

# LATIN

**Paper 9788/01**  
**Verse Literature**

## General Comments

The standard overall was high. It was clear that the majority of candidates knew their set texts extremely well and were able to recall large amounts of relevant detail when writing their set text essay. In the commentary questions and in the Unseen Literary Criticism question, there was less written about sound effects, which meant that more answers were more relevant.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Question 1

- (i) Candidates were clear about the events immediately preceding the passage and most received full marks.
- (ii) There were some very full answers here. Good comments were made about *ecce* and *mirabile monstrum* in line 3, and the colours described in lines 4-5 were well observed. Good answers also included reference to Aeneas' surprising sacrifice to Juno, and to the response of the river Tiber.
- (iii) There were again some very good answers here, with good comment on the pathetic fallacy of these lines, *mirantur* and *miratur* in lines 13-14, the painted boats of 14-15, the archaism *olli*, *placid* in line 18, and the contrast between the past and (Virgil's) present in lines 19-23.
- (iv) The translations were accurate for the most part.

### Question 2

- (i) This perhaps was the least successfully answered of all the commentary questions. There were some very good answers, but quite a few candidates did not include enough detail to be awarded high marks. The first seven lines have Venus recalling how she had not asked for help during the Trojan War. Worth comment here were: *vastabant*, *debita casurasque*, *non . . . non*, *carissime coniunx*, *incassum*, *deberem*, *durum*, *flevissem*. The contrast with the present is stressed in the first word of line 8 – *nunc*. There is the fact that she comes as a suppliant (line 9); the *arma rogo* of line 10 picks up the similar phrase in line 3; Venus recalls an earlier occasion when Vulcan was swayed (line 11); there is the imperative at the beginning of line 12, and the emphatic *meorum* at the end of 13. Most candidates wrote about some but not all of these things. No candidate observed that the most persuasive thing about Venus may very well not have been anything she says.
- (ii) This was better answered, with candidates observing well the description of Venus' arms and how that contrasts with the fire/heat metaphor of lines 16-17. Most also noted the simile of lines 18-19, and the wryness of line 20, where Venus is well aware of the effect she has on Vulcan.
- (iii) Nearly all the translations were accurate.

### Question 3

- (i) This was well answered, with most candidates focusing on the poet's exuberance and playfulness. More specifically, candidates picked up the jussive subjunctives in line 1, the juxtaposition of *omnes* and *unius*, the positions of *soles* and *lux*, the comedy of the numbers.

- (ii) Good candidates argued that the first two lines of 7 are Lesbia's response to the poet's demands in 5, and that the rest of 7 is the poet's response to Lesbia's question.
- (iii) It was well noted that in 7, just as in 5, there is comic and playful exaggeration, this time comparing the number of adequate kisses to grains of sand. There were some good observations about *lasarpiciferis*, and about *vesano* and *pernumerare*.
- (iv) Most translations were accurate.

#### Question 4

- (i) Well translated.
- (ii) This was well answered, with candidates observing the many short questions of lines 7-13, the fact that Ariadne has nowhere to turn, the breakup of her family, the various repetitions of *nullo* and *nulla*, *omina*, the clarity of the adjectives (*truculentum*, *deserta*). It was pleasing to see that candidates did not waste time writing about (bogus) effects of sound and concentrated more on what the poem says.
- (iii) This was well answered. Candidates were able to observe, for instance, the alliterations of line 18 and 24 (plosive 'p's here). There was also good comment about the Eumenides and the fearsome description of them by Ariadne; also observed were the imperatives of line 25, with the repetition of *huc*, *misera*, *extremis medullis*, and the adjective dominated line 27.

#### Question 5

Not many candidates attempted this essay. Of those that did, there was one very good essay and some that handled the idea of 'cinematic' less well. The following were well observed: Virgil often changes perspective at unexpected moments; he makes many visual contrasts, mainly in terms of colour or darkness and light (Cacus, Cyclops at work on the armour); he describes – very visually again – the fantastic quality of some of the events, such as the reaction of the Tiber and the surrounding countryside to the journey of Aeneas' boat; he playfully contrasts the poverty and rural nature of Evander's kingdom and the opulence and magnificence of Rome.

