was the better answered of the two questions. Candidates were able to observe the (rhetorical) questions, their number and variety: these pointed to Eteocles' worry, anxiety and doubt. Candidates also observed the way that Eteocles seems to change his mind not only about his opponent but also about his own men. Well spotted were the times when Eteocles interrupts himself – as in line 10 and 12.
- (ii) Some did this very well; others less successfully. With similes one always wants to evaluate the points of comparison. Quite a few answers spotted that the simile seemed to make clear that Eteocles was in a turbulent frame of mind, and that a steersman was a good analogy (indeed a classic one) for a ruler and general. It was also observed that both were experienced but had lost some element of control, and were operating in the dark, as it were. Few picked up on the ways in which the simile may be said to be excessive: it is harder to make all the very specific place names in 18 and 20 relevant to Eteocles' position.

### Question 10

No candidates answered this question.

### Question 11

One candidate attempted this question, and it was done reasonably well, but more specific knowledge of Ovid was required, as was a sharper and more useful definition of social order and why love might be a threat to it. There was also a lack of discussion of the various types of love (love of country, of the gods and so on).

### Questions 12-17

No candidates answered these questions.

# LATIN

---

Paper 9788/02  
Prose Literature

## General comments

Tacitus was more popular with Centres than Cicero but, in both cases, candidates displayed an impressive knowledge of the text and a good understanding of the literary and rhetorical features of the language. The two-hour paper allowed candidates sufficient time to answer all questions in depth and few time issues were evident. Quotation was used well from context passages, though, understandably, there was less quotation used in essays. Even so, it was noticeable that many candidates had a stock of quotes to use as appropriate.

Open-ended questions (e.g. 'Comment upon the description.....') were answered less well than questions where a prompt was given. It is important that candidates avoid mere paraphrase and translation when answering such a question. It is giving them the opportunity to say, for example, what they find impressive about the passage; comment on stylistic features should be included where appropriate.

It must be emphasised that the texts should be studied primarily for their literary merits, not as historical documents, though knowledge of relevant dates, events and persons referred to in the text is expected. Evidence of secondary reading where applied relevantly is credited in the essay, but candidates should ensure that their focus is upon the primary text.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Cicero, *Pro Milone***

#### **Question 1**

- (i) Answers showed a detailed knowledge of the actual meeting on the Appian Way, but candidates showed less awareness of the circumstances of the encounter and how both Clodius and Milo had ended up there.
- (ii) Answers were generally impressive here and many stylistic features listed in the mark scheme were discussed. There was an occasional over-reliance on technical terms: the important thing was to show how the Latin 'enlivened the argument'. The use of paradox (*insidiator superatus est*) and the suggestion that Clodius was acting like a bandit, as suggested elsewhere in the speech (*in latrones inciderint*), were a couple of additional things which were included in better answers.
- (iii) Translations were generally accurate, though *sin* ('but if...') caused a problem for one or two at the start.

## Question 2

- (i) Answers expressed Cicero's anger and outrage, but few went beyond this to suggest that Cicero is exaggerating for comic effect in order to entertain the jury. The suggestion that Clodius' death is divine punishment for his blasphemy at the Bona Dea festival surely includes an element of tongue-in-cheek and cannot be taken entirely at face value.
- (ii) Candidates clearly knew about Clodius' antics at the Bona Dea festival, but not all related those events and the resulting trial to the argument in this passage.
- (iii) Translations were generally accurate, though again the initial connection words *nec vero* caused some difficulty.

## Tacitus, *Annals XV*

### Question 3

- (i) This question revealed, for some, a lack of knowledge of dates, even of the fire in Nero's time (64 AD), with not many knowing the date of the fire started by the Gauls (390 BC). As a result, many did not know the calculation of years, months and days (418 of each), though they knew from the text that researchers had worked out that there were the same number of each between the two fires. To score full marks, the calculation was less important than knowing the dates and Tacitus' suggestion that it is the product of over-meticulous research (*alii eo usque cura...*).
- (ii) Answers were generally very impressive here, with many candidates achieving 10 marks or more. On the whole candidates argued in more detail about the Domus Aurea (which few mentioned by name!) than about the canal from Lake Avernus to the mouth of the Tiber. The very best answers separated these two projects and showed how Tacitus emphasises how offensive, futile and misconceived the projects were in their different ways.
- (iii) Several candidates took *ceterum* to mean 'other areas...' instead of 'but'. The phrase *dimensis vicorum ordinibus* was not always accurately translated, with a few candidates resorting to paraphrase. *quae...protegerent*: the sense of purpose of the verb in the subjunctive was not always reflected. Despite a few errors, most candidates scored at least 4 marks out of 5 on this question.

