

# LATIN

---

**Paper 9788/01**  
**Verse Literature**

## **Key messages**

This paper was extremely well done, for the most part. Not only did the candidates know their set text well – hence offered very accurate translations – they were also able to write sophisticated interpretive commentaries and essays.

Most centres chose the Virgil rather than the Ovid option. Only a few candidates chose the paired text over the unseen literary criticism option.

## **General comments**

Please see above.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

This translation question was done to a very high standard: candidates clearly knew their set text well.

### **Question 2**

- (a) Answers were for the most part good. Particularly impressive were the comments made about the contrasting descriptions of Hector, and how these contribute to the pathos of the passage. Candidates were able to choose relevant detail from the passage (e.g. the contrast between lines 8 and 10). The vocabulary of weeping was also commented on, as was the use of superlatives early in the passage.
- (b) Again, this was well answered. Candidates wrote well about how Aeneas' address to Hector consists entirely of questions, none of which Hector answers (line 20: *ille nihil*). The contrast between Aeneas' speech and the brevity and urgency of Hector's was well observed. Hector's use of imperatives was correctly commented on. More perhaps could have been made of the sad grandeur of the last couplet.

### **Question 3**

- (a) This question was well answered. Candidates were right to observe that the focus of most of this section is on Anchises' speech, where he outlines his reasons for refusing to leave Troy. Some candidates noted the pathos of Anchises' justification for staying. Some attention was rightly given to the response to Anchises' speech, and how Virgil describes the reaction both specifically (Creusa and Ascanius), as well as more generally (the whole household). More could have been made of the powerful present tenses in line 17.
- (b) This was, again, well answered. Particularly good was the candidates' attention to the despair and desperation of Aeneas' response. While Aeneas' promise to die in Troy along with his father was observed and commented on, more could have been made of Aeneas' inconsistency. He has already received Hector's visitation; he knows that he must leave Troy, and yet . . .

#### Question 4

Candidates clearly knew their set text well. Their translations were very accurate.

#### Question 5

- (a) This was well answered, with candidates showing attention to the detail and language of the passage. In particular, candidates did well to observe and comment on how the description of the monstrous animal elevates Meleager's achievement. Candidates also observed how the passage is dominated by splendour, joy, and wonder.
- (b) Candidates were able to argue that the lines convey the drama of the situation by a varied mode of description: the response of the crowd, the cinematic zooming into Thestius' two sons, the use of direct speech. Then, of course, there is Meleager's deadly response. This was well commented on by candidates.

#### Question 6

- (a) This was particularly well handled. Candidates offered detailed commentary on the description of Erysichthon's ravenous, gargantuan appetite. Also well observed were Ovid's use of hyperbole and extravagant adjectives. Some candidates argued that there was a comic quality in the lines or, at least, an instability of tone. More might have been made of the pathos of lines 19–20.
- (b) Again, this was very well answered, with candidates noting that the main cause of the pathos is the final relationship between the father and the daughter, the only thing not yet consumed. Also commented on was the way the appeal is made to Neptune, and his response to it.

#### Question 7

This was not the most favoured of the Virgil options. Nevertheless, those candidates who chose the option were able to demonstrate a detailed knowledge of the text; they also structured their answers in a rational and sometimes compelling way. There was some tendency for some answers to become something of a list; others, however, were rightly keen to distinguish between the various characters, both in terms of how important they are to Book 2, and how Virgil variously characterises them.

#### Question 8

Most candidates chose this question, drawn perhaps by what seemed the obvious invitation to write an essay with an 'on the one hand . . . but on the other hand' structure. This approach served most candidates well. The 'helplessness' of the Trojans was correctly seen in a variety of ways, e.g. in the surprise of the attack, and in the loss of divine support. The 'dignity' of the Trojans produced a wider variety of answers, with some arguing that the various attempts by the Trojans to fight back demonstrated dignity, while others thought that Trojans dressing up in Greek armour did the opposite. Nearly all candidates showed an excellent knowledge of the text.

#### Question 9

Most answers were good but more could have been made of family relationships, relationships between humans and animals, the importance of Crete, and the contrast between food as depicted in the Philemon and Baucis episode and as described in the depiction of Erysichthon's extraordinary appetite.

#### Question 10

Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the texts and were therefore able to write well about Daedalus and Icarus, Althaea and Meleager, Philemon and Baucis, and so on. Candidates were alert to the varieties of tone deployed by Ovid.

### Question 11

Candidates now tackle this exercise with considerably more care, and sometimes flair, than was the case in previous years. With the odd exception, little time was wasted on specious claims about sound effects. Questionable assertions about the importance of the position of words were, however, more common. Candidates should remember that one word must start a line, and another must end it: argument is therefore needed to make something of the position of words in this sense. That said, there were some very good answers about how Horace forcefully contrasts his poetic achievement with more obviously physical phenomena. The comparative adjectives in lines 1–2 were well observed. Candidates also wrote well about the future tenses in lines 6 and 10, and about the poet's humble origins and awareness of Greek models. There was a variety of opinion as to whether Horace was being arrogant or ironically self-deprecating.