#### Question 6

Most candidates tackled this essay and while there were some very good answers, there was also a partial failure to answer the question fully. Very few challenged, or even considered, the equation between light and peace; few candidates also made explicit the various moves that Virgil makes between literal and metaphorical darkness, and that metaphorical darkness has an ethical dimension. It was a surprise as well to see that, while most answers included a reference to the Cacus episode, few that did mention the episode went on to say that Cacus' cave is very precisely dark (in every sense) and that it is illuminated by Hercules. On the other hand, most candidates displayed a thorough knowledge of the text.

#### Question 7

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

#### Question 8

The answers to this question were knowledgeable and well organised. Most were able to refer both to the short poems and to the very different 64 and 68, selecting appropriate and relevant examples. The best were able to consider the idea of 'extremes' not only in relation to the affair with Lesbia, but also to invective specifically and poetic experimentation and variety more generally. Much – quite rightly – was made of 85 and its famously contradictory assertion.

#### Question 9

The candidates of all but one Centre attempted the unseen literary criticism question. On the whole, candidates focused much more on what Horace actually says rather than making dubious claims about the effects caused by the sound of the words.

- (i) There were some very good answers here, but also others that failed to analyse the lines with any sharpness. The best answers were able to note how Horace personalises his instructions (*si vis me flere*) and gives emphasis to his opening point by the use of a gerundive of obligation and *ipsi*. Also noted were the addresses to the two mythical figures in line 3 and the stark alternative responses by Horace in line 4. But the question was especially well answered when candidates took on lines 5-6 and observed how the word order and alliteration here stressed Horace's central point. The importance of nature was picked up, as was the change in the audience (from Horace himself to Roman knights and soldiers).
- (ii) The best candidates were able to say that Horace starts by using examples that could broadly be described as stereotypes, then moves quickly on to 'national' types, then spends some time on Achilles (whom he sums up in one entirely adjectival line), before continuing with mythical examples dealt with much more rapidly. The economy of these last two lines was commented on.
- (iii) Few knew how to deal with this, though there were still some very good answers. When good, answers were able to observe that the tone is throughout somewhat didactic but that the passage also aims for a wry, cool comedy. The pervasive verbal tricks in word order and so on were – quite rightly – seen as part of that attempt. Not noted was that, while all the above is true, there is a serious purpose behind what Horace is saying: it is just that he does not want to come over as earnest or as a bore.

### Theme essays

Only one Centre did the theme option, and that Centre chose Roman epic. The essays here – and all were either **Question 10** or **Question 12** – were, for the most part, very knowledgeable and well organised. At best the problems in determining whose 'aim' it might be to glorify Rome were well explored but those who chose **Question 12** could have had a sharper definition of what is meant by rhetoric.

It should be said that the theme option allows those candidates who write well and who have an interest in literature to shine. It is a surprise to this Examiner at least that more Centres do not take this option.

# LATIN

---

<p><b>Paper 9788/02</b> <b>Prose Literature</b></p>
---

## General comments

Candidates displayed a very impressive knowledge of the texts and a detailed 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.

A number of scripts were difficult to read: it was often the case that the longer the answer, the less legible the writing. A number of Centres had clearly taken note of the Examiner report of 2010 and context answers overall tended to be more concise and better directed to the exact wording of the question, though a small minority of candidates still tended to ignore the question and write down all they knew about a particular passage.

The best answers tended to be those which focused on the question asked, quoted only relevant detail from the text and consisted of short, well structured paragraphs. To obtain full marks for a context answer it was also advisable to include a short introduction and concluding statement, perhaps showing a broader understanding of the role of the extract in the context of the speech or work as a whole.

