

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/12  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a blank space will never be creditworthy.
- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List: the various English equivalents should also be known and understood. Credit will be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. the Latin verb *facere* can mean in English either 'to do' or 'to make'; this year, Daedalus bound feathers together in order to make (not to do) wings.

## General comments

Candidates must adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, and answers to the comprehension questions should be correctly identified and approached in the correct order.

The majority of candidates endeavoured to follow the instructions and made a good attempt to render the Latin passage for translation into sensible modern English; generally, they demonstrated thoughtful and accurate understanding in the comprehension section.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Question 1**

In general, nouns, adjectives and adverbs are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct number and case, and in the case of adjectives, they must be seen to be understood to apply to the correct noun by grammatical agreement). There are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + tense and/or voice). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently, for example the ablative absolute construction is generally taken as a single unit, worth three marks, thus allowing for vocabulary, tense and co-ordination with the rest of the sentence.

Note should be taken of the following common errors

- *Oderat*: a defective verb, here properly translated into English using the imperfect tense (Daedalus hated Crete); 'had hated' is incorrect, although there was 1 mark available for correct knowledge of vocabulary. Candidates who did not recognise the vocabulary, and wrote that Daedalus 'had' done something else were allowed 1 mark for recognition of what would have been the pluperfect tense of a regular verb.
- *Invitus*: not generally known.
- *Brevioribus sequentibus*: comparative (*brevior*) generally missed; present participle and vocabulary (*sequor*) generally missed. The phrase was very often rendered as 'with short ones in sequence' (for 2 of the available 4 marks).
- *Tandem*: not the same as *tamen*.
- *Aquam ... gravaturam esse*: although the oratio obliqua was often missed, the tense of the infinitive was generally correctly recognised. According to the text, Daedalus warned Icarus that 'the water would weigh down his feathers'; this is deemed exactly equivalent to a warning that 'the feathers would be weighed down by water', for which all the marks were available.
- *Proxime*: superlative often missed.
- '*Mediam viam tene!*' Here is a case in which the appropriate English translation should be selected. Daedalus and Icarus are about to fly through the air, so 'Keep to the middle of the street!' is not really a good translation.

- *Fac*: not generally known.
- *Tabuerant*: Candidates did well to recognise the pluperfect here, a subtle and effective choice by Ovid.
- *Clamans cecidit*: for the purposes of the present examination, deemed equivalent to *cadens clamavit*.
- *Infelix*: not the same as *miser*.
- *Petam*: future tense often missed.
- *Conspectis*: not the same as *visis*.
- *Vituperabat*: not the same as *verberabat*.

## Question 2: Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, observe the marks available for each, answer them in the order they appear on the paper (which will help to guide them through the passage), and adhere strictly to the lemma for each question. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and that a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal etc., nevertheless the questions deliberately direct candidates to the lemma because the answers to the questions are to be found in the lemma (and only in the lemma). In general, candidates should not expect to gain credit for words that appear in the questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items on the question paper.

The questions for comprehension were well understood, and the answers correctly identified by most candidates, although some demonstrated confusion about who was who, Greek or Persian: although this account of the Battle of Marathon begins with the Persian commander and his troops, the focus soon shifts to Miltiades, on the Greek side.

Throughout **Question 2**, candidates are demonstrating their understanding of the narrative; candidates who understood, for example, that the Greeks used the mountains for cover, rather than thinking that they stationed themselves in the mountains (or up trees) were rewarded, however they chose to express this idea.

Centres might advise candidates to observe the square-bracketed ‘marks available’ information: **Question 2(f)** directs candidates to lines 9 – 11, and asks a pair of questions to the total value of 9 marks. All the marks are unlikely to be gained with reference only to the first (or last) few words of the lemma. Likewise, in **Question 2(h)**, nearly every candidate scored a mark or two for demonstrating some understanding of *nulla enim umquam tam parva manus tantas copias hostium superavit* (the second half of the lemma); candidates also needed to pay attention to the first half (*qua pugna nihil adhuc fuit mirabilius*).