### Question 4

- (i) Most candidates scored 4 or 5 marks. Few candidates specified *cubiculum* as a bedroom or chamber and the last phrase *quae...supersedeo* was not always fully understood. Though it is acknowledged that Tacitus is difficult to translate literally, a translation which is over-paraphrased is unlikely to gain full credit if account is not taken of each and every word.
- (ii) This question, along with (iii), was answered less successfully than **Question 3**. (a) Most candidates commented that Nero's motive was to avoid ill-feeling in concern for his reputation, and the best included close analysis of the text and individual words and phrases. The key phrase to analyse was *ac ne glisceret invidia crudelitatis*. The verb *glisceret* is used elsewhere by Tacitus, as here, to suggest bad qualities, and this was noted in the better answers. (b) Most candidates rightly commented that Nero to a certain extent dissociates himself from the views expressed about Paulina but their inclusion is nevertheless significant. Again, the key to a good answer here was careful selection and analysis of key words and phrases, such as *famam, laudabili...memoria and ostentui*, that colour Paulina's actions and thereby criticise her selfishness and shallowness.
- (iii) A few candidates were surprisingly thrown by this open-ended question and resorted to paraphrase and even mere translation without saying how Tacitus' narrative makes Seneca's death dramatic. The question was 'open' in the sense that candidates had the opportunity both to comment about Seneca's behaviour and to show how stylistic features of the Latin contribute to the drama. Comparison to Socrates tended to be rather vague: more precision was needed here. The irony of the pouring of the libation to *Iovi liberatori* was rarely mentioned. Elements of Tacitus' style such as brevity, use of alliteration etc. were often mentioned but only the best candidates then went further to analyse their effect. When such a question is asked again, it is hoped that candidates will be more focused and analytical in their response.

### Question 5

There were several detailed answers here. There seemed to be a slight misunderstanding of the question by a handful who argued extensively that, because Cicero's narrative is not consistent with Asconius' independent account, it cannot be regarded as a 'masterpiece'. The question is not asking whether Cicero's account is accurate: on the contrary, it is asking how Cicero's narrative, humour and rhetoric brilliantly paper over any factual inaccuracies. To make a comparison to art, as the question implies, a 'masterpiece' does not stand and fall upon how accurately it depicts its subject. Overall, though reference to Asconius' account was relevant, there was over-emphasis on it at the expense of analysing episodes from Cicero's speech.

### Question 6

This question was less popular than **Question 5**. The key word in the title here was 'convincing'. Answers tended to focus upon the contrasts drawn between Clodius and Milo, but analysis of how Cicero exaggerates and distorts events was less evident. In this question 'accuracy' was more of a relevant issue, though, again, a comparison with Asconius' account was not the sole issue on which to focus.

### Question 7

This question was not as popular as **Question 8**, but a sizeable minority of candidates answered it. As expected, many focused upon the dramatic events described in book XV such as the fire, the persecution of the Christians and the deaths of the conspirators. Better candidates recognised that the question required some discussion of Book XIV. A few candidates used material from the context questions, which is, of course, acceptable, but they also needed to show a wider appreciation of the whole book. It was disappointing that few discussed in any detail the initial bungled murder attempt of Agrippina and her eventual end. There were some good observations made about Tacitus' literary strengths: the very best candidates analysed a few key episodes to show how Tacitus uses his idiosyncratic style to create drama, arousing the kind of emotions expected of tragedians: fear, pity, horror and sympathy.

### Question 8

It was clear that most candidates answering this question wanted to show that there is more than a little psychological complexity in the presentation of Nero's character. One or two had clearly previously written essays about Nero as an inhumane monster or similar and so spent the majority of the answer depicting him as a cruel tyrant executing his ex-friends and colleagues on mere suspicion, before concluding, in rather contradictory fashion, that his character is more complex than it first seems. The better answers explored Nero's relationships with his mother and wives, his artistic temperament and his constant desire for public acclaim; a few argued persuasively that he was a weak man, full of self-doubt, dominated by his mother, who was unsuited to govern an empire.

