

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/01

Language

## General comments

The majority of candidates did very well on this paper and the overall standard was high. The learning of the prescribed vocabulary was impressive and therefore scripts were devoid of careless errors. The best papers were of real quality, and those producing such work had a sound understanding of grammar and syntax.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

Few candidates had difficulty comprehending the piece, though there were some candidates who did not appreciate that *vivorum* and *mortuorum* referred to people. The present participle *rediens* was often omitted as was the word *itineris*. A number of candidates did not notice the pluperfects in the second and third sentences. The sentence *Orpheo.....licebat*, which was deemed difficult and had a large number of marks allocated to it, was translated well by most candidates. Again, most noted the result clause which followed, though the point of *in animo victus* eluded many. The majority coped well with the perfect passives in the sentence *iterum.....ablata est*, and the result clause which followed was problematic for very few candidates. The remaining sentences were well done, though some omitted a translation of *sua* in the last sentence and others did not know the word *dulcem*.

### **Section B**

Again, most candidates managed to make sense of this passage, and few were put off by the abstract noun being the subject of the first sentence. Several candidates wanted to make *conspectus* a participle, but they recovered quickly and produced good versions of the first sentence. The second sentence was also well done, and *ad pugnandum* posed few problems. Line 4 proved problematical for many candidates, and more attention needed to be paid to the word endings in order to get the phrases absolutely correct. In line 5 the sense was lost by many because the word *dignis* was not understood. The second paragraph was well done. The gerund *vincendi* (line 8) was translated accurately by the majority of the candidates. In line 9, the participle *excitatae* created some problems with a number of candidates turning it into the main verb and then having difficulty regaining the sense. The majority did not spot the superlative *plurimi* (line 10; this was similar in the case of *maxima* in the following line too, so more attention needs to be paid to the learning of the rules of comparison), and only the best translated *suos* (line 11) accurately. A few did not understand what was happening in the sentence *maxima.....oppresserant*, and a number were misled because they did not understand *quia*. The last paragraph was generally well done.

### **Section C**

The majority of candidates who answered this section produced excellent work. In **(a)**, the concept of *ad* plus the gerund was not problematical. Sentence **(b)** was well done, with the correct subjunctive form being used. The rules of sequence of tenses were well understood. Sentence **(d)** was the most difficult, and many candidates experienced problems with 'we are expecting'. The principal parts of *fugio* were well known and the future infinitive formed accurately by many. In **(e)**, all candidates were aware of the negative command and that it had to take an accusative here. This section was done very well by those who attempted it.

## **Section D**

This section was also well done. Candidates should avoid paraphrasing and keep as close to the Latin as possible in their answers to avoid omitting details. Generally, (b) to (e) were well done. In (f), many candidates thought that Paris was already dangerous and omitted the future *erit*. The answers to (h) - (j) illustrated the need for accuracy in these comprehension answers. In (h), *fidelem* had to be translated to earn the full mark. Similarly, *aggressuros* carried one of the three marks in (i), but it was frequently omitted, as was *miserum* in (j). Every candidate produced four good derivations in (k), but the full mark was not awarded if the English derivative was misspelt (e.g. in the case of 'ferocious').

<p><b>Paper 0480/02</b> <b>Verse Literature</b></p>
---

### **General comments**

Candidates are to be commended on their high standard of English, which, for many, is not their first language.

The candidates worked hard and their enthusiasm was apparent, with some lively responses to the literature. The most successful candidates were those who knew the texts well and were able to translate fluently. Their familiarity with the translation allowed them to answer the questions effectively. The summary questions proved to be the weakest area for the candidates. Candidates must observe the word limit. There were a number of extremely good essays written in answer to **Questions 4** and **8**, with several candidates showing a mature understanding of the material and an ability to produce a balanced and well supported argument.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Virgil***

The story appealed to the candidates and most answers were well informed and accurate. Some candidates failed to use quotes from the passage to support their argument in the questions that tested literary awareness, for example **Question 2 (c), (g)** and **Question 3 (e)**.

#### ***Martial***

Only one candidate answered this section.

### **Conclusion**

Overall, the general standard was high and many candidates attained excellent grades.

<p><b>Paper 0480/03</b> <b>Prose Literature</b></p>
---

**General comments**

See **General comments** for Paper 0480/02.

**Comments on specific questions**

***Nepos***

There was a little confusion with regard to the background to the text, with candidates showing little knowledge of historical details. There were some common inaccuracies: the phrase *coronis aureis aeneisque* was translated as ('gold and bronze crowns') or 'gold crowns and fillets'. **Question 2 (g)** was not well answered as most candidates only wrote about Alcibiades. In **Questions 3 (a), (b) and (c)** many candidates did not distinguish between the three groups of citizens properly. The phrase 'to what extent' in **Question 4** was designed to elicit a review of his good and his bad points.

***Livy***

There was some confusion over the geography, with Grades and New Carthage being placed in Africa or Greece. Generally, however, there was a good display of accurate background knowledge. Translation of the passage in **Question 7 (a)** was generally poor. In their answers to **Question 8**, too many candidates relied on the information offered in the question paper itself.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the general standard was high and many candidates scored excellent grades.