

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/11  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates are advised to use their examination time effectively and read the questions and Latin carefully before committing to an answer.
- It is important that candidates are familiar with the deponent verbs listed in the Defined Vocabulary List.

## General comments

It is important that candidates adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question.

The majority of candidates followed the instructions and made a good attempt to convert the translation into sensible modern English, producing thoughtful and accurate answers in the comprehension section. It has been noticeable that the use of the translation as an extended vocabulary recognition exercise or 'along the line, word by word' translation has declined.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A Translation**

Overall, vocabulary was well known. Common confusions were not recognising *pugnare* as distinct from *oppugnare*; *forte* was commonly taken as part of *fortis*; the superlative nature of *proxima* was often missed; *suis*, whose basic meaning was known, required candidates to supply a noun ('men', or similar) in their English versions; the value of the compound *pervenerat* was not always recognised; *num* often seemed to be confused with *nam* or *nunc*, and the phrases *bellum geretis* and *impetum fecit* seemed to cause some difficulty as well. Furthermore, candidates should be reminded that *cum* does not always mean 'when', and that *his* does not mean 'his'.

There were also some verb tenses which caused few problems. For instance, *iusserant* and *pervenerat* were not always recognised as pluperfect, or *aderunt* or *agent* as future. Participles such as *progressus* and *oblitus* were often taken as main verbs. The person of *sciamus* was often mistaken ('so that we all might know' is much more accurate than 'so that everyone will know'). Noun cases, too, need to be examined carefully: *hostem* is importantly different from *hostium*, and this difference should be represented in English translations.

Even though *ut* appeared three times in the passage, it only once signified a purpose (or final) clause; where Livy has composed a result (or consecutive) clause, the English 'in order to' is not an appropriate translation. Few difficulties were caused by *ne* in the first sentence ('lest' or 'in order that ... not'), and the passive nature of *caperetur* was often missed. *-ne (visne)* was not often acknowledged, perhaps because no question mark appeared at the end of the sentence. Other common omissions included *ita (ita ut ... abesset)*, *is (is, ubi Manlium vidit)*, *vos (vos Romani ... geretis)*, and *ipse (visne ... tu ipse)*. Candidates are reminded that, as a rule, all Latin words should be represented in their English versions. Furthermore, the verb *vincere* is always translated as 'to win', which means that 'whether he won or was won' is incorrect for *utrum vinceret an vinceretur*.

### Section B Comprehension

It is important that candidates read the questions thoroughly, 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. They are reminded that this is not simply another passage for translation and should therefore not spend time on translating the whole passage before answering the questions. A word-for-word translation of the lemma will not always result in full credit for the question as asked. Candidates need to differentiate between singular and plural (in both this and the translation passage). Verb tenses should also be observed.

In **(a)(i)**, many candidates seemed to struggle with their understanding of *vincere* as 'to win': Antiochus had not been 'won' by the Romans (*a Romanis victo*). *verens* **(ii)** did not seem to be well known, and many candidates simply copied from the introductory English sentence for their response to **(iii)**. **(iv)** was well done by most candidates.

Many mistranslated *intellexit* as 'he was intelligent' in **(b)(i)**, whereas the question asked for an understanding of the phrase *omnium callidissimus*. For **(ii)**, few candidates gave the proper value to the tense of *fore*. The vast majority of candidates followed the instruction in **(iii)** to 'give full details' and thus scored well here.

**(c)** was well done. Here a straightforward translation of the lemma did yield the available marks, which is a good example of the need to observe the number of marks available, and not to expect credit for an understanding of the glossed vocabulary.

Candidates who adhered strictly to the lemma here easily recognised the point of **(d)**, although an understanding of the Latin phrase in question proved difficult for many to express in English. It was important to be clear about who was pretending to trust whom.

For **(e)**, as with **(c)** above, a good translation tended to result in good marks. The difficulty most often encountered in this question was the Latin word order, and some candidates seemed to struggle to produce a coherent explanation of what was happening in the passage.