Overall, candidates' knowledge of the historical background was very good and they had clearly been well prepared for questions demanding knowledge beyond the printed text. It is, however, also important to be aware that questions demanding knowledge of the historical background will not always be asked if the passage does not contain material appropriate for such a question. Instead, candidates might be asked to explain the argument or situation in the passage, or an additional question demanding a literary response might be set. 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.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*

#### **Question 1**

- (i) Translations were generally very accurate and the majority of candidates scored maximum marks. It is pleasing that candidates are generally producing their own individual translations.
- (ii) Answers were detailed on Catiline, emphasising well his physical and mental characteristics. Many showed appreciation of the exaggerations and that the portrayal is for Sallust more of a literary exercise than an aim at a true record. Candidates also showed well how Catiline corrupted his associates but few focused upon the picture given of the associates themselves. Many examples of Sallust's rhetoric were given, e.g. alliteration, asyndeton etc. though a number of examples suggested in the mark scheme were not mentioned such as the use of tragic language and historic infinitives.
- (iii) Most candidates made mention of debt but its cause was often left unexplained or unreferenced. Reference to Chapter 11, where the extravagance of Sulla's troops after victories in the east led to bankruptcy, and/or to Manlius' letter in Chapter 33, which refers to past debt legislation, were expected for full marks.

## Question 2

- (i) Answers tended to be a little too brief: five details were expected, including Catiline's departure from Rome to join Manlius in Etruria and how he has left fellow conspirators in Rome with orders to continue acts of terrorism. Most candidates mentioned the dramatic confrontation with Cicero in the Senate House.
- (ii) The translation was done well by the majority of candidates. Only a few phrases caused difficulty, e.g. *optumo cuique, ex sua contentione*.
- (iii) There were many excellent answers here, and it was clear that candidates were aware that the letter might be the transcript of a real letter rather than Sallustian invention; candidates were keen to point out the variations from Sallust's normal style. Many focused upon the ways in which Catiline tries to gain the sympathy of Catulus, both by flattering him and by showing genuine marital concern. Candidates could have made more of how he portrays himself as the victim rather than the aggressor by discussing phrases such as *magnis in meis periculis, fructu laboris...privatus, vim mihi parari*.

Cicero, *Pro Caelio*

## Question 3

- (i) Almost all candidates related the first charge that Caelius arranged to assassinate Dio after stealing gold from Clodia, including excellent detail. However, several lost two marks by not mentioning that Caelius was also charged with preparing poison to murder Clodia.
- (ii) There were many good answers here which produced a variety of techniques used by Cicero to pour scorn on Clodia. In general there was insufficient emphasis on Cicero's jokes about Clodia's statue of Venus (which is probably invention) which she has adorned with 'spoils' from other lovers (*ceterorum*) but now despoils herself; the mock cult title *spoliatricem* could also have been mentioned in this regard. The best answers highlighted how Cicero portrays Clodia as a whore, with *liberalis, popularis and hospitalis* all suggesting sexual promiscuity. Sound effects could have been mentioned more frequently, e.g. assonance and alliteration.
- (iii) Translations were generally accurate and idiomatic; one or two candidates lost marks due to omission rather than error. *huic crimine* and *alienis...servis* were the phrases most commonly mistranslated.

## Question 4

- (i) The key word in the question is 'colourful': there was plenty of opportunity to discuss the many metaphors in the passage, an opportunity which most candidates relished. The metaphors from horticulture, horse-riding and plant life tended to be mentioned without full explanation of how they related to the argument, e.g. that *adulescentes* (like Caelius) need to be restrained (*refrenandi*) rather than spurred on (*incitandi*). Other colourful language describing Caelius' former flashy lifestyle (*purpureae genus...splendor, nitor*) was often but not always mentioned. Overall the weaker answers tended to focus upon rather mundane rhetorical features as opposed to the stand-out features. The best answers included a brief conclusion explaining Cicero's aim in the passage: he is admitting that Caelius' behaviour in his youth was over-exuberant and unrestrained but the message is that he has developed into a more mature and responsible adult.
- (ii) Most candidates correctly identified the two cases to which Cicero is referring: the prosecution of Antonius Hybrida, Cicero's co-consul in 63 BC, for malpractices during his governorship and the prosecution of Bestia, a friend of Cicero's, for bribery. The names and one relevant detail were required for two marks in each case. The best answers also explained Caelius' motives in prosecuting the two men: to kick-start his legal career with a high-profile success in the courts.

### Question 5

Understandably, most candidates focused upon the personality of Catiline about whom many interesting points were made. Many focused upon Sallust's character sketches of Catiline and his speeches. Weaker answers failed to devote sufficient attention to other personalities such as Sempronia, Cicero, Cato or Caesar. Several answers failed to mention the debate about the fate of the conspirators at all, which suggests that candidates had not spent sufficient time studying the prescription for reading in English, the later chapters of the *Bellum Catilinae* in this instance.

