LATIN

Paper 0480/12
Language 12

Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List: the various English equivalents should also be known and understood. Credit will generally be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. *de* (+ abl.) sometimes 'concerning', not always 'down from' (or vice versa).
- 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 be advised to read questions carefully before offering a response.
- Candidates should not write their answers on the Question Paper.
- Where centres are obliged for any reason to provide their own answer paper or booklets, please ensure that this is lined paper; furthermore, candidates should rule a margin on the left-hand-side before they begin to record their answers; 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.

General comments

Candidates must adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, 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 return candidates' scripts only: no question papers, please.

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). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently in the mark scheme, for example this year *haberet* was worth a total of 3 marks, 1 each for vocabulary (have = 1), tense (had = 2), and an appropriate rendering of the mood (could have *vel sim* = 3).

Vocabulary was generally well known, with some exceptions:

- *quidem* was too often confused with *quidam*
- the superlative nature of *maximum* and, later, *plurimae* were, as always, very often missed
- *nonnulli* should not be taken as *nulli*

- the gerundive of obligation (*abrogandam*) was well done
- *gereret* provides a good example of the point raised above: any form of 'wage' is not correct here
- *causa* (+ gen.), 'for the sake of' was well known
- *domi* tested English idiom: 'at home' was required
- *ut* does not always introduce a purpose clause. *ut … paterentur* here is an indirect command.
- *paterentur* was often omitted, or not known as a deponent verb: many versions said that women (or men) 'were suffered', rather than 'they should allow' *vel sim*
- *rure* as taken as *ruri* on very many occasions
- *conveniebant* means more than 'they came'
- *simulatque* was not as often distinguished from *simul* as it should have been.

Verb tenses caused few problems, although candidates could be imprecise: active and passive voices were not always acknowledged, especially *facta sit* and *fiebat*. The tenses of the Latin verbs *vicerint … coeperint* were difficult to render accurately and readably in modern English. The solution was something like: 'If women win today … As soon as they begin …' In this case, candidates were rewarded equally for either accuracy or 'good English': 'If women will have won … As soon as they will begin …' were both awarded full credit.

Care must be taken, too, with noun forms: too many candidates unnecessarily lost marks in the phrases *nec imperio virorum contineri domi poterant* (*imperio* is ablative); and *sacrorum publicorum causa* (*sacrorum publicorum* is plural).

Section B

Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, 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 etc., 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 questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items.

Question 2(a) was generally done well. In a comprehension test, it is perfectly acceptable to say either 'that the gates and walls were to be guarded' or that 'Caesar's men were to guard the gates and walls'. Harbours, however, were not involved.

Questions 2(b)(i) and **(ii)** are good examples of cases in which candidates could have read the questions (and studied the marks available) more carefully. Most candidates seemed to understand most of the Latin, but their responses to the specific questions lacked detail.

Question 2(c) was done well, although *quorundam* confounded many. Examiners rewarded any attempted reference to 'certain' or 'particular' men; neither 'some' nor 'any' were deemed correct.

In far too many cases, **Question 2(d)(ii)**, 'Where was (Lentulus) at the time?' generated the incorrect response 'In the middle of the night'. Even for candidates that had read the question closely, the response nevertheless required slightly more than merely the recall of vocabulary: since Lentulus spoke *de muro*, 'down from' (not 'concerning') the wall, he must therefore have been on (top of) it.

There was no credit in **Question 2(f)(ii)** for suggesting that Lentulus attempted to persuade Caesar to spare him through 'friendship' (*amicitiam* was, after all, glossed). Lentulus hoped that Caesar would 'have in mind', 'remember' etc. (1) their 'old', 'past' etc. (1) friendship. In this comprehension test, the candidates who said that 'Lentulus appealed to their former friendship' displayed excellent understanding.

Candidates needed to pay closer attention to the Latin in **Question 2(h)**: Caesar spoke little (however expressed); he did not, at least in this passage, address 'a few of them'.

In **Question 2(i)(i)**, *ille* refers to Lentulus, who had brought (*attulerat*; not stolen, which would have been *abstulerat*) the money to Corfinium before depositing it there. In **Question 2(j)(i)**, Caesar ordered Lentulus's men to swear an oath of loyalty to him, Caesar, not to themselves.

As usual, the derivations, **Question 2(k)**, were done well, with mural, prohibition and veteran all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

LATIN

> **Paper 0480/13**
> **Language**

Key messages

- Candidates should be familiar with the Defined Vocabulary List: the various English equivalents should also be known and understood. Credit will generally be given for accurate and appropriate translation, e.g. *de* (+ abl.) sometimes 'concerning', not always 'down from' (or vice versa).
- 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 be advised to read questions carefully before offering a response.
- Candidates should not write their answers on the Question Paper.
- Where centres are obliged for any reason to provide their own answer paper or booklets, please ensure that this is lined paper; furthermore, candidates should rule a margin on the left-hand-side before they begin to record their answers; 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.

General comments

Candidates must adhere to the rubric for each question and sub-question. The translation must be written on alternate lines of lined pages, with margin, 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 return candidates' scripts only: no question papers, please.

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). Certain more advanced constructions may be treated slightly differently in the mark scheme, for example this year *haberet* was worth a total of 3 marks, 1 each for vocabulary (have = 1), tense (had = 2), and an appropriate rendering of the mood (could have *vel sim* = 3).