### Question 12

Answers were well organised and demonstrated good knowledge of both *Aeneid* 2 and *Aeneid* 10. Significant comparisons and contrasts between the violence depicted in the two books were well observed and commented on (e.g. in Book 2, we witness the destruction of a city; in Book 10, we see the defence of a settlement). Some candidates were keen to argue that Book 10 is, in some way, more obviously Homeric.

### Question 13

Candidates could have made more of the various inconsistencies in the characterisation of Aeneas, and the questions that follow from that inconsistency. That said, his vulnerability and desperation in Book 2 were well observed, as was his warrior status in Book 10.

### Question 14

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

### Question 15

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

# LATIN

---

Paper 9788/02  
Prose Literature

## Key messages

To do well in **Section A**, candidates need to show that they understand the Latin by supporting their points with apt details from the given text.

To do well in **Section B**, candidates need both to make wide reference to the text, and to develop their argument through analysis of detail.

## General comments

The quality of answers was in general very high, with candidates showing excellent knowledge of the Latin and answering the questions asked. The best answers were able to quote from the Latin to questions in **Section B** as well as in **Section A**. For **Questions 4–6** and **10–12**, there were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

Candidates performed very well in answering this question, with many gaining full or very high marks. Many translations were nuanced as well as accurate. There were few problems, but those that were included: the past tense of *fuisse*; the inclusion of *olim*; the syntax of *nisi qui... defenderet*; the use of *cum... tum*; and, the past tense of *poterat*.

#### **Question 2**

- (a) Candidates wrote well about the ways in which Cicero now switches to a direct address and establishes an aggressive tone. All candidates made apt reference to Cicero's use of parallel clauses in anaphora, and the best answers made sophisticated reference to the choice of words, for instance in *quae insimulas, quae moliris*. Many candidates showed understanding of the importance of *nihil se te invita dicere*, and of the insult in *mente nescio qua effrenata*. The shift in tone in *aut diluas oportet* was correctly identified in most answers.
- (b) Candidates showed excellent knowledge of the text in their answers. Most answers discussed a variety of ways in which Cicero entertains us, including: his mock hesitance on *nescio quam*; the use of insinuation; and, the reduction of Clodia's case against Caelius to a lover's quarrel. The best answers included reference to the inclusion of direct quotation and tropes from New Comedy, and the fact that Cicero entertains the jury here in lieu of a day at the Ludi Megalenses.

#### **Question 3**

- (a) There was a tendency for candidates to summarise or narrate Cicero's argument rather than to evaluate its power in their answers. Important points that were missed included: the humour of *plerique autem iratos putabunt*; the hyperbole of the extended metaphor of the abandoned road to virtue; and, the climactic force of the repeated *ne* clauses. However, candidates showed good understanding of Cicero's main point that licence should be granted to youth, provided that no-one is injured. All candidates provided apt and accurate reference to the Latin.

- (b) Candidates in general showed good knowledge of and engagement with a difficult passage in their answers. To do well, they needed to discuss the fact that Cicero refuses to name those who he has in mind, but that their identities would have been obvious to the court; there is much potential for insinuation in the hyperbole of the final sentence.

### **Section B**

#### **Question 7**

Candidates showed excellent attention to detail in their discussion of the given passage as well as making wide reference to the rest of the text. They need to be careful to answer the question asked: there was a tendency to discuss Cicero's attack on Clodia in more detail than was relevant to the issue of his characterisation of Caelius.

#### **Question 8**

There were some excellent answers to this question, with most candidates arguing that Cicero persuades us that he is a rational and fair judge of character, that Caelius is a promising young man, and that Clodia has some questions to answer. Furthermore, by providing the jury with the entertainment that they are missing, he wins them over. Marks in general for Assessment Objective 3 were high. Candidates can improve their answers by including both more detail and more range.

#### **Question 9**

There were some very good answers with some impressive use of secondary literature. Many candidates wrote particularly well about the misogyny at the heart of the speech. The best answers provided a sophisticated discussion of the way in which Cicero shows us a Rome that is shifting and unreliable in terms of her class system, moral compass, and politics.

# LATIN

---

Paper 9788/03  
Unseen Translation

## Key messages

- It is important that candidates have a good understanding of morphology and syntax, as well as knowledge of a wide range of vocabulary.
- For **Question 1**, candidates are required to translate the Latin into natural English in order to score the highest marks.
- For **Question 2**, appreciation of poetic word order and forms are also required.

