

# LATIN

Paper 0480/12  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with **all** the Latin words and their various English equivalents listed in the Defined Vocabulary List.
- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a gap will never be creditworthy.
- Candidates should not write their answers on the Question Paper.
- Translations must be written on alternate lines.
- Centres should not attempt to bind candidates' work before returning scripts for marking. If single, loose leaves are used, a traditional treasury tag is appropriate and sufficient binding.
- Question Papers should not be returned to Cambridge.

## General comments

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

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

In terms of administration

- a 4-page answer booklet is usually adequate for this paper.
- Candidates' scripts should be returned in the correct numerical order.
- Please do not return question papers with scripts.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Translation**

It should be known that, in general, nouns are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct cases), while there are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + form). Two-word phrases in the ablative absolute construction are thus generally worth 3 marks in total: 1 mark for the vocabulary meaning of each word, with a third mark reserved for the correct 'co-ordination' of the verb (in other words, *clamore facto* will score 2 marks for 'they made a shout', but 3 for 'when they had made a shout' *vel sim*).

Vocabulary was generally well known, with some exceptions: *quaedam* was too often omitted; *proxima* almost never recognised as superlative (merely 'near' is *prope*); *studium* does not, in this context, mean 'study'; very few candidates achieved both available marks for *quam longissime*, the correct translation of which was required to acknowledge the idiomatic *quam* + superlative adverb = 'as ... as possible'. Furthermore, it was necessary to demonstrate that the boy was swimming far away from the shore, not a long way along it. The ablative of comparison (*audacior ceteris*) challenged many; *fortis/forte* were often confused; the comparative *saepius* was correctly translated by only the strongest candidates; *comitum* caused some difficulty; *huc illuc* was not really known; some candidates were unable to make the proper distinction between *hic/illic*; *in* + acc. = 'into/'onto' was missed by a very large number of candidates.

Examiners acknowledge that in contemporary English, we often ‘jump in the car’ etc., but some sense of ‘motion towards’ is always required. In passages for examination, *pueri* are not ‘kids’; *iuvenes* are not ‘guys’.

Verb tenses caused few problems, however, the passive voice was often overlooked. Participles should be represented as such: *facto*, in the ablative absolute phrase *clamore facto*, can be rendered as a main verb, but only with careful co-ordination with *tangebatur*: better to observe a more conventional rendering of the construction. Similarly, in an effort to represent Pliny’s ideas, *siccatus* should not have been translated as ‘[the dolphin] dried him/itself ...’. The tenses of the Latin verbs *vincit ... reliquit* were difficult to render accurately and readably in modern English. The solution was something like: ‘the one who wins is the one who has left ...’. In this case, candidates were rewarded for accuracy over ‘good English’: ‘the one who wins is the one who left’ was deemed better than ‘the one who wins is the one who leaves’. Care must be taken, too, with noun cases: in the short sentence *ei delphinus forte occurrit*, some candidates incorrectly took *delphinus* as accusative.

## Section B

### Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice is that candidates should 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. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal, 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 question or are glossed as vocabulary items.

**Question (a)(i) and (ii)** were generally done well, although it should be noted that *servus* is a slave, not a servant. If a candidate did not gain the mark here, there was no further penalty if the error was repeated in **Question (e)(ii)** below.

Candidates did understand how Gyges had been able to find the horse [**Question (b)**], but few scored the full 4 marks for an explanation of the fact that there had been a landslide.

No credit was given in **Question (c)** for suggesting that the bronze horse was bronze.

**Questions (d) and (e)** were well done, but **(e)(ii)** is a good example of how this comprehension exercise, while not a passage for translation, does demand accuracy: Gyges next ‘went (or proceeded) to a meeting of slaves’; Cicero certainly implies, but he does not say, that Gyges ‘took [the ring] to a meeting of slaves’.

**Questions (f) and (g)** are examples of high-tariff questions where candidates have the opportunity readily to garner the maximum marks available by attempting a translation of the lemma in each case. Most candidates scored highly on these questions, although there was some confusion over who was obstructing whom.

Most candidates knew that next, Gyges married the queen [**Question (h)**], and that nobody saw him do these things. An extra note here: ‘anybody’ and ‘nobody’ are perhaps more distinct from one another in English than in some candidates’ first languages. Examiners credited understanding of the Latin passage, but could not reward the answer ‘anybody could have seen Gyges’.