### Question 6

Answers were rather varied to this question since the key word 'sensational' was sometimes ignored or misinterpreted. Most candidates devoted their attentions to discussing Sallust's merits and demerits as a historian, an essay which, no doubt, they had already written during their course. Many concluded that he cannot be regarded as a 'proper historian' due to inaccuracies, exaggerations etc. but without reference to the passages which could be argued to be 'sensationalised'. Consequently, marks here for AO1 were rather low at times. Those candidates who focused more closely on the quote discussed, for instance, the oath sworn over human blood in Chapter 22, Catiline's departure from the senate house in Chapter 31 and the final battle at Pistoria. Sallust's over-emphasis on moral corruption and the trial of the conspirators could also have been mentioned.

### Question 7

Candidates were asked to illustrate this maxim: 'Rhetoric is designed to instruct, to please, to influence'. The best answers to this question explained what is meant by the word 'rhetoric' and exemplified all three parts of the quote; weaker answers either ignored the word 'rhetoric' or tended to focus almost exclusively on how Cicero uses it to 'please'. Few differentiated between 'instruction' and 'influence'. Consequently, marks for AO1 tended to be comparatively low. Examples of 'instruction' might have been Cicero's reflections about the strictness of the past and his argument that 'youth must have its fling' in order to excuse his client's past indiscretions; examples of 'influence' which could have been mentioned are the scene describing the death of Marcellus and the final appeal for sympathy towards Caelius' father. Most candidates tended to focus upon the entertaining sections where Cicero is mocking Clodia.

### Question 8

Several answers explained well how many elements of Cicero's defence of Caelius would be unsuccessful or even inadmissible in a modern court of law: the digressions, attacks upon Clodia, lack of focus on the actual charges were all rightly cited as potential weaknesses in Cicero's case. A few argued cogently, however, that Cicero is often at his most brilliant as a defence lawyer when his arguments are at their weakest. A number of answers to this essay again suffered from a failure to answer the question fully: one or two devoted almost their entire essay to Cicero's attacks upon Clodia, which, though famous, do not constitute the majority of the speech. It was also expected that candidates criticise Cicero's handling of the charges themselves, his obvious bias towards a former candidate and so on. Most concluded rightly that any criticism of the speech needs to be tempered by the fact that Cicero's speech won the day.

Overall, there were many entertaining and well structured essays and the vast majority of candidates are to be congratulated upon their depth of knowledge and understanding of the text. The most successful essays focused upon the key words in the title and avoided the impression that the candidates were regurgitating a pre-prepared or previously written essay.

# LATIN

**Paper 9788/03**  
**Unseen Translation**

## General comments

All candidates completed their translation of both the prose and the verse unseen passages, with many finding time to write a rough copy before their final version. Candidates often scored similar marks on **Question 1** and **2**, with marks on **Question 2** often boosted by accurate scansion. There was a noticeable improvement in candidates' attempts to translate idiomatically and use natural English where possible and, consequently, style marks were generally higher.

There was a wide range of performance on the two passages set: there was something to challenge the very best candidates and, at the same time, weaker candidates could pick up a considerable number of marks provided that they kept in mind the situation: it was, as usual, very important to bear in mind the introduction to the passages.

The scansion was generally answered well. A number of candidates did not spot the elision at the end of the pentameter, and, in general, candidates were more confident on the hexameter than the pentameter, with a few seemingly unaware that they should divide the line into two 2 x 2 ½ feet. Candidates should be reminded that the final syllable of a hexameter can always, for examination purposes, be marked as an anceps (x). From 2012, the scansion question will demand not only lengths of syllables but also divisions between feet (which the vast majority of candidates have been including anyway) and the main caesura(e).