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/13  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a blank space will never be creditworthy.
- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List: the various English equivalents should also be known and understood. Credit will be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. Pyramus and Thisbe decided to meet (not to gather) under a certain tree.

## General comments

Candidates must adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, and answers to the comprehension questions should be correctly identified and approached in the correct order.

The majority of candidates endeavoured to follow the instructions and made a good attempt to render the Latin passage for translation into sensible modern English; generally, they demonstrated thoughtful and accurate understanding in the comprehension section.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

In general, nouns, adjectives and adverbs are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct number and case, and in the case of adjectives, they must be seen to be understood to apply to the correct noun by grammatical agreement). There are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + tense and/or voice). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently, for example the ablative absolute construction is generally taken as a single unit, worth three marks, thus allowing for vocabulary, tense and co-ordination with the rest of the sentence.

Note should be taken of the following common errors

- *Amaverunt*: traditionally in English, the perfect tense of this verb renders the translation 'fell in love', however 'they loved' was credited.
- *Inter se*: 'they fell in love' (*amaverunt* above) naturally yields 'with each other' here; however, 'between' or 'among(st) themselves' was credited.
- *Minima*: the superlative was very seldom recognised.
- *Vituperabant*: not the same as *verberabant*.
- *Egressa*: not always recognised as a participle, although '(Thisbe) went out and ...' was deemed acceptable.
- *Pervenit*: 'went/came through' is not an acceptable translation of this word, even if each element may be correct in other contexts.
- *Ut ... biberet*: the purpose clause was universally translated as such.
- *Proximo*: the superlative was very seldom recognised.
- *Quod*: *too often taken as 'because'*.
- *Inventum*: many candidates found this tricky.
- *Tandem*: not the same as *tamen*.
- *Conspecto*: not the same as *viso*.

- *Eam mortuam esse*: ‘that she was dead’ or ‘that she had died’. In the latter version, the tense is important.
- *Carissima*: not ‘very caring’, but ‘very cared for’ (or ‘dearest’, ‘darling’, etc.).
- *Infelix*: not the same as *miser*.
- *His verbis dictis*: very well translated by the vast majority of candidates.

### Question 2: Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, observe the marks available for each, answer them in the order they appear on the paper (which will help to guide them through the passage), and adhere strictly to the lemma for each question. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and that a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal etc., nevertheless the questions deliberately direct candidates to the lemma because the answers to the questions are to be found in the lemma (and only in the lemma). In general, candidates should not expect to gain credit for words that appear in the questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items on the question paper.

The questions for comprehension were well understood, and the answers correctly identified by most candidates, although some demonstrated confusion about Xerxes’ reaction to Themistocles’ trickery.

Throughout **Question 2**, candidates are demonstrating their understanding of the narrative; candidates who understood, for example, that Xerxes was persuaded that the battle would be longer and harder if he allowed the Athenians to escape were rewarded, however they chose to express this idea.

Centres might advise candidates to observe the square-bracketed ‘marks available’ information:

**Question 2(g)** directs candidates to lines 11 – 12, and asks a question worth 6 marks. All the marks are unlikely to be gained with reference only to the first (or last) part of the lemma: nearly every candidate scored a mark or two for demonstrating some understanding of *qui si discessissent, illum maiore cum labore et tempore bellum conjecturum esse* (the first part of the lemma); candidates also needed to pay attention to the second part (*cum civitates singulatim oppugnare cogeretur*).

# LATIN

---

**Paper 0480/22**  
**Literature**

## **Key messages**

- Candidates should give a reasoned personal response to the literature.
- Candidates should attempt the questions in order and label them with the correct number.
- Candidates should take note of the mark allocation for each question to ensure they provide an appropriate number of points in their responses.

## **General comments**

In this examination, it is necessary for candidates to describe character, action and context, pick out details from the texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts and explain matters relating to the social and historical context. Moreover, candidates ought to be able to analyse and evaluate style, tone and metre, select evidence to make judgments on the social and historical context and give a personal response to the literature.

