

CONTENTS

LATIN	2
Paper 0480/01 Language	2
Paper 0480/02 Literature	3

LATIN

<p>Paper 0480/01</p>

<p>Language</p>

General comments

Candidates continue to tackle this paper very well, and it is pleasing to note that some of the grammatical issues highlighted as common errors in past years (e.g. the failure to spot comparative and superlative adjectives) have proved far less problematical. Similarly, some common vocabulary errors, such as translating *audere* as *audire*, have been less prevalent. In the comprehension passage, candidates are paying greater heed to the mark scheme and are therefore generally giving the right amount of detail to merit the marks allocated.

Comments on specific sections

Section A

Once again, candidates followed the story well and a few managed a virtually faultless translation. *Quaedam* is one of those words often not known or omitted by candidates, but here it was generally translated correctly. Some did not see that *provinciam* and *Asiam* (line 1) agreed and so translated 'a province in Asia'. All saw that *haec* referred to the woman, though a similar use, *hi* in line 9, proved more tricky. The phrase *eodem tempore* was not well translated and in particular candidates were clearly unsure of the meaning of *eodem*. In line 3, a surprising number wanted *habui* as a present tense verb, but the rest of that sentence was well done, with the superlatives being accurately translated (as mentioned above). The indirect statement in lines 4 and 5 (as with other examples of this construction elsewhere) was accurately translated, though many translated *eius* as if it were *ea*. The long sentence in lines 5-8 was well followed by the majority, with the *non solum...sed etiam* balance being well translated; the force of the perfect tense of the infinitive *punitos esse* needed to be brought out by many candidates.

Line 10 predictably was the most challenging of the whole passage, and only the best candidates saw that *accusatorem* and *ipsam* were parallel objects of *iusserunt*; therefore where to append the words *quae accusabatur* proved difficult. There were rather a lot of instances of *cum* being translated as 'with' and *omnia* translated as if it were nominative and masculine. In terms of following the sense, only here did some candidates go awry: the idea of coming back in the hundredth year proved puzzling. The natural periodic structure of the last sentence allowed most candidates to follow it well, though only the best knew precisely to what antecedent *quam* referred, and as a result many paraphrased the last phrase too loosely. Finally, a minor vocabulary point: *sic* was not known or omitted by a large number of candidates.

Section B

As a general rule, candidates should be advised to keep as close to the Latin as possible in their answers to comprehension questions. Loose paraphrasing was especially prevalent in **(a)(i)** where candidates needed to say for the first mark that Caesar found out what was going on around Cicero's camp, and rather many used the introductory rubric as their answer. A large number made *captives* singular in **(a)(ii)**, while many then made *cuidam* plural in **(b)(i)**, presumably distracted by the plural *equitibus*. The following questions, **(b)(ii)**, both parts of **(c)**, and **(d)** were particularly well done. In **(e)(i)**, most did not bring out the perfect tense of *profectum* and so did not convey the fact that Caesar had already set out; the more unusual vocabulary (*hortatus est, solitam, praeberent*) was a major handicap in **(e)(ii)** and only a few grasped the sense accurately. Both parts of **(f)** were well done, and, as stated above, candidates generally spotted that there were three marks allocated to **(f)(ii)** and so included the requisite detail. Many candidates did not see that *lectam* was a clue to answering **(g)** and resorted to invention, while the comparatively tricky sentences from where the answers to both parts of **(h)** came were very well followed. The derivations in **(i)** were, as usual, well done, though candidates who did not know what *forte* and *hortatus* meant made the predictable errors.

<p style="text-align: center;">Paper 0480/02 Literature</p>

General comments

The candidates fell into three categories. The strongest (and most numerous) were those who knew their texts well, and were able to answer all the questions confidently and accurately. The second group contained those who were able to tackle most of the questions adequately. The third (minority) group did not have sufficient knowledge of the texts and were consequently unable to answer the majority of the questions with any authority.

Comments on specific questions**Section A***Virgil Aeneid IV*

Most candidates were able to give the background information required in their answers to **Questions 1 (i), (iii) and (v)**, and **Question 2 (i) and (vii)**. The translation elements were generally either very accurate or very poor. Scansion was well done by most candidates. Answers to the questions requiring some analysis of the text were varied, with some sensitive handling of Dido's state of mind in answers to **Question 1 (iv)**. Better answers to **Question 2 (v)** covered both colours, purple and gold, and both Dido and the horse. There were some good answers to **Question 3**, giving a good range of detail from the text and a balanced evaluation.

Section B*Two Centuries of Roman Prose*

Some candidates were unsure about the status of Niceros (**Question 4 (i)**), the location of the incident (**Question 4 (ii)**) and the official nature of the relationship between Niceros and Melissa (**Question 4 (v)**). The story behind the incident described in the passage for **Question 5** seemed to have engaged the interest of most candidates, and background detail was generally well known. Answers to **Question 6** in a few cases consisted of undigested material about Sallust's political views; better answers showed a good knowledge of the text studied and candidates' personal reactions to it.