Most candidates understood that the Gortynians were guarding the temple in **(f)(i)**, but many missed the superlative (*maxima cura*). Few realised for **(f)(ii)** that their reason was to prevent Hannibal from retrieving his pots – or were perhaps content to rely on common sense to guess a likely explanation, often an inaccurate one.

**Question (g)** provides a good example of the difference between a translation and a comprehension exercise: Hannibal went to the temple so that the Gortynians might give his pots back (*redderent*). Equally worthy of credit here would be to respond that Hannibal went to the temple in order to get his pots back from the Gortynians. In **(g)(ii)**, it was clear to most candidates that the Gortynians refused Hannibal's request, but *passi sunt* was seldom understood.

Overall, **(h)** produced good answers, but *servatis* was hardly ever linked to 'serving'.

The derivations **Question (i)** was done well, simulation and custody being the most popular answers. Portable does derive from *portabat*; port does not.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/12  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates are advised to use their examination time effectively and read the questions and Latin carefully before committing to an answer.
- It is important that candidates are familiar with the deponent verbs listed in the Defined Vocabulary List.

## General comments

It is important that candidates adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question.

The majority of candidates followed the instructions and made a good attempt to convert the translation into sensible modern English, producing thoughtful and accurate answers in the comprehension section. It has been noticeable that the use of the translation as an extended vocabulary recognition exercise or 'along the line, word by word' translation has declined.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A Translation**

Overall, vocabulary was well known. Common confusions were not recognising *pugnare* as distinct from *oppugnare*; *forte* was commonly taken as part of *fortis*; the superlative nature of *proxima* was often missed; *suis*, whose basic meaning was known, required candidates to supply a noun ('men', or similar) in their English versions; the value of the compound *pervenerat* was not always recognised; *num* often seemed to be confused with *nam* or *nunc*, and the phrases *bellum geretis* and *impetum fecit* seemed to cause some difficulty as well. Furthermore, candidates should be reminded that *cum* does not always mean 'when', and that *his* does not mean 'his'.

There were also some verb tenses which caused few problems. For instance, *iusserant* and *pervenerat* were not always recognised as pluperfect, or *aderunt* or *agent* as future. Participles such as *progressus* and *oblitus* were often taken as main verbs. The person of *sciamus* was often mistaken ('so that we all might know' is much more accurate than 'so that everyone will know'). Noun cases, too, need to be examined carefully: *hostem* is importantly different from *hostium*, and this difference should be represented in English translations.

Even though *ut* appeared three times in the passage, it only once signified a purpose (or final) clause; where Livy has composed a result (or consecutive) clause, the English 'in order to' is not an appropriate translation. Few difficulties were caused by *ne* in the first sentence ('lest' or 'in order that ... not'), and the passive nature of *caperetur* was often missed. *-ne* (*visne*) was not often acknowledged, perhaps because no question mark appeared at the end of the sentence. Other common omissions included *ita* (*ita ut ... abesset*), *is* (*is, ubi Manlium vidit*), *vos* (*vos Romani ... geretis*), and *ipse* (*visne ... tu ipse*). Candidates are reminded that, as a rule, all Latin words should be represented in their English versions. Furthermore, the verb *vincere* is always translated as 'to win', which means that 'whether he won or was won' is incorrect for *utrum vinceret an vinceretur*.

### Section B Comprehension

It is important that candidates read the questions thoroughly, 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. They are reminded that this is not simply another passage for translation and should therefore not spend time on translating the whole passage before answering the questions. A word-for-word translation of the lemma will not always result in full credit for the question as asked. Candidates need to differentiate between singular and plural (in both this and the translation passage). Verb tenses should also be observed.

In **(a)(i)**, many candidates seemed to struggle with their understanding of *vincere* as 'to win': Antiochus had not been 'won' by the Romans (*a Romanis victo*). *verens* **(ii)** did not seem to be well known, and many candidates simply copied from the introductory English sentence for their response to **(iii)**. **(iv)** was well done by most candidates.

Many mistranslated *intellexit* as 'he was intelligent' in **(b)(i)**, whereas the question asked for an understanding of the phrase *omnium callidissimus*. For **(ii)**, few candidates gave the proper value to the tense of *fore*. The vast majority of candidates followed the instruction in **(iii)** to 'give full details' and thus scored well here.