**Question (j)** is a good example of a question where candidates needed to pay due attention to the number of marks available: an acknowledgement of the force of *celeriter* was often omitted.

**Question (k)** Due to an issue with the spelling of *feceris*, careful consideration was given to its treatment in marking in order to ensure that no candidates were disadvantaged. A mark was not attached to ‘when you did’.

In the closing lines of the passage [**Questions (k), (l) and (m)**], Cicero becomes philosophical, which challenged some candidates. A more careful reading of the question, too, would have given some the help they needed. However, as in **Questions (f) and (g)** above, those candidates who attempted as close a synopsis of the lemma as they could were likely to give most if not all the points required by the mark scheme.

As usual, the derivations **Question (n)** was done well, with descendents, lateral and fabulous all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners; further offerings will not be marked. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

# LATIN

---

Paper 0480/13  
Language

## Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with **all** the Latin words and their various English equivalents listed in the Defined Vocabulary List.
- Candidates should be encouraged to attempt a translation of every word in **Question 1**, and not to leave gaps in their translations: a gap will never be creditworthy.
- Candidates should not write their answers on the Question Paper.
- Translations must be written on alternate lines.
- Centres should not attempt to bind candidates' work before returning scripts for marking. If single, loose leaves are used, a traditional treasury tag is appropriate and sufficient binding.
- Question Papers should not be returned to Cambridge.

## General comments

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

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

In terms of administration

- a 4-page answer booklet is usually adequate for this paper.
- Candidates' scripts should be returned in the correct numerical order.
- Please do not return question papers with scripts.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Translation**

It should be known that, in general, nouns are worth 1 mark each (although these must be seen to be understood in their correct cases), while there are two marks available for most verbs (vocabulary + form). Two-word phrases in the ablative absolute construction are thus generally worth 3 marks in total: 1 mark for the vocabulary meaning of each word, with a third mark reserved for the correct 'co-ordination' of the verb (in other words, *clamore facto* will score 2 marks for 'they made a shout', but 3 for 'when they had made a shout' *vel sim*).

Vocabulary was generally well known, with some exceptions: *quaedam* was too often omitted; *proxima* almost never recognised as superlative (merely 'near' is *prope*); *studium* does not, in this context, mean 'study'; very few candidates achieved both available marks for *quam longissime*, the correct translation of which was required to acknowledge the idiomatic *quam* + superlative adverb = 'as ... as possible'. Furthermore, it was necessary to demonstrate that the boy was swimming far away from the shore, not a long way along it. The ablative of comparison (*audacior ceteris*) challenged many; *fortis/forte* were often confused; the comparative *saepius* was correctly translated by only the strongest candidates; *comitum* caused some difficulty; *huc illuc* was not really known; some candidates were unable to make the proper distinction between *hic/illic*; *in* + acc. = 'into/'onto' was missed by a very large number of candidates.

Examiners acknowledge that in contemporary English, we often ‘jump in the car’ etc., but some sense of ‘motion towards’ is always required. In passages for examination, *pueri* are not ‘kids’; *iuvenes* are not ‘guys’.

Verb tenses caused few problems, however, the passive voice was often overlooked. Participles should be represented as such: *facto*, in the ablative absolute phrase *clamore facto*, can be rendered as a main verb, but only with careful co-ordination with *tangebatur*: better to observe a more conventional rendering of the construction. Similarly, in an effort to represent Pliny’s ideas, *siccatus* should not have been translated as ‘[the dolphin] dried him/itself ...’. The tenses of the Latin verbs *vincit ... reliquit* were difficult to render accurately and readably in modern English. The solution was something like: ‘the one who wins is the one who has left ...’. In this case, candidates were rewarded for accuracy over ‘good English’: ‘the one who wins is the one who left’ was deemed better than ‘the one who wins is the one who leaves’. Care must be taken, too, with noun cases: in the short sentence *ei delphinus forte occurrit*, some candidates incorrectly took *delphinus* as accusative.

## Section B

### Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice is that candidates should 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. It is important that candidates remember that while this is not simply another passage for full translation, and a certain leeway is granted with, for example, verb tenses, participial expression, active/passive reversal, 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 question or are glossed as vocabulary items.

**Question (a)(i) and (ii)** were generally done well, although it should be noted that *servus* is a slave, not a servant. If a candidate did not gain the mark here, there was no further penalty if the error was repeated in **Question (e)(ii)** below.