From 2012, there will be no separate style mark for the verse unseen: instead the 5 'style' marks will be incorporated into the mark scheme, i.e. the verse unseen will be marked out of 135 and divided by 3 to give a total of 45 marks. This is to try to ensure that candidates are not penalised twice. When candidates lose the sense of the passage as tends to happen more often when translating the verse passage, it is also difficult for them to pick up style marks for idiomatic English. The marking procedure for the prose unseen will remain unchanged.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

#### Caesar, De Bello Gallico VII.66

**Cum Caesar...consedit:** the opening *cum* clause was translated well and a pleasing majority of candidates understood the use of *quo* + comparative + subjunctive which followed. Only a few did not know the word *subsidium*. Very few candidates spotted that 'Romanis' is a noun in this context, i.e. the phrase means 'about 10 miles from the Romans' and not an adjective agreeing with *trinis castris*: this was understandably difficult since Caesar has not used a preposition such as *in* before *trinis castris*; *consedit* was translated in a number of satisfactory ways such as 'took up position', but 'sat down' was not accepted.

**convocatisque...profici:** the ablative absolute *convocatis...praefectis* was translated idiomatically and the use of the vivid present *demonstrat* caused few difficulties: those that translated it was present needed to pay particular attention to how they then proceeded to translate the verbs in the extended piece of *oratio obliqua*; a number of candidates translated *fugere* and *excedere* as though they were perfect infinitives; most realised that *id* refers to the previous clause and is the subject of *esse*; *sibi* proved difficult with most translating it 'for him' rather than 'for them(selves)' which gained extra credit; *ad reliqui temporis pacem atque otium parum profici*: this proved a difficult phrase to translate especially as most candidates chose to omit the *ad* altogether and take *pacem* as the subject of *profici*; in fact, as only a few realised, *id* remains the subject.

**maioribus...non posse:** a considerable number of candidates did not know the military meaning of *cogo* as 'I muster', 'I recruit' or similar. The majority of candidates had no problem with the continued indirect statements and omission of *esse* after *reversuros* and *facturos* or indeed the sudden switch into an indirect command, though the meaning of *adorior* was not universally known; *impeditos* was confused with *impedimenta* by many; *in eo morentur* proved one of the most difficult phrases in the passage, partly because of the potential confusion of *morentur* with *moriantur* and partly because some candidates did not realise that *in eo* refers to the previous action *si pedites suis auxilium ferant*.

**si...dubitare:** idiomatic translations of *id quod magis futurum confidat* were pleasingly common; the ablative absolute *relictis impedimentis* was also translated well; a few misunderstood the use of the ablative after *spoliatum iri* and a number translated it as though future active rather than passive; emphatic words *ipsos quidem* were omitted by some: the force of both words was required in some way with the bland 'they themselves indeed' being acceptable; most understood the use of *quin* and that it was preferable to translate it after *dubitare* by which it is governed; a larger number of candidates than expected confused *agmen* with *acies*: many did not realise that *agmen* describes an army in column or on the march as opposed to a battle-line.

**id quo maiore...futurum:** a difficult sentence and, understandably, many candidates did not score high marks here; *quo* + comparative + subjunctive, translated so well in the first sentence, proved harder here, partly because, again, candidates did not realise that *id* refers to the whole previous action. But rather basic errors were also made such as translating *se...habiturum* as plural. A pleasing number spotted that *terrori* is a predicative dative and translated the phrase *terrori hostibus futurum* idiomatically as 'would cause terror for the enemy'; few, however, realised that Vercingetorix (*se*) is the subject of *habiturum* and *futurum*.

**conclamant..perequitasset:** despite the difficulties of the previous section, most candidates finished strongly, though *aditum habeat* ('might have access to') caused difficulties and a sizeable minority did not know *liberos*. The syncopated form *perequitasset* was recognised correctly as a pluperfect subjunctive.

This was a challenging piece of Caesar, especially given the extended *oratio obliqua*: most candidates dealt with it extremely well, though some were let down by their command of English, perhaps, rather than their Latin in trying to get the right tenses in Vercingetorix' speech. The syntax, though challenging, did not generally cause undue difficulties; vocabulary was generally known well, but a few common words such as *agmen* and *liberos* caused confusion. The stronger candidates pieced together the whole passage more effectively, analysing carefully the connections between sentences: short pronouns such as *id* and *se* proved very important for understanding the sense of the trickier phrases and candidates who chose to ignore them did so at their peril. Overall, this piece proved slightly tougher than the Livy passage set in 2010.