**(c)** was well done. Here a straightforward translation of the lemma did yield the available marks, which is a good example of the need to observe the number of marks available, and not to expect credit for an understanding of the glossed vocabulary.

Candidates who adhered strictly to the lemma here easily recognised the point of **(d)**, although an understanding of the Latin phrase in question proved difficult for many to express in English. It was important to be clear about who was pretending to trust whom.

For **(e)**, as with **(c)** above, a good translation tended to result in good marks. The difficulty most often encountered in this question was the Latin word order, and some candidates seemed to struggle to produce a coherent explanation of what was happening in the passage.

Most candidates understood that the Gortynians were guarding the temple in **(f)(i)**, but many missed the superlative (*maxima cura*). Few realised for **(f)(ii)** that their reason was to prevent Hannibal from retrieving his pots – or were perhaps content to rely on common sense to guess a likely explanation, often an inaccurate one.

**Question (g)** provides a good example of the difference between a translation and a comprehension exercise: Hannibal went to the temple so that the Gortynians might give his pots back (*redderent*). Equally worthy of credit here would be to respond that Hannibal went to the temple in order to get his pots back from the Gortynians. In **(g)(ii)**, it was clear to most candidates that the Gortynians refused Hannibal's request, but *passi sunt* was seldom understood.

Overall, **(h)** produced good answers, but *servatis* was hardly ever linked to 'serving'.

The derivations **Question (i)** was done well, simulation and custody being the most popular answers. Portable does derive from *portabat*; port does not.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/13  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates are advised to use their examination time effectively and read the questions and Latin carefully before committing to an answer.
- It is important that candidates are familiar with the deponent verbs listed in the Defined Vocabulary List.

## General comments

It is important that candidates adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question.

The majority of candidates followed the instructions and made a good attempt to convert the translation into sensible modern English, producing thoughtful and accurate answers in the comprehension section. It has been noticeable that the use of the translation as an extended vocabulary recognition exercise or 'along the line, word by word' translation has declined.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A Translation**

Overall, vocabulary was well known. Common confusions were not recognising *proximam* as superlative and translating it as 'next'; not recognising *simulac* as distinct from *simul*, or *conspexit* from *vidit*. In Livy, *imperator* is always rendered as 'general', even if 'emperor' is more memorable; *non modo ... sed etiam* was not very well known; *quem* was not always distinguished from *quid*; *superba* was often taken as a part of *superare*; *neminem* was often confused with *nihil*, and *postea* with *postquam*; *illi* was often omitted, and candidates should be reminded that, as a rule, all Latin words need to be represented in their English versions. Also, *socios* are not 'friends' in this context, and in the last sentence, *redire* was often taken as *reddare*.

There were also some verb tenses which caused few problems. While *cepisset* was usually translated correctly, *progredi* was sometimes taken as *progressus est*, in parallel with *constituit*, rather than as that verb's prolative infinitive.

Grammatical constructions were generally well handled, although the conditional nature of Quinctius's first speech, as expressed in the Latin by the present subjunctives *sit ... egrediaris ... dicamus ... audiamus* was often rendered as indicative and the verbs thought to be in the future tense. While most candidates understood Quinctius's second speech, reported by Livy in *oratio obliqua*, few produced a coherent English version. Often the required sense of obligation was replaced by a mere futurity in the rendering of the gerundives at the end of the passage.

### **Section B Comprehension**

It is important that candidates read the questions thoroughly, 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. They are reminded that this is not simply another passage for translation and should therefore not spend time on translating the whole passage before answering the questions. A word-for-word translation of the lemma will not always result in full credit for the question as asked. Candidates need to differentiate between singular and plural (in both this and the translation passage). Verb tenses should also be observed.