The majority of candidates rendered the set texts with commendable accuracy and fluency, and answered most of the questions with confidence. It was encouraging to observe that a greater number of candidates were attempting most of the paper, opting to engage with the material rather than omit sections. Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully in order to identify those focusing on literary style. For questions requiring commentary on both the author's content and style, it is insufficient to translate two phrases; a degree of literary interpretation is expected.

Performance in scansion improved this year, with a significant proportion of candidates showing proficiency in this area. Candidates engaged effectively with both the verse and prose components, demonstrating an ability to analyse not only the style but also the substance of the prescribed texts, and to formulate personal reflections on the literature.

Examination technique was generally satisfactory for shorter questions, although the 10 mark questions were handled with less confidence. A lengthy introduction is not necessary for a response of this type; what is required is a broad and relevant selection of points that directly address the question, each supported by specific reference to the set text in either English or Latin, along with pertinent analysis and evaluation.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A: Virgil Aeneid Book 3**

##### **Question 1**

(a) On the whole the first question was answered well with most candidates being able to identify that the speaker was a Greek and had fought against Troy for 2 marks.

(b) This question required candidates to discuss both content and style and some limited themselves to 2 marks by making two content points. Repetition of *pereo* was a popular choice, focusing on the idea that he does not mind dying, but wants to be killed by humans. The imperatives *spargite* and *immergeite* were another frequently selected alternative.

(c) Almost all candidates could name a feature for (i), although fewer could explain the effectiveness for (ii). Alliteration of *fortuna fateri* drawing attention to the Trojans wanting to know what had happened to him was a widely favoured option as well as repetition/polyptoton of *qui ... quo ... quae* highlighting the eagerness of their questions.

(d) Candidates showed excellent understanding of this section of the text and the majority stated that he offered his right hand along with either 'without delay' or 'lifting his spirit'.

(e) Responses to the question were suitably framed, with most candidates demonstrating confidence in their translations. There were many interesting renderings of *mansissetque utinam fortuna*. A common error was to omit the translation of *profectus* or *genitore Adamasto paupere*.

##### **Question 2**

(a) Many candidates scanned the whole line correctly. The most frequent mistakes were to get 'nam *simul|exple*' the wrong way round: spondee, dactyl when it should have been dactyl then spondee or to try to make the 'que' on 'vinoque' into two separate syllables.

(b) The main concern with answers to this question was not relating the points to being 'disgusting' – there is nothing inherently disgusting about being big, so quoting *immensus* and saying the Cyclops is big is not enough. Quotations and explanations of the different aspects of *saniem eructans et frusta cruento/per somnum commixta mero* were the best way to achieve full marks.

(c) Candidates who were familiar with the story and had studied the set text diligently approached this question with confidence; some missed out *acuto* or *torva* while others missed off the simile at the end.

(d) For this question, the fact that the comrades are dead is reflected already in the fact that they are ghosts, so it was necessary to say specifically that the Cyclops had eaten them.

(e) This question was answered very well, with candidates usually referring to the repetition of *fugite*, the three imperatives and the vocative *o miseri*, with explanations.

##### **Question 3**

A significant proportion of candidates gave strong responses. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a precise example from the text studied. Most candidates remembered a wealth of specific details about the Cyclops and the Harpies episodes and expressed how the details were or were not frightening – the best answers gave a balance: not merely stating 'this is more frightening/less frightening' but explaining why e.g. The story of the Cyclops eating Ulysses' men is horrible, but it is told second hand to the Trojans, while the Harpies get much closer physically and Calaeno gives them a prophecy that makes their blood freeze. A Level 3 answer requires a good range of appropriate points using specific details from the set text with clear and detailed explanation as well as detailed analysis of evidence. Candidates achieved Level 1 or 2 marks by giving imprecise responses to the question with some or minimal engagement with specific aspects of the text.