Candidates did understand how Gyges had been able to find the horse [**Question (b)**], but few scored the full 4 marks for an explanation of the fact that there had been a landslide.

No credit was given in **Question (c)** for suggesting that the bronze horse was bronze.

**Questions (d) and (e)** were well done, but **(e)(ii)** is a good example of how this comprehension exercise, while not a passage for translation, does demand accuracy: Gyges next ‘went (or proceeded) to a meeting of slaves’; Cicero certainly implies, but he does not say, that Gyges ‘took [the ring] to a meeting of slaves’.

**Questions (f) and (g)** are examples of high-tariff questions where candidates have the opportunity readily to garner the maximum marks available by attempting a translation of the lemma in each case. Most candidates scored highly on these questions, although there was some confusion over who was obstructing whom.

Most candidates knew that next, Gyges married the queen [**Question (h)**], and that nobody saw him do these things. An extra note here: ‘anybody’ and ‘nobody’ are perhaps more distinct from one another in English than in some candidates’ first languages. Examiners credited understanding of the Latin passage, but could not reward the answer ‘anybody could have seen Gyges’.

**Question (j)** is a good example of a question where candidates needed to pay due attention to the number of marks available: an acknowledgement of the force of *celeriter* was often omitted.

**Question (k)** Due to an issue with the spelling of *feceris*, careful consideration was given to its treatment in marking in order to ensure that no candidates were disadvantaged. A mark was not attached to ‘when you did’.

In the closing lines of the passage [**Questions (k), (l) and (m)**], Cicero becomes philosophical, which challenged some candidates. A more careful reading of the question, too, would have given some the help they needed. However, as in **Questions (f) and (g)** above, those candidates who attempted as close a synopsis of the lemma as they could were likely to give most if not all the points required by the mark scheme.

As usual, the derivations **Question (n)** was done well, with descendents, lateral and fabulous all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners; further offerings will not be marked. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

# LATIN

---

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

## **Key messages**

- Candidates engaged well with both the verse and prose selections.
- Strong candidates demonstrated the ability to analyse both the style and content of the prescribed texts.
- Most candidates were able to produce a personal response to the literature.

## **General comments**

The examination requires candidates to answer questions on the two prescribed texts: one prose and one verse. The questions allow candidates to demonstrate their comprehension skills, translation skills and appreciation of the literature. It is expected that they demonstrate an understanding of some of the elements of Roman civilization and a consciousness of the motives and attitudes of people of a different time and culture, while contemplating Rome's legacy to the modern world with the purpose of allowing them to foster a deeper understanding of a selection of aesthetic, ethical, linguistic, political, religious and social issues.

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 reasoned personal response to the literature.

The majority of candidates were able to translate the prescribed texts with confident fluency and responded with self assurance to most of the questions. A very small percentage of the candidates were unable to translate the Latin and almost all demonstrated some understanding of the content of the set texts; only a very few were unable to give any response at all to the questions. Performance on scansion was secure with many candidates executing this with aplomb. Examination technique was for the most part very good and it was a minority of candidates who left a number of questions unanswered.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section A: Virgil, Aeneid book 6***

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This question was usually answered correctly, with candidates identifying the Sybil.
- (b) Largely answered well with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *di cuius ... fallere numen*. A common error was to miss out one word (often numen). Candidates should be reminded to check through the Latin carefully and not rely on reproducing memorised translations.
- (c) Most candidates were able to state that the groups were the buried and the unburied.
- (d) On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most stating that the souls roamed or flitted around the shores.

- (e) The majority of candidates were able to give a suitable translation of *miseratus* for **part (i)** with some reference to the meaning of *sortem iniquam* as an answer for **part (ii)**.
- (f) Many 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 repetition of *-que* in line 16 was also noted frequently and its effect explained. Some candidates mistakenly thought that *Lyciae* was another person.

### Question 2

- (a) Although a good deal of candidates gave the correct answer for **part (i)**, a number of candidates did not seem to know who Palinurus was, or mixed him up with Charon. For **part (ii)** quite a few candidates mistakenly thought that he drowned.
- (b) This question did not pose a problem for those who knew who Palinurus was and had learnt the set text carefully; sometimes the part about comfort or remembering the words was missed.
- (c) This question tended to be answered well, with the most popular responses referring to the tomb and the place being named after him.
- (d) Where candidates had the ability to scan, many were let down by thinking that *gau* was two syllables. Some appeared to have no knowledge of how to scan, dividing into the wrong number of feet or using feet which would be impossible in hexameter.
- (e) Candidates were mainly able to translate fluently. Sometimes *ultro* was missed.
- (f) Some candidates thought that the *navita* was Charon's boat; others were confused by *armatus*, thinking it referred to Charon.