**Question (a)(i)** was done well by most candidates. **(a)(ii)** was slightly more challenging as *insignem* was not always known. **(a)(iii)** showed that it is important to know more than one English equivalent for each Latin word on the vocabulary list: according to the envoy, Hannibal was not really 'remaining', but rather 'staying' in Prusias's kingdom. **Question (a)(iv)** proved a differentiator as many candidates seemed to have stopped at the ablative absolute reference to the senator, thus missing the fact that *legatus* was the subject of the main verb *dixit*.

**Question (b)**, as in the case of **(a)(iii)**, required a deeper knowledge of vocabulary than just the first definition given in the vocabulary list: Flaminius did not 'bring this back' (*id ... rettulit*) to the rest of the senators, rather he 'told' them. This usage of the verb is given in the defined vocabulary list for the syllabus.

**(c)(i)** was well done. Here a straightforward translation of the lemma did yield the available marks. **Part (ii)** was also well answered, with nearly all candidates correctly identifying *inimicissimum* and its meaning. The superlative was recognised by most candidates.

**Question (d)** presented few problems as some did not mention whose palace was being discussed. Candidates who had taken note that three marks were available made sure to say that Hannibal was not living in *aula sua*, 'his' (Prusias's) palace, rather than simply 'a' or 'the' palace.

As with all of the higher-tariff questions, such as **(c)(i)** above and **(g)** and **(h)** below, in **Question (e)** a good understanding of the relevant text tended to be well rewarded with the maximum score. An absolutely correct translation is not required in this comprehension exercise.

**Questions (f)(i)** and **(ii)** were done well, with most candidates recognising *dono* as a gift, not a home, and being aware of the necessity to extract and interpret the phrase *in omnibus partibus* from the lemma.

**Question (g)** seemed to be more challenging, although most candidates recognised that soldiers were involved. There were difficulties with *plures ... quam solito*, and the tense of *apparuisse* was often incorrectly understood.

Few candidates achieved full marks in **(h)**. Many candidates seemed to struggle with *circumiret* as it was often taken as 'surround', and *eodem modo* was often missed.

**Questions (i)**, **(j)(i)** and **(ii)** were all done very well by most candidates.

The derivations **Question (k)** was done well with mission, invention and apparition all making regular appearances.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/21  
Literature

## Key messages

- Candidates should attempt all questions and answer them fully.
- Candidates are advised to avoid unnecessary length in their answers.
- In **Question 3**, candidates are encouraged to refer to the whole text, not just the printed passage.

## 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 texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts 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 overall standard was very good, and many candidates showed a considerable level of comprehension in relation to both Virgil and Cicero. Most candidates translated the prescribed texts with accurate fluency and many responded well to the questions. There was a small number of candidates who seemed to struggle to translate the set texts into English, and others, while being able to translate the set texts into English, did not seem to know how to approach either the short questions requiring analysis or the 10-mark questions. There was a very small minority of candidates who did not give any response at all to the questions.

With regard to the general level of response, both the verse and prose selections were well received and candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Excellent examination technique was demonstrated by many candidates and most made an attempt at every question, rather than leaving blanks. Some candidates numbered their questions incorrectly, and although correct answers were credited even with the wrong question number, it is important that candidates use the numbers correctly.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Virgil Aeneid Book 12**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to pick out two aspects, such as throwing spears, fighting on open ground or clashing shields.
- (b) This was answered well by many candidates. The majority were able to scan with greater or lesser accuracy. The most common error was to treat the *i* in *coniectis* as a vowel rather than a consonant.

- (c) Answers commonly identified the personification of the earth for one mark. Some candidates did not explain the effect of the personification, e.g. it is vivid because it depicts the event as so important that even the earth is having a physical reaction. Many answers referred to *fors et virtus miscerentur in unum* gaining one mark, but could have gained full marks by also explaining that this is vivid because it depicts the warriors as equally matched in courage and (at this point) chance of survival, creating suspense/excitement (a few lines later Jupiter weighs their lives to decide who will die).
- (d) Most candidates were able to explain the idea that Turnus and Aeneas were represented by the fierce, strong bulls. Stronger answers explained that the watching herdsman, cattle and cows represent the rest of the armies observing the duel.
- (e) This was generally answered well, with most candidates giving a fluent translation. Common errors were to miss translating *non aliter* or *clipeis*.