## Question 2

### (a) Ovid, *Heroides* 18

The Ovid extract proved challenging but a fair test and a good differentiator; the nautical background caused difficulty for some and imagination was required to understand Leander's direct address to the letter.

**ipsa...iter:** these lines proved a challenging start mainly due to a number of potential vocabulary confusions; *freta* ('straits') was known only by a minority and *rates* ('boats') was often confused with *ratus*; it was disappointing that more candidates could not fathom that both *turbida* and *adeunda* agree with *freta* but if candidates took it as an adjective meaning 'relying upon' then this was understandable. *adeunda* (= 'to be approached') was generally recognised as the gerundive of *adeo* but *per* (= 'by means of') tended to be translated over-literally. The main problem in lines 3-4 proved to be *navita*, despite it being a fairly common poetic alternative to *nauta* and therefore not glossed: unfortunately many took this to mean 'ship' and, as a consequence, missed the point of *unus et hic audax*. Extra credit was given to those who translated *nostra* as 'my' rather than 'our'. In this passage it was advisable to keep the tenses as they are, e.g. *vides* = 'you see', *redditur* = 'is delivered'.

**adsensurus eram...amor:** *nisi quod cum* (= 'except that when'): it was not accepted to translate *nisi* as 'unless' here; many good attempts were made to translate *vincula*, e.g. 'chains', 'ropes', 'cables'; most, but not all, realised that *omnis Abydos* is the subject of *erat*. Several did not agree *meos* with *parentes*, despite the common split of adjective and noun. The promoted *quem* clause understandably caused problems, with candidates assuming that *quem* refers to a person rather than the abstract *amor*. The conditional use of the subjunctive in *latuisset* was well translated but several took the verb transitively rather than intransitively.

**protinus...volet:** a pleasing number of candidates realised that *illa* refers to Hero and that Leander is imagining her receipt of the letter he has sent; *porriget* was correctly seen as a future by most and the majority knew its meaning. **admotis...labellis:** few obtained the two marks available for *admotis* with most failing to stress the sense of *ad* to show that Hero's lips are moving towards the letter to break the seal; the glossing helped candidates to realise that *tangere* (= *tangeris*) is 2<sup>nd</sup> person but several translated it as active; *vincula* was difficult, especially as it had already appeared in the passage in a different sense but many candidates made sensible guesses, realising that it refers to some kind of binding or seal on the letter; it was acceptable to translate *vincula* as singular here, though not in line 5. **niveo...dente:** 'white' was allowed for *niveo*, though 'snow-white' was preferable. Many candidates did not appreciate that 'volet' is the third verb in succession in the future tense following *porriget* and *tangere*: the *dum* clause, perhaps, prompted candidates to expect a present tense.

**talibus...aquas:** *talibus...dictis...verbis:* each of these three words needed to be accounted for, e.g. 'when such words had been spoken'; *mihi* = 'to myself' was often translated as 'by me'; a good translation of *murmure* here was, e.g., 'whisper': most candidates kept to the more literal 'murmur' which was accepted. It should be noted that *murmur* in Latin can refer to a wider variety and volume of sounds than its English equivalent. Those who scanned line 14 correctly and took note of the lengths of the final -a's generally worked out the correct translation: 'my right hand (fem sing.) spoke the rest (n.pl.) with paper (abl.sing.)'; others seemed to use guesswork rather than analysis to work out how the words interrelate. The lines for scansion will often be chosen as an aid to translation: it is worth reminding candidates of this. Most knew the meaning of the verb *malle* but the mood was often missed, i.e. 'I would prefer'. **adsuetas...aquas** ('accustomed...waters'): many translated *adsuetas* as its more commonly met opposite *insuetas*, perhaps not appreciating how often Leander is supposed to have swum across the Hellespont to his lover.