Overall, the essay questions were answered less well this year than in 2011 and it was the Examiners' feeling that additional essay practice and preparation would have been beneficial. Some candidates displayed little evidence of reading and study in English of the earlier sections of the *Pro Milone* or *Annals* XIV as prescribed in the syllabus. Other candidates gave the impression that they were regurgitating a pre-prepared or previously written essay without focusing on the actual essay question, and consistency of argument was not always in evidence. It was, however, clear that many candidates had done some useful secondary reading and research, for which credit was given when used in a relevant way.

# LATIN

---

Paper 9788/03  
Unseen Translation

## General comments

The standard of translation was very high this year, with many candidates scoring over 80 out of 100 marks. All candidates completed the paper. The marks obtained for the Livy and Lucan passages were comparable for most candidates: only one or two scored significantly higher marks on the Lucan, which was to be expected. The majority of candidates made good use of the titles and glossary: it should be noted that, on occasion, the glossary offers an explanation of a word rather than a direct translation. The quality of English varied significantly from candidate to candidate and few achieved the higher marks of 4 or 5 marks for Style and Fluency on **Question 1**. In general, candidates could work harder to rework sentences into good English where it aids clarity and sense. Candidates using a word processor are requested to use at least 14 font size and double space their work to allow room for Examiner markings.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

Overall, the Livy passage did not cause most candidates undue difficulties in terms of vocabulary and syntax. A few individual sentences caused difficulty due to word order and omission of auxiliary verbs, but most candidates were able to follow the plot until the end. More effort could have been made by candidates to rework the Latin into English idiom, with the award of 4 or 5 marks for Style and Fluency proving a rarity.

**inter...erat:** most candidates understood the general sense but many were unable to work out the exact grammar and syntax: the adjective *insigne* was often taken as agreeing with *spectaculo* rather than *genus*; a pleasing number of candidates understood that *spectaculo exemploque* is a predicative dative (or at least translated it as such); provided that candidates translated these two nouns in combination, several possible renderings were acceptable; many went beyond the pedestrian 'was a spectacle and example for the citizens' and thereby received additional style credit.

**ex his Q. Fabium...transfigit:** this long sentence, containing a lengthy description of Quintus Fabius and his actions before he meets his end at the hands of an Etruscan, resulted in a number of clumsy versions from those attempting a purely literal translation. Several successfully split the sentence into three or four shorter manageable parts and turned the sentence around to make Quintus Fabius the subject and the concluding verb *transfigit* passive: the focus of the sentence is Fabius so this was a perfectly acceptable, indeed preferable, way to approach it. Correct literal translations received full marks but here was an opportunity for candidates to gain style marks. Abbreviations such as Q. do not have to be written out in full, but style credit is gained for doing so correctly. There were a few who confused *viribus* with *viris*. One or two misunderstood the gloss for *Tuscus*, taking Tuscus to be his name rather than his race: the possible ambiguity was accepted by the Examiner and Tuscus was allowed as a translation. *incautum*: most candidates understood that this described Fabius 'throwing caution to the winds', careless for his own safety. *manus* was translated variously as 'bands' or 'hands': though the former was preferred, the latter was accepted.

**telo extracto...labitur:** a literal translation of the ablative absolute here proved acceptable; better translations included 'when the weapon had been pulled out' or 'when the Etruscan had pulled out the weapon'; one or two candidates thought that Fabius himself had pulled out the weapon before collapsing; though technically possible, this was thought unlikely in the context.

**sensit utraque acies...parma:** various translations were accepted for *casum*, including 'death' and 'fall' but not 'killing'; most realised that *Romanus* is a collective noun here; it was acceptable to translate *iacentis* as if agreeing with *corpus* though the bland 'lying' did not receive full credit; *transiluit*: candidates need reminding to try to get the force of the prefix of compound verbs; here 'across' or 'over' were accepted.

**hoc iurastis...redituros:** several did not know the meaning of *iuro* and others did not recognise this syncopated form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural of the perfect tense: candidates are expected to recognise such abbreviated verb forms in both the prose and verse unseen. Teachers might find it appropriate to provide their candidates with a suitable checklist. Misunderstandings of *iuro* resulted in a failure to spot that *redituros* (and omitted *esse*) is an indirect statement. A few took *fugientes* as agreeing with *milites* in the vocative, which was not accepted.