### Question 2

- (a) Almost all candidates were able to name Juturna.
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to identify Jupiter as having sent the Dira.
- (c) Answers were generally successful in picking out and quoting features which show distress. To gain full credit, candidates also needed to explain how distress is shown. The vast majority of candidates referred to the rhetorical questions and the most successful answers explained the significance of the questions to her distress or who she is questioning so bluntly. Some candidates picked out and explained the ironic use of *magnanimi*.
- (d) Rhetorical questions were most commonly identified and full credit was given when their effectiveness was explained, too. Omission of the verb in *immortalis ego?* was another popular choice and again, explanation was required for full credit.
- (e) Candidates were able to translate fluently. *tantum effata* and *multa gemens* were sometimes missed out.

### Question 3

Overall, this question was answered well and inspired some well-argued discussion of interest in the depth of emotions in the *Aeneid*. Successful answers gave specific examples of emotions from the set text, saying who felt them and why, and explained why this was interesting. There were many thoughtful ideas expressed in informed personal responses and some clever counter arguments. Few candidates could have been more concise and many concise answers attained full marks. A common mistake was to have a great deal of argument about emotions, but only few specific examples of characters and their feelings.

### Section B: Two Centuries of Roman Prose

#### Question 4

- (a) This question was generally answered well, with a few candidates losing a mark for not translating *praeter*, which is crucial to the sense of the sentence. The first sentence and the part after *ab eo ponticulo* were particularly well rendered by the vast majority of candidates.
- (b) On the whole, candidates answered this question well, with many identifying the repetition of negatives *non* and *neque*. The use of *pulvis* rather than *glarea* was commonly discussed as well as *mutabitur*. Explanation of the effect of the choice of words was required for full credit.
- (c) (i) This question about the efforts made by the neighbours was answered well by most candidates.
  - (ii) Most candidates gained full credit for this question by giving a rendering of both *aggrediar* and *commovebo*.
  - (iii) Most candidates translated *aqua*, although not some did not seem to know what was to be done with it.



### Question 5

- (a) Full marks were gained by referring to both content and style with the most common style point being evaluation of the superlatives. There was much discussion of Cicero's casual racism and his ire at not having had replies to his letters.
- (b) This was usually answered well by using either the content of the two halves of the sentence (*you praise him ... you will judge*), or the grammar (future tense of *iudico*/use of the gerundive).
- (c) Generally, this section was translated fluently. *illud te rogo* was most often missed out.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates seemed to understand Cicero's suggestion and the reason for it.

### Question 6

Many candidates approached this question with insight, dividing the texts into those which they considered great literature and those that they did not. There was much discussion of the rhetoric of *An Orator Defies Death* and the philosophy of *Ethics of a Salesman*, as well as the humour regarding Diphilus (*offendi Diphilum Diphilo tardiorem*) in *Domestic Design*. The most successful responses picked out specific features from the different texts and discussed how 'beautiful' or not they are and whether the candidate considered them 'great literature'.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/22  
Literature

## Key messages

- Candidates should attempt all questions and answer them fully.
- Candidates are advised to avoid unnecessary length in their answers.
- In **Question 3**, candidates are encouraged to refer to the whole text, not just the printed passage.

## 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 texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts 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 overall standard was very good, and many candidates showed a considerable level of comprehension in relation to both Virgil and Cicero. Most candidates translated the prescribed texts with accurate fluency and many responded well to the questions. There was a small number of candidates who seemed to struggle to translate the set texts into English, and others, while being able to translate the set texts into English, did not seem to know how to approach either the short questions requiring analysis or the 10-mark questions. There was a very small minority of candidates who did not give any response at all to the questions.

With regard to the general level of response, both the verse and prose selections were well received and candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Excellent examination technique was demonstrated by many candidates and most made an attempt at every question, rather than leaving blanks. Some candidates numbered their questions incorrectly, and although correct answers were credited even with the wrong question number, it is important that candidates use the numbers correctly.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Virgil Aeneid Book 12**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to pick out two aspects, such as throwing spears, fighting on open ground or clashing shields.
- (b) This was answered well by many candidates. The majority were able to scan with greater or lesser accuracy. The most common error was to treat the *i* in *coniectis* as a vowel rather than a consonant.

