

LATIN

Paper 0480/01
Language

General Comments:

General comments about rubric remain the same as in previous years. Candidates need to be reminded, probably in the exam room, that they should write out the translation on alternate lines. Ideally, they should not give numerous alternatives for words, and should stick to the given passage for answers in the comprehension section. It was pleasing to see that only a handful of candidates this year wrote out a working draft of the translation before copying it up in neat. This is a very time-consuming process for the candidate and the Examiners wonder whether it is valuable in terms of end product. Careful reading of all the information given and of the passages is very important and it is a pity to note that there is still a number of candidates who ignore the glossed words.

Translation:

The translation followed a pattern set in previous years in which candidates should expect a series of constructions to appear. Many were spotted, recognised and well-translated, including the gerundive of purpose coming at the end of a rather tricky sentence which was quite demanding in itself to construe into good English, providing a good differentiator. Many candidates did not fully grasp the force of *daretur* after *priusquam*. Virtually all recognised the indirect statement though not always the correct translations for the *se*. There were few problems with the purpose clauses or the indirect command. The consecutive clause was usually well handled, as was the pluperfect force of *profectus erat*. Some other areas that were felt to be good discriminators were: *omnes navem Eumenis oppugnarent* with the recognition that all the Bithynians were to attack Eumenes ship not all the ships or all the Bithynian ships; the phrase *reliquis Pergamenorum navibus*; the tense of *superarentur* and the long sentence describing the actions of the courier after revealing the location of Eumenes' ship.

It is always intended that there should be a gradient of difficulty throughout the piece but it is also important that, if candidates are thrown by a particularly tricky phrase or sentence, they should have the chance to regroup with a more straightforward phrase and not move further away from the real line of translation. At various points there were phrases that did allow candidates to do this in this passage, such as the short *itaque statim proelium commisit*, coming immediately after the lengthy sentence on what Eumenes found in the letter once he had opened it.

As in previous years there were the usual confusions over *profectus* and the two differing appearances of *primo*. Other words to cause confusion this year were *vim* and the recognition that *consiliis callidissimis* expressed both plurality and superlative. Where *at* was translated and not ignored, it frequently appeared as 'and'. *nave regis suis patefacta* caused a few problems for some, especially those who ignored the gloss for *patefacta*, mainly with how to attribute *suis*. Other common slips included *hortatus* being confused with *hortus*; and a satisfactory translation of *tali modo* as well as points mentioned earlier.

There were, inevitably, some mistranslations and some poor attempts at translation but it was good to note how many candidates tried hard to give a translation into good modern English. While some candidates clearly tried to find an appropriate translation for *inicere* if they did not know it or could not work out its meaning with a neutral verb such as 'put', several ventured a more dramatic 'hurl' or 'launch' or 'fire', giving full expression to the force of both the 'in' of *inicere* and that of *in hostium naves*.

Comprehension:

The opening remarks on the comprehension section this year could very well be taken from last year's report in that it was again good to see candidates of all abilities have some success on this part of the paper aided, no doubt, by the directions to particular sections of the text. It also remains true that candidates would do well to order their thoughts and make sure that they pick the right information for answers from the given sections and, especially when a question is broken down into more than one part, use the appropriate piece of information to answer each sub-section. The derivations question now only requires two derivations and, as we move forward from this first year of having only two derivations, candidates should be encouraged to follow the rubric which requires them to select two, rather than write out four and hope, perhaps, that two will be correct.

In general, candidates responded well to the passage and the sequence of events did not prove overwhelming for most, though, as in previous years, it was relatively straightforward to gain a creditable score. It was also true that an eye for the detail and clear expression of that detail allowed the more able candidates to score highly. It remains true that a few candidates still under-answer questions and so do not gain access to the full range of marks. However, overall, the Examiners were pleased with the good range of answers and that many candidates did answer in detail.