**Section B: Introducing Cicero**

**Question 4**

- (a) The instruction to make reference to the Latin in this question was heeded by most candidates. Popular choices were *vere* or *vere mehercule* emphasising that he is telling the truth by calling the god/hero to witness, and the double negative of *nisi ... nisi* expressing the idea that Cicero was convinced that nobody was talking about anything except his quaestorship.
- (b) Almost every candidate was able to identify two techniques of an orator, although not all of them appeared in the lines. Asyndeton or listing in *frumenti ... sociis* and superlatives *maximum, diligentissimus, summa* were the most commonly chosen creditworthy techniques.
- (c) The majority of candidates demonstrated the ability to render the text into fluent and accurate English. Translations of *ultra* or *putarem* were sometimes omitted.
- (d) Almost universally, candidates were able to recall with obvious amusement Cicero's shock when nobody recognised him or knew what he had been doing.

**Question 5**

- (a) Many candidates spotted the rhetorical questions and quoted the repetition of *quem* and, along with this, the reference to the effect on the women was very popular. There was some confusion over the meaning of *maiores*.
- (b) Knowledge of this part of the prescribed text was strong. In many cases the section was translated fluently with all parts included, although there was a tendency to omit 'to Segesta from Carthage' or a translation of *eadem*.
- (c) Many candidates were able to identify the two events.
- (d) The idea of the contrasting superlatives with quotations was the most frequently seen answer. Candidates understood the idea of the actions of the two men having opposite effects, with one returning something taken by the enemy and the other behaving like an enemy towards allies.

**Question 6**

The most confident responses acknowledged that we learn nothing about Plancius as the *pro Plancio* extracts are all about Cicero. There was plenty to say about what we learn about Cicero from the *pro Plancio* extracts and about what we learn about Verres rather than Cicero from the *in Verrem* extracts. A minority of candidates confused the name Plancius with Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica and wrote about what we find out from the extracts of *in Verrem* about Verres and Scipio, but they were given credit for material relating to Verres. A detailed introduction and conclusion are not required for this type of question and the most successful method of attaining Level 3 is to choose a good range of evidence from throughout the set texts, paraphrasing in English or quoting in Latin and evaluate each piece of evidence in the context of the question asked.

# LATIN

---

**Paper 0480/23**  
**Literature**

## **Key messages**

- Candidates should give a reasoned personal response to the literature.
- Candidates should attempt the questions in order and label them with the correct number.
- Candidates should take note of the mark allocation for each question to ensure they provide an appropriate number of points in their responses.

## **General comments**

In this examination, it is necessary for candidates to describe character, action and context, pick out details from the texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts and explain matters relating to the social and historical context. Moreover, candidates ought to be able to analyse and evaluate style, tone and metre, select evidence to make judgments on the social and historical context and give a personal response to the literature.

The majority of candidates rendered the set texts with commendable accuracy and fluency, and answered most of the questions with confidence. It was encouraging to observe that a greater number of candidates were attempting most of the paper, opting to engage with the material rather than omit sections. Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully in order to identify those focusing on literary style. For questions requiring commentary on both the author's content and style, it is insufficient to translate two phrases; a degree of literary interpretation is expected.

Performance in scansion improved this year, with a significant proportion of candidates showing proficiency in this area. Candidates engaged effectively with both the verse and prose components, demonstrating an ability to analyse not only the style but also the substance of the prescribed texts, and to formulate personal reflections on the literature.

Examination technique was generally satisfactory for shorter questions, although the 10 mark questions were handled with less confidence. A lengthy introduction is not necessary for a response of this type; what is required is a broad and relevant selection of points that directly address the question, each supported by specific reference to the set text in either English or Latin, along with pertinent analysis and evaluation.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A: Virgil, *Aeneid* Book 3**

##### **Question 1**

- (a) The responses to this question were appropriately structured, with the majority of candidates displaying assurance in their translation. A common error was to omit the translation of *hic*.
- (b) Almost all candidates could name a feature for (i), although fewer could explain the effectiveness for (ii). A popular choice was the hyperbole *pulsat sidera* emphasising how tall the Cyclopes are.
- (c) Candidates showed excellent understanding of this section of the text and the majority stated that the Cyclops was not easy to look at or pleasant to talk about.
- (d) Many candidates were able to gain full credit by making reference to both content and style, *natarent* being a popular choice with discussion of the metaphor highlighting the amount of blood.
- (e) Numerous candidates scanned the whole line correctly, marking the long and short syllables and divisions between the feet.