### Question 3

Most candidates showed that they had understood the question and gave a personal response although specific knowledge of the set text was lacking in many cases.

Weakest answers gave a vague response to the question with little or no engagement with specific details from the text. Some candidates argued that Virgil's style was the thing which made the text gripping, but did not include specific examples from Virgil and resorted to general discussion of alliteration, anaphora and use of adjectives. Many argued that other characters were equally gripping, but gave no evidence/details about these characters to back up this assertion. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a specific detail from the text studied.

### Question 4

- (a) This question required candidates to show understanding of the set text rather than just translating the words written there, and was not answered well as many candidates thought this referred to a revolution/civil war which had already taken place rather than the plans of the conspirators which were never carried out. This was also reflected in a general confusion about the time scales involved elsewhere – some candidates thought Cicero had already executed citizens at the point this speech was given, or that he was trying to drive Catiline out of the city.
- (b) Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. Some missed translating *sentient* which was needed for full marks.
- (c) The rhetorical question was a popular choice of answer. Candidates followed the instruction to quote the Latin in their answers.
- (d) For **part (i)** candidates, for the most part, correctly identified *severitatem* and for **(ii)** and **(iii)** were able to state that Cicero wanted them to leave and join Cataline and would show them the way, although some mistakenly thought that he was trying to drive Catiline out of the city. Candidates should remember to look at the whole lemma and the number of marks available in answering this type of question: for **part (ii)** they had to give both 'leave' and 'join Cataline'.



### Question 5

- (a) Candidates had little difficulty with this question and there was a wealth of interesting translations of *municipiorum*.
- (b) Lots of candidates knew this was about troops and equipment, but few brought out the contrasts – many/few; Rome/that bandit. Indeed, some thought bandit was plural and referred to the soldiers in Catiline's army.
- (c) Full marks were gained by making two points with a relevant quotation for each. The most popular answer was discussion of the list of things the Republic has that Catiline lacks. There was also much reference to the inclusive language quoting *nos* and the first person verbs.
- (d) On the whole the section was translated fluently with varied choices in where to put the translation of *monitos etiam atque etiam volo* in the English. Some missed *etiam atque etiam*.
- (e) Some answers revealed a lack of understanding of what Cicero was actually trying to do. They thought he was warning them to leave and therefore that he was trying to rid the city of Catiline's supporters or reveal who they were rather than warn them off being involved at all. Not all candidates had grasped the importance of Roman citizenship.

### Question 6

There were some lively answers to this question; the most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was insulting Catiline and how he was doing it, using specific references to the speech and then discussed other things Cicero was doing, in addition to insulting Catiline, also giving specific examples from the speech. Some candidates struggled with the counterargument and suggested that the other thing Cicero does is use rhetorical devices, rather than thinking about what else he might be doing from a content perspective.

# LATIN

---

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

## **Key messages**

- Candidates engaged well with both the verse and prose selections.
- Strong candidates demonstrated the ability to analyse both the style and content of the prescribed texts.
- Most candidates were able to produce a personal response to the literature.

## **General comments**

The examination requires candidates to answer questions on the two prescribed texts: one prose and one verse. The questions allow candidates to demonstrate their comprehension skills, translation skills and appreciation of the literature. It is expected that they demonstrate an understanding of some of the elements of Roman civilization and a consciousness of the motives and attitudes of people of a different time and culture, while contemplating Rome's legacy to the modern world with the purpose of allowing them to foster a deeper understanding of a selection of aesthetic, ethical, linguistic, political, religious and social issues.

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 reasoned personal response to the literature.

The majority of candidates were able to translate the prescribed texts with confident fluency and responded with self assurance to most of the questions. A very small percentage of the candidates were unable to translate the Latin and almost all demonstrated some understanding of the content of the set texts; only a very few were unable to give any response at all to the questions. Performance on scansion was secure with many candidates executing this with aplomb. Examination technique was for the most part very good and it was a minority of candidates who left a number of questions unanswered.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### ***Section A: Virgil, Aeneid book 6***

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This question was usually answered correctly, with candidates identifying the Sybil.
- (b) Largely answered well with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *di cuius ... fallere numen*. A common error was to miss out one word (often numen). Candidates should be reminded to check through the Latin carefully and not rely on reproducing memorised translations.
- (c) Most candidates were able to state that the groups were the buried and the unburied.
- (d) On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most stating that the souls roamed or flitted around the shores.

