

LATIN

Paper 0480/01

Language

General comments

The number taking the subject more than doubled this year, and once again the marks on this paper were spread across the range. There was a healthy concentration of high achievers at the top end, but a significant number of candidates were also found seriously wanting at the level. Candidates in general performed better in **Section A** (Translation) than in **Section B** (Comprehension), where there was a higher proportion of weak performers. A number of candidates inadvisably continue, as part of their rough working, to copy out both Latin passages in full and to leave themselves, as a result, insufficient time to complete **Section B**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Candidates, on the whole, rose well to the challenge of the Cicero passage and a few managed a virtually faultless translation. Constructions such as purpose and indirect statement were often well handled and serious vocabulary problems were not experienced by the majority. Some, however, continue not to help themselves by confusing words of similar appearance such as *audio* and *adiuvo*.

Claudius... constituit (line 1)

This opening sentence proved to be to most candidates' liking and full marks were frequently obtained. The meaning of *diu* was occasionally not known.

Claudius igitur... ivit (lines 1-3)

Some missed the future tense of *facturum esse* in the indirect statement after *sciret*. Items of vocabulary not always known were *igitur*, *iter* (sometimes confused with *iterum*) and *profectus est*.

ibi... habebat (line 3)

The participle *procedenti* proved a stumbling-block for many, being taken often for a main verb (e.g. 'Milo proceeded on his journey to set up an ambush he had in mind'). Some candidates also seemed unfamiliar with *in animo habebat*.

postridie... exspectavit (lines 4-5)

Most scored highly here and full marks were often obtained. *Senatores dimissi sunt* was occasionally mistranslated (e.g. 'the senators dismissed him') and a number of candidates did not know *paulisper*.

ex urbe... interfecerunt (lines 5-7)

These two sentences were mostly well translated, but in the first *tandem* was sometimes taken for *tamen* and *profectus* was not often recognised as the perfect participle of *proficiscor*; in the second a surprising number mistranslated *statim*, and *complures*, *telis* and *impetum* were not always known.

cum autem... aggressi sunt (lines 7-10)

The structure of this long sentence was reasonably well handled by most. In the *cum* clause *autem* was sometimes mistranslated and *ipse* occasionally omitted, but many coped well with *seque defenderet* and accurately rendered the superlative *fortissime*. Elsewhere, the purpose clause *ut a tergo... oppugnarent* was usually well done, but *alii eius servos... aggressi sunt* was often translated as 'his other slaves...were attacked'.

pauci...adiuvarent (lines 10-11)

Some did not know *ceteri* and *adiuvarent* was sometimes confused with *audio*, but the sentence as a whole well handled with many taking *animo fideli* and the purpose clause (*ut Milonem adiuverent*), stride.

hi servi...interfecerunt (lines 11-14)

This sentence predictably proved the most challenging of the whole passage. Only the ablest coped successfully with *neque domino imperante neque sciente*, but many made good sense of the surrounding Latin. Some did not know *non solum...sed etiam* and *vulneratum* was often translated 'vulnerable'.

Section B

Most difficulty was caused here by the long sentence in lines 4-7 of the Latin passage, where a number of candidates seemed to lose their way, and this particularly affected answers to **Questions (e)(ii) and (f)(ii)**. The best candidates, however, displayed an excellent understanding of the whole passage, and many followed the story well while occasionally missing some of the detail. In this connection it is worth repeating last year's advice to candidates about avoiding loose paraphrase, where detail can easily be lost, and sticking as closely as possible to the Latin.

- (a) Most candidates referred correctly to Caninius marching to Lemonum and many were able to supply a suitable meaning for *legatus* (e.g. officer/general).
- (b)(i) The news received by Caninius, which was contained in the indirect statement after *cognoveret* (line 2), was in general well understood and many obtained full marks here.
 - (ii) A good number of answers failed to mention Duratius who had sent the letters and messengers.
- (c) Most candidates saw that Duratius had always been a friend of the Romans, but not so many mentioned those of his people who had deserted and were not therefore friends of the Romans.
- (d) Many answered correctly that it was when he arrived there/at Lemonum that Caninius heard from the prisoners.
- (e)(i) Most could identify Dumnacus as the leader of the enemy, but in answering about his forces a fair number confused *milibus* with *militibus* and said that he had many soldiers.
 - (ii) Many experienced difficulty with the indirect statement after *audivisset* (line 5) where the answer to this question was to be found, and fully correct answers came only from the strongest candidates.
- (f)(i) A number of candidates stumbled here over the meaning of *munito loco* (line 6), but many answered correctly.
 - (ii) Only a minority succeeded in extracting the right answer from the *quod* clause (line 7), which was that Caninius' legions were weak or too weak to expose to the enemy.
- (g) In dealing with the first of Dumnacus' actions candidates occasionally had trouble translating *copiis omnibus ad legiones versis* (line 8), where some surprisingly took *legiones* for singular, but few had difficulty in pointing out his second action ('he began to attack the Roman camp').
- (h) Most pointed to the fact that Dumnacus had spent several days vainly attacking the Roman camp, and many also to the fact that he had been unable to destroy any part of the fortifications, but the third point in *magna suorum caede* was frequently missed.
- (i) The derivations were, as usual, very well done and full marks were often achieved. A number of candidates, however, thought that 'delirious' came from *delere*.