**aptior...mei:** *dare verbera:* a few confused *verbera* with *verba* and therefore lost the sense of this line but most made an excellent effort to translate the phrase, improving on the literal 'to give beatings' with, e.g., 'to apply strokes'; inevitably perhaps, one or two candidates incorrectly thought *ponto* comes from *pons* but most knew this common poetic word for 'sea'. The word order of the last line caused problems: *et* = 'also' was omitted by many and the agreement between *sensus* and *mei* often not recognised, with *mei* being taken as a pronoun rather than an adjective. It was acceptable, even preferable, to translate *sensus...mei* in the plural as, e.g., 'of my feelings' or 'of my emotions'. Candidates should be encouraged to convert singulars into plurals and vice versa when they can see that to do so results in more natural English. A caveat to this is that when candidates are uncertain of the meaning, they would be better advised to keep things literal and not risk losing marks for inaccuracy. In general, the marking of singular and plural nouns in verse passages aims to be flexible and reasonable in any instance where a good case for a poetic singular or plural can be made.

In conclusion, the majority of candidates understood the storyline well and made sensible guesses when vocabulary was unfamiliar. Grammar and syntax did not cause undue difficulty but it proved important in this piece that candidates were confident about 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person forms of verbs and present and future tenses, which can be common in verse, especially in love poetry. It should be made clear that any Latin verse author can be set for the unseen whose work is written in hexameters or elegiac couplets. Teachers are encouraged to use unseen passages from a variety of authors and ensure that their candidates are equally familiar with hexameter and elegiac works.

**(b)** The hexameter caused few difficulties; a number of candidates did not know how to scan a pentameter, attempting to use five whole feet rather than 2 x 2 ½. Several missed the elision at the end of the pentameter: candidates are encouraged to use the following notation when marking an elision, bracketing the vowel to be ignored, and avoiding putting a length of syllable mark above it:

v/ - v v / -  
e.g. *locuta me(a) est*

# LATIN

---

Paper 9788/04

Prose Composition or Comprehension

## General Comments

The standard was extremely high, even better than last year. Candidates clearly had plenty of time to complete the paper. Some of those who attempted the prose composition had written out several versions.

The best of the prose compositions were extremely good, and sometimes stylish, with bold attempts to subordinate verbs, and with appropriate and often inventive attention paid to the connection of sentences. Most were right most of the time about the syntax, though there was more confusion over the correct grammatical form to use (as in, for instance, the present passive infinitive in the first sentence). Those candidates who attempted the comprehension did well in the comprehension questions themselves but did not do so well in the grammatical and syntactical questions.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### **Section A**

This was generally extremely well done.

First sentence

Very few of those who used *dedecus* seemed to be aware that this noun needs to go into the (predicative) dative after the verb *to be*. Others may have been aware but were unable to form the dative of the noun and so tried alternatives – sometimes successfully, sometimes not. Few found the proper ablative form of Etruscans; more wrote *obsideri* correctly.

Second sentence

Some good connection here, with *enim* rightly added. A few candidates were able to write the conditional clause in a completely correct manner using a verb in the pluperfect subjunctive. Some candidates tried to use an infinitive after *persuadeo*: this is very rarely attested.

Third sentence

Most handled the opening clause extremely well, using an ablative absolute. Not many knew the correct accusative form of Tiber, and some wanted to use *in* after *intro*.

Fourth sentence

This sentence caused some trouble, but was done extremely well by a number of candidates, who were confident in their use of the syntax of verbs of fearing and indirect questions. A few candidates were muddled about what to write for 'who', and there was some confusion about how to translate *ignorance* (one interesting coinage was *insciens*). Most understood that a reflexive pronoun was required after *betrayed*. Very few knew the correct translation for *secretary*.

Fifth sentence

Excellent as a rule, with quite a few candidates beginning the sentence with *quo facto*. There was also some good subordination of *he was arrested*.

Sixth sentence

The fact that indirect statement was required was understood by the majority of candidates, and some were able to write the future passive infinitive precisely. There was some good subordination in this sentence (using *tenens*, for example), and more than expected used the genitive of character. Many did not know the correct infinitive form of *patior*.

Final sentence

This was well done by a number of candidates who used the perfect subjunctive in the result clause.

**Section B**

Not all the candidates were quite sure who was who and where was where in this passage. **Question (ii)** was rarely answered completely; the same was true of **Questions (v)** and **(viii)**. Most candidates managed to answer at least three of the five questions correctly in **Question (ix)**. Very few of the case usages were correctly identified in the final question.