**adeo ignavissimos...iurastis:** many did not translate the full force of *adeo...magis timetis; per quos* ('by whom') was difficult, but a good number of candidates realised that *per* was best translated as 'by' in this instance

**at ego...revertar:** *iniuratus* ('unsworn') understandably caused difficulties for those candidates who did not know *iuro*, but most expressed the negative sense; several treated *revertar* and *cadam* as present subjunctive rather than the required future tense here: context rather than form was the key here.

**consuli...iuravere:** candidates generally coped well with the difficult opening to Caeso's speech, dealing well with the unusual word order and the omission of *esse* after *impetratum*, and realising that *ut pugnent* is dependent upon *impetratum*; a few did not recognise the syncopated form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural of the perfect tense, for *iuraverunt*.

**et nos...militum animos:** candidates coped well with the gerunds *pugnando* and *adhortando*, but several did not take *nos* with *accendamus* ('let us inspire') and a few did not seem to realise that the adjective *dignum* is followed by the ablative *nomine* ('worthy of the name').

**sic...aciem:** *in primum* ('into the front line' or similar) was translated in various ways: 'firstly' was not accepted; *infensis* ('hostile') caused vocabulary problems but many made sensible guesses for the phrase *infensis hastis*; it was hoped that candidates would reflect the metaphor in *provolant* ('flew ahead') in some way to gain its two marks so 'ran forward' did not gain full credit, whereas 'rushed forward' was allowed and 'swooped ahead' gained style credit.

## Question 2 (a)

The Lucan passage proved more accessible than the Ovid passage set in 2011; only a small number of candidates resorted to guesswork and did not display understanding of the plot. It was also very pleasing to see how many candidates really made an effort to translate the passage idiomatically, even poetically, in order to retain the tone and atmosphere of the original: it was evident that candidates from most Centres had some experience of Lucan and were attuned to his satiric style.

**lucus...ferro:** this proved a tough opening to the unseen (despite the help in the introduction), since a number of adjective/noun combinations needed to be understood, testing the candidates' grammatical knowledge, as well as their appreciation of poetic word order: the noun/adjective pair which caused most difficulties was *obscurum...aera*, partly because many did not know the meaning of *aera* or that it is a Greek accusative. *aer* ('air') was regarded as a relatively common word in verse and therefore not glossed. *alte* ('on high') caused problems since many did not translate it closely with *summotis*. Most candidates took *solibus* as a poetic plural and a pleasing minority translated it idiomatically as 'the sun's rays', successfully replicating the plural ending: 'suns' was not accepted and there were the customary confusions with *solus*, *solum* and *soleo*. Over-literal translations of *inmisso...ferro* did not gain full credit, i.e. 'with iron sent in' gained two marks rather than three.

**nam vicina...montes:** notwithstanding the mention of 'siege-works' in the title, a large number did not see that *operi* referred to them; several did not realise that *vicina* describes the wood, along with *intacta* and *densissima*, partly due to misunderstanding of its meaning (knowledge of the English word 'vicinity' helped out most here); for two marks *nudatos* had to be translated with its full perfect passive participial sense, i.e. 'stripped' or 'bared' as opposed to merely 'bare' or 'naked', to emphasise that this is not the mountains' natural state.

**sed fortes...secures:** the shortened form *tremuere* was translated well; *motique verenda maiestate loci* proved one of the most difficult phrases in the passage, partly because many did not see that *moti* is describing the soldiers rather than the place; a sizeable minority of candidates did not recognise *verenda* as a part of the verb *vereor* and there were confusions with *verus*; *verenda* could be adequately translated as 'awesome' or 'fearsome' with the gerundive sense not being demanded; many did not know the meaning of *ferio* ('I strike') but most realised that *ferirent* is not the imperfect subjunctive of *ferro*. *in sua...secures:* this

phrase was translated very well by most. There were excellent renderings of *redituras*, such as 'would rebound', showing a good understanding of what the soldiers feared might happen if they were to try to cut the trees down with axes.

***implicitas...ferro***: candidates coped well with the overall structure of the sentences, but a few words and phrases caused difficulties: the meaning of *torpore* ('sluggishness') was known by only one or two candidates and few expressed the full force of *effatur*: 'he spoke' gained 1 mark, 'he cried out', 'he announced' or similar gained 2 marks. Again, candidates need reminding of the need to express the full force of compound verbs to which 2 marks is often allocated. ***merso...ferro***: impressive translations included 'with the blade buried...', another example of how many candidates made a successful effort to translate 'poetically'. Various translations of *robora* were allowed e.g. 'oak', 'tree', 'trunk' and their equivalent plurals.