LATIN

Paper 0480/02

Literature

General comments

The general standard at this examination session was good, with several candidates achieving high marks. As usual, an ability to translate the text was the key to answering the full range of questions well, and those candidates who scored poorly on the translation questions rarely achieved good marks on the others. In a few cases it was clear that there was little familiarity with any of the Latin texts or with the notes in *Two Centuries of Roman Prose*. In general candidates managed their time well, and it was only occasionally that their time appeared to have run out. Spelling of proper names was often inaccurate. But most importantly, the majority of the candidates had clearly engaged with the texts, enjoyed reading them and gained good insight into the Roman world.

Virgil – *Aeneid IV*

In answers to **Question 1(iii)** the phrase *sic adeo insistit* produced a wide variety of translations, and many candidates missed the point that *adeo* emphasises *sic*, and that a fair translation would be “It was like this, then, that she began to speak...”. Most candidates translated the question in line 6 as if the Latin were *en, quid agam?* (“See, what am I to do?”) not *en, quid ago?* (“See, what am I doing?”). It should be noted that *Nomadum* in line 7 is genitive plural, not accusative singular, and depends on *conubia* – “marriage with one of the Nomads”. Some good contextual knowledge was shown in answers to **Question 1(vi)**; Laomedon (Priam’s father) had persuaded Neptune and Apollo to build the walls of Troy, but had then cheated them of their pay; hence his name became a byword for perjury, and is applied here to Aeneas and the Trojans in the light of their perjury towards Dido.

In answers to **Question 2(i)** *atria* in line 4 was often mistranslated as “altars”, and the imagery of *bacchatur* in line 4 was often lost; several translations offered the word “wounds”, which is not in the Latin. In answers to **Questions 2(ii)** and **(iv)** many candidates failed to scan, or even count up the syllables, and suggested that a predominance of dactyls in the one line and of spondees in the other was at the root of “matching sound to sense”; line 4 and line 9 both contain 15 syllables (+ one elision), i.e. three dactyls and three spondees. In answers to **Question 2(iii)** several candidates misapplied the simile to Dido herself rather than to the rumour of her death, but there were also some sophisticated answers which pointed to wider implications such as the ultimate destruction of Carthage by the Romans.

In answers to **Question 3** many candidates tended to choose scenes rather than features of the text, and consequently their essays were over-dependent on narrative at the expense of discussion, failing to focus on the dramatic qualities. Clearly many candidates had read the whole of book 4 in translation, and based their answers on a wider range of material than that offered in the prescription; this was entirely acceptable, unless essays ignored the prescribed passage altogether. On the other hand some candidates relied entirely on the material printed on the Question Paper, and so their answers were inadequate.

Two Centuries of Roman Prose

In answers to **Question 4(ii)** the better translations rendered *facile credidi* as “I easily persuaded myself”, thus making much better sense of the purpose/ final clause *ne...experirer* following. Surprisingly some candidates who had correctly identified *Neapolim* as “Naples” in answers to (i) translated it as “Neapolim” in (ii). **Questions 4(iii)** and **(iv)** defeated those who had not consulted the notes in *Two Centuries of Roman Prose*. In (iii) there was often some confusion between athletes and gladiators.

In answers to **Questions 5(ii)** and **(iii)** a degree of social knowledge was required: *salutatio* was not just any greeting, but that offered by clients to patrons (as Pliny’s townsmen to Pliny himself), and the *toga praetexta* was a purple-bordered toga worn on formal occasions by boys (and magistrates). In **Question 5(v)** *una* in line 4 is not nominative masculine singular, but ablative feminine singular used adverbially, meaning “together (with him)”.

In answers to **Question 6** no one individual or group proved the most popular. As in answers to **Question 5** there was often too great an emphasis on recounting the factual details and too little discussion.