##### **Question 2**

- (a) The simile comparing the Cyclopes to trees was a frequent response from candidates as well as *lumine torvo* depicting them as wild eyed. There was some confusion about the deities mentioned in line 5 with candidates mistakenly thinking the Cyclopes were being compared to the gods.
- (b) A frequent response to this question was to quote and translate *praecipitis* for 2 marks.
- (c) The text here is complex but many candidates were able to explain that going between Scylla and Charybdis would mean that death would be on either side with not much difference between the sides.
- (d) Translation of this section of text was done well, with interestingly varied renderings of *vivo*, although there was a tendency to omit *ecce*.
- (e) The majority of responses correctly noted that Achaemenides had travelled the route in reverse as a companion of Ulysses.

##### **Question 3**

A considerable number of candidates produced commendable responses. The most accomplished answers demonstrated an ability to consider both sides of the question, substantiating each argument with precise textual references. A large portion of the cohort recalled a rich array of specific details about both the supernatural and mortal characters, and articulated whether – and in what ways – these aspects were interesting. Achaemenides with his strange appearance and vivid back story was a strong competitor to the Harpies and Cyclopes in attracting the interest of candidates.

To achieve a level 3 mark, candidates were required to present a wide range of relevant points, supported by specific references to the set text, and to deliver both detailed explanation and thorough analysis. Responses that received level 1 or 2 marks tended to offer vague or underdeveloped answers, with limited engagement with the text and insufficient reference to particular details.

#### **Section B: Introducing Cicero**

##### **Question 4**

- (a) For (i) most candidates were able to identify that great numbers – *plurimi* – of the most elegant – *lautissimi* – were accustomed to spend time there. With only a few exceptions, reference was made to *casu* or *forte* or both for (ii).

- (b) It was generally known that Cicero was asked when he had set out from Rome and if there was any news. Cicero acting like one who had come to take the waters was also mentioned and credited.
- (c) The translation of this section of the text was very confident. Candidates reproduced the direct speech with a lively tone.
- (d) Both parts (i) and (ii) of this question were answered correctly in many cases. The only problem was if a candidate chose *stomachans* but then translated it with the meaning of *fastidiose* or vice versa: either was acceptable with the correct meaning.
- (e) The one who acts as if he knows everything or the know-it-all was familiar to candidates.

#### Question 5

- (a) It was necessary for responses to include reference to both style and content in order to be awarded full credit. A popular choice was the use of *iste* and the simile about Verres having been hit with the torch and the metaphor of him burning with desire and madness.
- (b) Candidates knew this section of the text very well and were able to explain about the Segestans' extreme religious reverence for the statue, and their respect or fear for the laws and courts.
- (c) There were three parts to supply for full marks, with four options available: entreat this favour of them (1) threaten them (1) excite their hopes (1) arouse their (fears). Most answers actually included all four elements as the text was well remembered.
- (d) Fluent translations were provided by the majority of candidates. It was apposite that they knew that he was a general and not the emperor.

#### Question 6

The most assured responses recognised Cicero's expertise in the art of public speaking while maintaining that subject matter was of significance. There was ample opportunity to discuss both Cicero's use of rhetorical techniques, as well as the subject matter in question. Some candidates discussed that the extract they studied from *pro Plancio* does not have anything to do with Plancius.

For this type of question, a detailed introduction and conclusion are unnecessary. Candidates achieved level 3 by selecting a well-balanced range of evidence drawn from across the set texts, either paraphrased in English or cited in Latin, and offering thoughtful evaluation of each example in direct relation to the question.