***iam ne quis...nefas***: a few candidates did not recognise that *ne quis* ('in case anyone') introduced a negative purpose clause and a few did not realise that *vestrum* is the genitive plural of *vos*; *subvertere* encouraged a number of pleasing translations, with 'uproot' and 'undermine' being perhaps the most impressive; *nefas* was also translated well, with some candidates realising that its position at the end of the sentence required something more forceful than merely 'wrong'; 'crime', 'offence against the gods' etc. were all acceptable.

***tum paruit...ira***: the final ablative absolute was translated well, with most candidates correctly translating *superorum* as 'of the gods', but the beginning of the sentence proved difficult due to the separation of the adjective *omnis* from its noun, the meaning of *secura* ('free from concern') and the problematic *non* which should probably be taken both with *sublato* and *secura* (though candidates were not penalised if they did not do so since the Latin was felt to be ambiguous); the correct meaning of *sublato* as 'removed' was not always recognised; other meanings of *tollo* such as 'raised' did not suit the context and were therefore not accepted.

## Question 2 (b)

The scansion was generally done well, although one or two candidates surprisingly attempted to scan the second line as a pentameter.

***imperiis...pavore***: very few encountered problems with this line, the only serious errors arising from miscounting the number of syllables in *imperiis* (as three, rather than four).

***turba...ira***: again, this line proved fairly straightforward for most. Occasionally, candidates scanned the final *a* in *ira* as short, but this did not affect their marks, as the final syllable is not anyway credited. It was pleasing that almost all candidates realised that the main caesura in this line does not occur in the third foot, and put it in either the second or the fourth (both were accepted).

(This question is initially marked out of 15. 12 marks are allocated to correct quantities, and 3 for feet divisions and caesurae. The total is then divided by three).



# LATIN

---

**Paper 9788/04**

**Prose Composition or Comprehension**

In relation to the prose composition, Examiners think that this was a challenging passage, but one which a number of candidates triumphantly showed could be done.

The candidates who tackled the comprehension found – unusually – that it was the comprehension rather than the grammar questions which caused them trouble.

While no one this year was awarded full marks, as one was last year, the standard overall was the highest it has been. Generally speaking, the grammar of the candidates was very sound; and there was some striking vocabulary. The very best coped admirably, and sometimes stylishly, with the challenges posed by the extended piece of indirect speech.

## **Section A**

### **First sentence**

Here, most candidates had a reasonable translation for 'both'; one very good answer used *uterque dux*. Also well handled in this sentence was the idea of obligation, with many correctly using a gerundive. Most of this sentence had to be part of the generals' speech, so the conditional 'if luck was on their side' caused some difficulty in relation to the tense.

### **Second sentence**

Most opted to continue in *oratio obliqua* for this short sentence, and most were able to form the future infinitive of *scio* correctly, as well as the periphrastic future of *rego*.

### **Third sentence**

The best continued to translate in indirect speech, and managed the tenses well. There was some good redrafting of 'in case of defeat', the most economical being a perfect participle passive of *vinco*.

### **Fourth sentence**

Again, some bravely chose to continue with indirect speech, which for a second time caused some difficulty with the tense of the verb in the conditional.

### **Fifth sentence**

This was done well as a rule, the only problem for some being how to translate 'in turn'.

### **Final sentence**

Some found 'reminded' difficult; 'previous' too. There were some clever redraftings of 'recent weakness of the enemy'. All candidates understood the syntax of the last two clauses (an indirect command and then a purpose clause). Some – wishing to avoid a repetition of *ut* – used *ad* with the gerund.

Nearly every candidate displayed sound grammatical knowledge; in the majority of compositions there was some attempt – often successful – to write idiomatic Latin.

**Section B**

Very few candidates attempted the comprehension option. Overall, they fared less well than those who tackled the composition. Marks tended to be lost on the comprehension questions with more marks (e.g. **(i)**, **(iii)**, **(v)**). The grammar **Questions – (x) – (xiv)** – were answered with varying degrees of accuracy. The questions that causes the most problems were **(xi)** on cases, and **(xiii)** which required candidates to identify the 1<sup>st</sup> person present singular of *peperi*. All the candidates correctly identified a supine, which was pleasing.

Candidates clearly had plenty of time to complete the paper. Some of those who attempted the prose composition had written out several versions.

The passage to be translated into Latin was indeed challenging but, as Examiners have said a number of times, many candidates handled the challenges extremely well.