

LATIN

Paper 0480/01
Language

General Comments:

In general, candidates must be encouraged to follow the rubric, writing legibly on alternate lines for the translation, for example. As noted in previous reports, this allows for candidates to reframe their work on checking and for the Examiner to see clearly what the actual final version is. Candidates should again be reminded not to give alternatives for words. There remain problems with some candidates who will, on occasion, tend to transliterate or paraphrase rather than produce a translation in good modern English, for example leaving main verbs in the position they find them in the Latin sentence.

Careful reading of the passages and all the information given, like the introduction to the translation passage, the given vocabulary and, for the comprehension, the questions, will benefit candidates. Some candidates again this year wrote a complete version out before producing a neat copy and some also wrote out all the Latin and a working draft before attempting a neat copy. This was clearly very time-consuming and most who worked this way did not finish either the draft or the final version.

Translation:

Candidates must expect a series of constructions to appear in the translation and must be prepared to look out for them. Many spotted ablative absolute and purpose clause with *ut*, but fewer recognised the *qui* of purpose and the consecutive clause following *tam segniter*.

Weaker candidates did tend to confuse words like *partem* with *patrem*, *praefectus* with *profectus* and *solum* with *solem*; many also ignored the adverbial force of *solum*. Similarly, in many cases, the translation of *primo* was taken with the walls adjectivally rather than as an adverbial usage. Not unexpectedly, perhaps, *liberis* produced the usual crop of interesting variants and ingenious attempts to make the particular translation fit into the translated sentence. Application of logic might well have helped here as the majority of candidates recognised *cum coniugibus* as meaning 'with spouses' or similar. Candidates need to be clear about expressing the various past tenses accurately rather than using some kind of ubiquitous aorist-like past tense. The same comment, as ever, may be made about candidates turning active sentences into passive ones but omitting some of the elements of the original – the city was captured *by him*, for example.

On occasions, candidates ignored the given vocabulary which hindered full expression of the translation rather than penalising them. Surprisingly, the force of *quam celerrime* was not as well known as might have been expected; nor were phrases like *summa vi* and verbs like *oppugnabatur*. The importance of the comparative phrase *quos non minus quam* was also missed by some candidates. *illi* and the various forms of *is* were often ignored.

The lengthier and more complex sentences were generally handled well by those who took time to work out the sequence of the sentence, while those who tried to put together the elements they understood at first reading tended to produce muddled responses. It was pleasing to see that, among higher scoring candidates, there was a noticeable attention to detail and a rigour which paid dividends.

Comprehension:

As in previous years, it was good to see candidates of all abilities have some success in answering the questions set on this passage. Generally, candidates find the comprehension more accessible than the translation, particularly now that the references for each answer are clearly indicated. The obverse of this is that candidates must make sure that they limit their answers to the section indicated at the beginning of each question. Because of a failure to do this, there were a number of scripts with lines and crossings out which made for confusing deciphering. The passage provided a good differentiated test of ability and only the really good candidates displayed a sufficient depth of knowledge to answer questions which achieved full or



nearly full marks. Some candidates do tend to 'under-answer' questions, resulting in fewer marks than might be hoped for. Clearly, a four or three mark question will require a fuller answer than a one mark one. **Questions (d), (g) and (e)** fitted into this category as they required a logical and detailed answer - sometimes answers became rather muddled, but these questions did allow good candidates to show the depth of their understanding, as did the sentence for translation **(f)** (though many missed the ablative absolute and the superlative adverb *diligentissime*). Some candidates missed the comparison in **(g)**, and others got rather muddled with what Alexander was holding where in **(d)** and mis-translations of *sinistra* as 'evil' or 'sinister' were not uncommon. In **(e) (ii)** the failure to recognise the importance of *nec* made for a number of mistakes as well as some interesting eye movements. Generally, candidates handled the shorter lower tariff questions soundly.

The derivations produced, aside from a wide variety of correct answers, an interesting crop of neologisms, as ever, and mis-derived words. Under the new syllabus (from 2013 onwards), this particular question reduces in importance and Centres need to be aware of this.