- (e) The majority of candidates were able to give a suitable translation of *miseratus* for **part (i)** with some reference to the meaning of *sortem iniquam* as an answer for **part (ii)**.
- (f) Many 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 repetition of *-que* in line 16 was also noted frequently and its effect explained. Some candidates mistakenly thought that *Lyciae* was another person.

### Question 2

- (a) Although a good deal of candidates gave the correct answer for **part (i)**, a number of candidates did not seem to know who Palinurus was, or mixed him up with Charon. For **part (ii)** quite a few candidates mistakenly thought that he drowned.
- (b) This question did not pose a problem for those who knew who Palinurus was and had learnt the set text carefully; sometimes the part about comfort or remembering the words was missed.
- (c) This question tended to be answered well, with the most popular responses referring to the tomb and the place being named after him.
- (d) Where candidates had the ability to scan, many were let down by thinking that *gau* was two syllables. Some appeared to have no knowledge of how to scan, dividing into the wrong number of feet or using feet which would be impossible in hexameter.
- (e) Candidates were mainly able to translate fluently. Sometimes *ultro* was missed.
- (f) Some candidates thought that the *navita* was Charon's boat; others were confused by *armatus*, thinking it referred to Charon.

### Question 3

Most candidates showed that they had understood the question and gave a personal response although specific knowledge of the set text was lacking in many cases.

Weakest answers gave a vague response to the question with little or no engagement with specific details from the text. Some candidates argued that Virgil's style was the thing which made the text gripping, but did not include specific examples from Virgil and resorted to general discussion of alliteration, anaphora and use of adjectives. Many argued that other characters were equally gripping, but gave no evidence/details about these characters to back up this assertion. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a specific detail from the text studied.

### Question 4

- (a) This question required candidates to show understanding of the set text rather than just translating the words written there, and was not answered well as many candidates thought this referred to a revolution/civil war which had already taken place rather than the plans of the conspirators which were never carried out. This was also reflected in a general confusion about the time scales involved elsewhere – some candidates thought Cicero had already executed citizens at the point this speech was given, or that he was trying to drive Catiline out of the city.
- (b) Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. Some missed translating *sentient* which was needed for full marks.
- (c) The rhetorical question was a popular choice of answer. Candidates followed the instruction to quote the Latin in their answers.
- (d) For **part (i)** candidates, for the most part, correctly identified *severitatem* and for **(ii)** and **(iii)** were able to state that Cicero wanted them to leave and join Cataline and would show them the way, although some mistakenly thought that he was trying to drive Catiline out of the city. Candidates should remember to look at the whole lemma and the number of marks available in answering this type of question: for **part (ii)** they had to give both 'leave' and 'join Cataline'.

### Question 5

- (a) Candidates had little difficulty with this question and there was a wealth of interesting translations of *municipiorum*.
- (b) Lots of candidates knew this was about troops and equipment, but few brought out the contrasts – many/few; Rome/that bandit. Indeed, some thought bandit was plural and referred to the soldiers in Catiline's army.
- (c) Full marks were gained by making two points with a relevant quotation for each. The most popular answer was discussion of the list of things the Republic has that Catiline lacks. There was also much reference to the inclusive language quoting *nos* and the first person verbs.
- (d) On the whole the section was translated fluently with varied choices in where to put the translation of *monitos etiam atque etiam volo* in the English. Some missed *etiam atque etiam*.
- (e) Some answers revealed a lack of understanding of what Cicero was actually trying to do. They thought he was warning them to leave and therefore that he was trying to rid the city of Catiline's supporters or reveal who they were rather than warn them off being involved at all. Not all candidates had grasped the importance of Roman citizenship.

### Question 6

There were some lively answers to this question; the most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was insulting Catiline and how he was doing it, using specific references to the speech and then discussed other things Cicero was doing, in addition to insulting Catiline, also giving specific examples from the speech. Some candidates struggled with the counterargument and suggested that the other thing Cicero does is use rhetorical devices, rather than thinking about what else he might be doing from a content perspective.