While **Question (c)** gave plenty of scope for candidates to gain the marks, **Question (d)** provided more of a challenge for full marks. **Questions (f), (g) and (j)** were ones that required candidates to make sure that they gave the right information for each sub-section and some candidates did answer both parts as though it were one. **(jii)** also gave more able candidates to show that they had recognised *dedi* as opposed to *dari* and there were many suitable variants on the idea of being surrendered/handed over to the Romans. In **(gi)** the Examiners were generally happy to accept a clear expression of the idea that Masinissa was conspicuous for what he was wearing and the arms he was carrying, realising that the usage of the word 'conspicuous' has evolved and that young people might find it a slightly strange expression to use.

LATIN

Paper 0480/02

Literature

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 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 level of comprehension concerning both Virgil and the prose authors: Livy, Nepos and Seneca; it was in evidence that teachers had prepared their candidates very thoroughly. Many candidates translated the prescribed texts with fluency and accuracy and performed suitably on the majority of the questions. There were a few candidates who lacked the ability to translate the Latin although many of these obviously understood the stories of the set texts as there were only a handful who could hardly answer any questions at all. The teaching of scansion to this cohort seems to have been to a particularly high standard since the vast majority were able to scan competently including quite a few of those who seemed to lack any ability to translate. 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.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid* Book 2

- 1 (a) Answered well with most candidates being able to refer to Hector being dead so having come from the underworld or mentioning the fact that he was in a dream.
- (b) Sub section (i) was answered correctly by the majority of candidates while a few candidates failed to identify Achilles as the culprit in (ii).
- (c) Both parts of this question was answered particularly well by most candidates who gave some very interesting personal responses as to why Hector reacts the way he does, showing excellent engagement with the set text.
- (d) The alliteration of *hostis habet* was a very popular answer to this question which was answered well.
- (e) Most candidates were able to translate fluently.
- (f) Generally answered well with the majority of candidates able to scan, including those who were weaker on translation.

- 2 (a) Candidates were able to translate fluently although some missed *et umida circum caligat*.
- (b) Most identified Venus although Creusa and Juno were mentioned.
- (c) Almost all candidates gave the correct answer, often referring to the stones and the smoke or dust.
- (d) Alliteration of *m* was mentioned frequently as was the superlative *saevissima* and *s* alliteration. It was pleasing when candidates referred to the spondaic nature of line 7.
- (e) Answers frequently identified the cloud or location on the top of the citadel and the Gorgon.
- (f) The majority of candidates were able to give the reason that the king of the gods was against Troy meaning that there was no hope for the Trojans.
- 3 The question was answered well on the whole, and inspired some excellent personal responses which were very well thought out. Successful answers referred to a range of characters; occasionally a candidate discussed only two characters and received only limited marks since this was not really answering the question. Some candidates wrote a great deal, but there were plenty of succinct answers which received full marks. Some candidates interpreted the question as referring only to the passages printed on the question paper but if they answered well using the characters mentioned they could still score full marks.

Section B *Two Centuries of Roman Prose*

- 4 (a) Most candidates identified the fact that both ‘ events ‘ were battles in which Aristides was involved for (i) and almost all candidates gave the correct answer to (ii).
- (b) This question was answered well with the majority of candidates referring to the death and routing of Mardonius and the army.
- (c) The majority of candidates were able to identify justice and fairness for (i), although some referred to lines not included in the lemma as an answer to (ii).
- (d) Most candidates were able to translate fluently.
- 5 (a) The reference to *unam* was discussed by great many candidates and many achieved full marks.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe the process although references to the flammable properties of vinegar did occur.
- (c) The majority of candidates identified *non solum...sed etiam* and referred to word order although the chiasmus was seldom mentioned by name.
- (d) Most candidates were able to translate fluently. A common mistake was to omit *muniendo*.
- 6 Candidates tended to approach the question in a lively manner, giving a wealth of detail about Roman society. Most answers referred to the bath house and its popularity, as well as what took place there. A successful way to gain a high mark was to choose a selection of items mentioned by Seneca and explain what we can learn from them about Roman society. The man testing musical instruments near the fountain, the people in the boat and the chariot were popular choices mentioned from outside the bath house.