## General comments

The standard of responses was generally very high and many candidates translated very accurately. Vocabulary seemed to cause more difficulties than syntax and at times, candidates could have improved their translation by writing more natural English, especially when translating the prose unseen for which up to 5 marks are awarded for 'style and fluency'.

It is important that responses are presented clearly, and candidates are advised to think about their translation carefully before writing it down.

## Comments on specific questions

### Question 1

Most candidates did well on this philosophical piece and successfully followed Cicero's argument with the help of the title. Candidates are reminded that a prose unseen passage can be on any topic including military, political or philosophical.

**atque...scientiam:** most candidates found the opening sentence straightforward. '*ne...quidem*' (not even) was often mistranslated as 'not indeed'.

**quae...habitus?:** most candidates did well on the conditional clause and identified the correct tenses. A number of candidates thought '*habitus*' is a part of '*habito*'. For '*quos eventus*' the plural idea should be retained, e.g. 'what outcomes'.

**abeamus...scire:** the jussive subjunctives '*abeamus*' and '*videamus*' were generally recognised. Weaker responses translated '*propiora*' too loosely, while stronger answers referred to 'more recent (historical) events'. '*tum...cum*' needed to be taken in combination, e.g. 'at the time when...'.

**sibi interfecto...pereundum:** while the sense of obligation expressed by the gerundive was recognised by most candidates, many thought '*pereo*' meant 'I go through' rather than 'I die'. Candidates used a number of appropriate translations for the virtual synonyms '*ignominia*' and '*dedecore*'. The ablative absolutes '*interfecto filio exercituque deleto*' offered opportunities to candidates to rework into, for example, a 'when' clause in English for which style credit was given.

**an Pompeium...fuisse:** this was translated well by candidates who knew the vocabulary. Several did not recognise '*tribus*' as the ablative of '*tres*' and mistranslated the political words '*consulatibus*' ('consulships') and '*triumphis*' ('triumphs' as opposed to 'victories'). '*laetatum fuisse*' = 'would have rejoiced'.

**si sciret...dicere:** *'in solitudine Aegyptiorum'* ('in the desert of Egypt') proved a challenging phrase and several confused *'amisso'* with *'emisso'*.

**quid vero Caesarem putamus...cooptasset:** the last section seemed to be the most challenging with many candidates assuming that *'Caesarem'* is the start of an accusative + infinitive construction in parallel with the previous sections about Crassus and Pompey. A translation such as 'what indeed do we think of Caesar' avoided the problems which many candidates seemed to find in translating the final phrase of the passage. *'fore'* was omitted by several candidates and many did not know *'maior pars'* ('the majority'). *'cooptasset'*: candidates needed to recognise this syncopated form of the pluperfect subjunctive and needed to work out from the English 'coopt' that it means 'had chosen/elected'.

**tot..iaceret:** *'civibus...partim etiam a se omnibus rebus ornatis'*: a number of candidates did not realise that *'ornatis'* is agreeing with *'civibus'*, not part of an ablative absolute with *'omnibus rebus'* and consequently did not recognise that Caesar was assassinated even by some whose careers he had promoted and provided for; thus *'partim'* needed to be treated as *'alii'*.

**ut...fuisse:** some candidates did not recognise that the *'ut'* here is introducing a result clause after the preceding *'ita'*: 'in such a way that...'. The negatives seemed to cause some problems, too, and candidates needed to think carefully about the context to achieve the correct sense: 'not only did not one of his friends approach, but not even one of his slaves...'. *'quo cruciatu animi'*: e.g. 'in what mental torture'. The strongest translations broke up the long final sentence into shorter sections, achieving style credit.

## Question 2

With sense breaks at the end of each couplet, even where candidates seemed to have lost sense of an individual couplet, they usually managed to get back on track. The passage contained a large number of negatives and it was important for candidates to ascribe the negative idea to the correct words by taking close note of the word order and the sense. A number of vocabulary items were not known, and words most commonly causing problems will be indicated below.

(a) **quam bene ... vias:** this couplet was generally translated well. The word *'via'* occurs a few times in this passage, each time with a different shade of meaning. Here it was best translated as 'journeys' rather than 'roads'. Vocabulary difficulties included *'tellus'* ('land') and *'patefacta est'* ('was opened up').

**nondum ... sinum:** several candidates did not seem to know *'contempserat'* (from *contemno* = I scorn) and the phrase *'effusum ventis'* ('spread to the winds') caused difficulties for those who treated *'ventis'* as ablative.

**illo ... equus:** the separation of *'illo...tempore'* caused some candidates difficulties and several did not know *'iuga'* ('yokes'), therefore mistranslated *'subiit'*. The 'non' needed to be taken with *'momordit'*, not *'domito'*.