- (c) Answers commonly identified the personification of the earth for one mark. Some candidates did not explain the effect of the personification, e.g. it is vivid because it depicts the event as so important that even the earth is having a physical reaction. Many answers referred to *fors et virtus miscerentur in unum* gaining one mark, but could have gained full marks by also explaining that this is vivid because it depicts the warriors as equally matched in courage and (at this point) chance of survival, creating suspense/excitement (a few lines later Jupiter weighs their lives to decide who will die).
- (d) Most candidates were able to explain the idea that Turnus and Aeneas were represented by the fierce, strong bulls. Stronger answers explained that the watching herdsman, cattle and cows represent the rest of the armies observing the duel.
- (e) This was generally answered well, with most candidates giving a fluent translation. Common errors were to miss translating *non aliter* or *clipeis*.

### Question 2

- (a) Almost all candidates were able to name Juturna.
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to identify Jupiter as having sent the Dira.
- (c) Answers were generally successful in picking out and quoting features which show distress. To gain full credit, candidates also needed to explain how distress is shown. The vast majority of candidates referred to the rhetorical questions and the most successful answers explained the significance of the questions to her distress or who she is questioning so bluntly. Some candidates picked out and explained the ironic use of *magnanimi*.
- (d) Rhetorical questions were most commonly identified and full credit was given when their effectiveness was explained, too. Omission of the verb in *immortalis ego?* was another popular choice and again, explanation was required for full credit.
- (e) Candidates were able to translate fluently. *tantum effata* and *multa gemens* were sometimes missed out.

### Question 3

Overall, this question was answered well and inspired some well-argued discussion of interest in the depth of emotions in the *Aeneid*. Successful answers gave specific examples of emotions from the set text, saying who felt them and why, and explained why this was interesting. There were many thoughtful ideas expressed in informed personal responses and some clever counter arguments. Few candidates could have been more concise and many concise answers attained full marks. A common mistake was to have a great deal of argument about emotions, but only few specific examples of characters and their feelings.

### Section B: Two Centuries of Roman Prose

#### Question 4

- (a) This question was generally answered well, with a few candidates losing a mark for not translating *praeter*, which is crucial to the sense of the sentence. The first sentence and the part after *ab eo ponticulo* were particularly well rendered by the vast majority of candidates.
- (b) On the whole, candidates answered this question well, with many identifying the repetition of negatives *non* and *neque*. The use of *pulvis* rather than *glarea* was commonly discussed as well as *mutabitur*. Explanation of the effect of the choice of words was required for full credit.
- (c) (i) This question about the efforts made by the neighbours was answered well by most candidates.
  - (ii) Most candidates gained full credit for this question by giving a rendering of both *aggrediar* and *commovebo*.
  - (iii) Most candidates translated *aqua*, although not some did not seem to know what was to be done with it.

### Question 5

- (a) Full marks were gained by referring to both content and style with the most common style point being evaluation of the superlatives. There was much discussion of Cicero's casual racism and his ire at not having had replies to his letters.
- (b) This was usually answered well by using either the content of the two halves of the sentence (*you praise him ... you will judge*), or the grammar (future tense of *iudico*/use of the gerundive).
- (c) Generally, this section was translated fluently. *illud te rogo* was most often missed out.
- (d) The vast majority of candidates seemed to understand Cicero's suggestion and the reason for it.

### Question 6

Many candidates approached this question with insight, dividing the texts into those which they considered great literature and those that they did not. There was much discussion of the rhetoric of *An Orator Defies Death* and the philosophy of *Ethics of a Salesman*, as well as the humour regarding Diphilus (*offendi Diphilum Diphilo tardiorem*) in *Domestic Design*. The most successful responses picked out specific features from the different texts and discussed how 'beautiful' or not they are and whether the candidate considered them 'great literature'.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/23  
Literature

## Key messages

- Candidates should attempt all questions and answer them fully.
- Candidates are advised to avoid unnecessary length in their answers.
- In **Question 3**, candidates are encouraged to refer to the whole text, not just the printed passage.