LATIN

Paper 0480/02
Literature

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 civilisation 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 text, explain meanings and references, translate a portion of the text 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 general standard was very high, and most candidates showed a pleasing depth of understanding of Ovid, Virgil and Cicero; it was clear that, on the whole, teachers had prepared their classes very thoroughly. The majority of candidates translated the prescribed texts fluently and tended to perform well on most questions, with very few lacking any ability to translate Latin and the vast majority able to scan. 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. It was disappointing when candidates with obvious knowledge of Latin lost a great many marks through poor examination technique, especially on the 10 mark questions; however, most candidates' answers reflected very good examination technique and a clear understanding of the requirements of the paper.

Section A Two Centuries of Roman Poetry

Question 1

- (a) This was answered well, with most candidates being able to name Vulcan.
- (b) This was generally answered well, with the majority of candidates able to scan, including those who were weaker on translation. It was disappointing when a whole Centre lacked the ability to scan correctly.
- (c) The majority of candidates identified suckling by the wolf, although some failed to mention her 'licking them into shape'. Candidates should be mindful to answer with reference only to the lines cited in the lemma.
- (d) Most candidates identified *sine more* or explained *raptas* instead.
- (e) Candidates were able to identify alliteration and make a sensible suggestion of what it might represent, although a few seemed not to understand the term 'literary feature'.
- (f) Most candidates were able to translate fluently, although some omitted *armati* or *inter se posito certamine*.
- (g) Candidates who knew the meaning of *pateras*, on the whole, were able to explain their use.
- (h) Almost all candidates gave the correct answer.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates identified the veil and empty scabbard, although 'sword' and 'Pyramus' body' (which are not in lines 1 and 2) were common misinterpretations.
- (b) Most candidates explained that she was gaining the strength to kill herself.
- (c) The majority of candidates identified alliteration and linked it to the sound of sobbing although some used scansion or O plus a good explanation to gain credit.
- (d) Candidates were able to translate fluently, although some omitted *non invidetis*.
- (e) Almost all candidates gave the correct answer.
- (f) Answers identified the desire for the fruit to always be dark coloured and therefore suitable for mourning or as a memorial to the dead lovers.

Question 3

The question was answered well on the whole, and provoked some excellent personal responses which were very well thought out. Successful answers referred to enjoyable features such as: vivid description; similes; apostrophe; imagery; personification; pathos; humour; and Roman patriotism. Candidates could not score highly unless they supported each point with a specific reference to the text, and retelling the stories did not gain credit. Occasionally a candidate failed to discuss both authors and received a maximum of 7 marks. Some candidates wrote a great deal, but there were plenty of succinct answers which received full marks.

Section B Introducing Cicero

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates identified the time of year exactly, although some did not translate *summa* and therefore lost the mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates gave the correct answer.
- (c) The majority of candidates were able to identify the threshing floor, although there was some unfortunate confusion with 'the threshold' which gained no credit.
- (d) Most candidates were able to translate fluently. Common mistakes were to miss out *perspicitur* or *commonet*.
- (e) (i) Almost every candidate gave the correct response.
(ii) Many candidates were able to suggest what the tone might be and to explain their opinion, which is pleasing as sarcasm or irony can be difficult to explain.
- (f) Candidates were, on the whole, able to make a sensible assertion based on the text as to why Verres picked the location, referring usually to its beauty or the climate.
- (g) Creditworthy answers included lecherous friends (or equivalents), women e.g. Tertia and his son.

Question 5

- (a) The Mediterranean Sea was identified by a great many candidates.
- (b) Most candidates were able to translate fluently.
- (c) The majority of candidates identified death and servitude, although some referred to statements outside the lemma and therefore received no credit.

- (d) Although almost all candidates were able to write down two adjectives, some failed to translate them or gave inaccurate translations.
- (e) Answers used the lemma well, picking out the repetition of *tam* and the list of adjectives in addition to the contrast between all the generals in one year and one general in all the years.
- (f) (i) For the most part, candidates identified rhetorical questions.
(ii) Almost every candidate could explain how the questions were effective.

Question 6

Candidates tended to approach the question with confidence, giving a wealth of opinions which were very interesting to read. Most answers referred to the rhetorical techniques used by Cicero and gave examples from the text. A successful way to gain a high mark was to choose a selection of techniques, give an example of each from the text and say why each one would have given Cicero success. Techniques referred to included: appeals to emotions; sarcasm; mockery; humour; analogy; rhetorical questions; anaphora; and tricolons. The use of technical terms was not a specific requirement but, by the same token, a list of technical terms with no examples could not gain a high mark. Occasionally candidates referred to Cicero's training or preparation for his speeches in a manner specific enough to be given credit.