**non domus ... lapis:** vocabulary difficulties included *'fores'* ('doors') and *'lapis'* (stone): the potential of a boundary stone being used to mark out people's territory was missed by many.

**non acies ... faber:** there were few problems here apart from the adjective *'immitis'* ('harsh', 'pitiless'), which also occurs in line 17.

**nunc love ... viae:** candidates needed to supply a part of *'sum'* here, which most did without difficulty; *'leti'* (genitive of *letum* = death) was not known by several candidates.

**parce ... deos:** these proved to be the most challenging lines in the passage, where Tibullus prays to the gods to be merciful and claims to be unafraid of divine retribution for perjury or impiety.

**quodsi ... notis:** the idiom *'fac + subjunctive'* ('see to it that...') was not recognised by many; *'fatales'* needed to be translated as 'fated' rather than 'fatal' and *'explevimus'* translated as a true perfect; many candidates needed to recognise that *'lapis'* is nominative singular.

**hic iacet ... mari:** candidates understood that Tibullus is writing his own epitaph here; the misplaced *'-que'* linking *'terra'* and *'mari'* ('by land and sea') caused some problem.

- (b) Scansion was usually accurate. Many candidates scored 5/5 for this question. The most common errors involved the scansion of the quadrasyllabic '*periuria*' and missing the elision '*dict(a) in*'. The main caesura in the hexameter could be marked in the second (preferable here) or third foot. A few candidates did not appear to know the rules for scanning a pentameter.



# LATIN

---

<p><b>Paper 9788/04</b> <b>Prose Composition or Comprehension</b></p>
---

## Key messages

Most candidates attempted the prose composition. The passages offered by the candidates were very impressive. Not only was the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary very good, the understanding of Latin idiom was often excellent.

The comprehension was less well done (please see specific remarks below).

## General comments

Please see above.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

The standard was very high, with few mistakes, and with many candidates demonstrating a very good understanding of grammar, vocabulary and idiom.

### **First sentence**

'**At this sight**' was often translated with an ablative absolute, but the phrase 'all military action' caused some problems. One good way adopted by a number of candidates was either to use *militia* or *res* in some way. 'Ceased' caused problems.

### **Second sentence**

Some very good Latin was written here, with 'enthusiasm for fighting' often well translated by *stadium* + gerund; some candidates circumnavigated 'laying aside their enthusiasm' by using *non iam cupidi* + gerund. The rest of the sentence was, for the most part accurately translated.

### **Third sentence**

The translation here was mainly accurate. 'Officers' was not always accurately translated, but the indirect command generally was.

### **Fourth sentence**

There was some confusion in this sentence about what parts of it were in indirect speech. This led to some strange grammatical translations. The simplest way to take the sentence was to make both 'they realised' and 'they did not intend' as main verbs.

### **Fifth sentence**

This sentence caused the most trouble of all in the passage. Strictly speaking, the syntax demands that the conditional clause within indirect speech should have its verb in the pluperfect subjunctive (though an imperfect was accepted). The conventions governing how to translate verbs of prevention were not well known, a number of candidates tried to translate 'could not prevent the soldiers from breaking into the town'

without much success. There are some quite simple ways of rendering this, but few chose the simple option. Finally, 'in search of plunder' really needed a translation that gave this simple clause a purposive dimension.

### **Sixth sentence**

This was generally very well handled, though 'more of the same kind' caused problems.

### **Seventh sentence**

While this was generally well translated, there was some uncertainty over the syntax of 'as if . . . '.

### **Section B**

A small number of candidates attempted the comprehension and it would be difficult to draw many general observations.

However, it can be said that, in order to achieve full marks on each comprehension question, accurate and thorough answers need to be given.

Marks awarded for this exercise did not match those in the Prose Composition.

- (a) Mainly well answered.
- (b) Some candidates missed that the Athenians had missed Cimon for a long time.
- (c) Mainly well answered.
- (d) A question with many marks. Most candidates did not quite understand that Cimon never set a guard on his property in order to protect his produce.
- (e) Well done.
- (f) Often not all the details required were presented.
- (g) 'Less well dressed' was not always noted.
- (h) 2 of the 3 points were usually accurately made, but some candidates missed that Cimon was inviting the 'previously uninvited'.
- (i) This question was not always well done, even though it is in truth a question about knowledge of vocabulary.
- (j) Answers here could be impressionistic, and not precise enough.
- (k) Most understood the first two points but not that his death was bitterly felt.
- (l) There was much confusion here about the syntax.
- (m) The case usages were not always well understood.
- (n) Some confusion here about infinitive forms.
- (o) Candidates were not always clear about the difference between adjectives and adverbs.
- (p) While candidates were able to spot gerunds and gerundives, they were not always able to explain how those gerunds and gerundives were being used,