## 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 texts, explain meanings and references, translate sections of the texts 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 overall standard was very good, and many candidates showed a considerable level of comprehension in relation to both Virgil and Cicero. Most candidates translated the prescribed texts with accurate fluency and many responded well to the questions. There was a small number of candidates who seemed to struggle to translate the set texts into English, and others, while being able to translate the set texts into English, did not seem to know how to approach either the short questions requiring analysis or the 10-mark questions. There was a very small minority of candidates who did not give any response at all to the questions.

With regard to the general level of response, both the verse and prose selections were well received and candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Excellent examination technique was demonstrated by many candidates and most made an attempt at every question, rather than leaving blanks. Some candidates numbered their questions incorrectly, and although correct answers were credited even with the wrong question number, it is important that candidates use the numbers correctly.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: Virgil Aeneid Book 12**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Overall, this question was answered well with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many good renderings of *simul fugiens ... simul increpat...*
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to make two points and refer to both content and style. Alliteration was a popular choice, which required a quotation and explanation to gain full credit. The hendiadys *vita et sanguine* was also often noted and explained.

- (c) Most candidates were able to state the importance of the olive tree and to give enough detail for four marks.
- (d) Answers commonly identified that the tree had been cut down by the Trojans, either because they wanted to fight on a clear plain or because they had no regard for it being sacred.

### Question 2

- (a) Answers were generally successful and often made reference to the weapon described as *fatale*, and the simile comparing the spear throw to a stone being hurled by a siege engine. *corpore toto* was also discussed. It was necessary to discuss both content and style to attain full marks.
- (b) This was answered well by many candidates.
- (c) Candidates were able to translate fluently. Sometimes *totus* or *alta* was missed.
- (d) The majority of candidates were able to comment confidently on the way Turnus tries to persuade Aeneas. Successful answers often mentioned the references to the fathers and the raised eyes and outstretched hands.

### Question 3

This question was generally answered well and provoked some well-argued responses regarding what makes the Aeneid so enjoyable and whether or not it is the contrast between gods and humans. Successful answers assessed the differences between gods and humans, giving specific examples from/references to the set text and discussed whether these or other aspects of the text create enjoyment. Few candidates needed to be more concise, and many concise answers gained full marks. The most successful answers took specific examples of contrasts to comment upon as well as giving a sound counter argument for enjoyment such as narrative technique, plot etc. Informed personal response was very much in evidence.

## Section B: Two Centuries of Roman Prose

### Question 4

- (a) Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. Some missed translating *de qua mecum locutus es*.
- (b) Almost all candidates commented with assurance on this memorable response from Nicephorus as it is rendered by Cicero. The zeugma (not necessarily using the term) of *addidisse* and *opus* and *pretium* was a very popular choice.
- (c) On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most discussing Cicero being pleased and philosopher simile.
- (d) The question was really well answered by many candidates with some beautiful descriptions of the promenade and the statues doing topiary and 'selling' ivy.

### Question 5

- (a) On the whole, this section was translated fluently with varied renderings of *ex ratione sumptus offensio* and *ille sic dies*.
- (b)(i) This question was usually answered correctly.
- (ii) This question was usually answered correctly.
- (c) Full marks were gained by referring to both content and style with the most common style point being discussion of the superlative. There was also much reference to the comparative *nihil potuit ... dulcius...*
- (d) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the text here, referring to Cicero's suggested interpretation as well as what he saw happen.

### Question 6

Many candidates approached this question thoughtfully, showing very good knowledge of the Cicero set texts and separating the two parts of the question, since there was a general feeling that while being always full of information, Cicero's work was not necessarily always a joy to read. Candidates displayed detailed recall of the information contained in the passages. The most successful responses picked out informative sections of the texts to highlight that aspect of the question and discussed their joy (or lack of it) when reading the passages, supporting each point with reference to a specific detail from one of the texts.