Vocabulary was generally well known, with some exceptions:

- *quidem* was too often confused with *quidam*
- the superlative nature of *maximum* and, later, *plurimae* were, as always, very often missed
- *nonnulli* should not be taken as *nulli*

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

© 2023

- the gerundive of obligation (*abrogandam*) was well done
- *gereret* provides a good example of the point raised above: any form of 'wage' is not correct here
- *causa* (+ gen.), 'for the sake of' was well known
- *domi* tested English idiom: 'at home' was required
- *ut* does not always introduce a purpose clause. *ut … paterentur* here is an indirect command.
- *paterentur* was often omitted, or not known as a deponent verb: many versions said that women (or men) 'were suffered', rather than 'they should allow' *vel sim*
- *rure* as taken as *ruri* on very many occasions
- *conveniebant* means more than 'they came'
- *simulatque* was not as often distinguished from *simul* as it should have been.

Verb tenses caused few problems, although candidates could be imprecise: active and passive voices were not always acknowledged, especially *facta sit* and *fiebat*. The tenses of the Latin verbs *vicerint … coeperint* were difficult to render accurately and readably in modern English. The solution was something like: 'If women win today … As soon as they begin …' In this case, candidates were rewarded equally for either accuracy or 'good English': 'If women will have won … As soon as they will begin …' were both awarded full credit.

Care must be taken, too, with noun forms: too many candidates unnecessarily lost marks in the phrases *nec imperio virorum contineri domi poterant* (*imperio* is ablative); and *sacrorum publicorum causa* (*sacrorum publicorum* is plural).

Section B

Comprehension

As in previous years, the most important advice to candidates is that they should read the questions carefully, 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 etc., 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 questions themselves or are glossed as vocabulary items.

Question 2(a) was generally done well. In a comprehension test, it is perfectly acceptable to say either 'that the gates and walls were to be guarded' or that 'Caesar's men were to guard the gates and walls'. Harbours, however, were not involved.

Questions 2(b)(i) and **(ii)** are good examples of cases in which candidates could have read the questions (and studied the marks available) more carefully. Most candidates seemed to understand most of the Latin, but their responses to the specific questions lacked detail.

Question 2(c) was done well, although *quorundam* confounded many. Examiners rewarded any attempted reference to 'certain' or 'particular' men; neither 'some' nor 'any' were deemed correct.

In far too many cases, **Question 2(d)(ii)**, 'Where was (Lentulus) at the time?' generated the incorrect response 'In the middle of the night'. Even for candidates that had read the question closely, the response nevertheless required slightly more than merely the recall of vocabulary: since Lentulus spoke *de muro*, 'down from' (not 'concerning') the wall, he must therefore have been on (top of) it.

There was no credit in **Question 2(f)(ii)** for suggesting that Lentulus attempted to persuade Caesar to spare him through 'friendship' (*amicitiam* was, after all, glossed). Lentulus hoped that Caesar would 'have in mind', 'remember' etc. (1) their 'old', 'past' etc. (1) friendship. In this comprehension test, the candidates who said that 'Lentulus appealed to their former friendship' displayed excellent understanding.

Candidates needed to pay closer attention to the Latin in **Question 2(h)**: Caesar spoke little (however expressed); he did not, at least in this passage, address 'a few of them'.

In **Question 2(i)(i)**, *ille* refers to Lentulus, who had brought (*attulerat*; not stolen, which would have been *abstulerat*) the money to Corfinium before depositing it there. In **Question 2(j)(i)**, Caesar ordered Lentulus's men to swear an oath of loyalty to him, Caesar, not to themselves.

As usual, the derivations, **Question 2(k)**, were done well, with mural, prohibition and veteran all making regular appearances. Centres are reminded that only the first four derivations will be accepted by Examiners. Correct English spelling of each derived word is required.

LATIN

<table>
<tr><td>

Paper 0480/22
Literature

</td></tr>
</table>

Key messages

The examination requires candidates to answer questions on the two prescribed texts: one prose and one verse. The questions allow candidates to demonstrate their skills in comprehension and translation. Candidates are also required to show an 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.

It is necessary for candidates to describe character, action and context and to select relevant details from the texts. Candidates should be able to explain meanings and reference and translate sections of the texts 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.

General comments

Overall, candidates demonstrated a sound comprehension of the works of Virgil and Cicero. The majority of candidates were able to translate the prescribed texts with fluent accuracy and responded with confidence 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. Candidates should read the questions carefully to identify style questions. For the questions asking for reference to both what the author says and how he says it, it is not adequate for candidates simply to translate two phrases as there must be some element of analysis. Performance on scansion was sound with many candidates executing this with poise, although some candidates missed the question out. With regard to the general level of response, candidates engaged well with both the verse and prose selections and demonstrated the ability to analyse the style and content of the prescribed texts and produced personal responses to the literature. Candidates should be reminded to look at the marks available for a question to ensure they are making a suitable number of points. Examination technique was good on the shorter questions, while the 10 mark questions were approached with less assurance. Specimen papers, past papers and mark schemes are available which are a useful aid to examination preparation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid* Book 3

Question 1

(a) The first question was largely answered well with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *inruimus* and *partem praedam*. Common errors were to confuse *toros* with *tauros* and *opimis* with *optimis*.

(b) Many candidates were able to make two points and refer to both content and style. Enjambement was a popular choice, which required a quotation and explanation to gain full credit. The *taetrum odorem* in the hyperbaton was also noted frequently and its effect explained. Some candidates drew attention to lines 6 – 7: *contactu immundo* with the verb *foedant* as well as the *horrifico lapsu* in line 4.

(c) Most candidates were able to state that they went into a cave/under a hollow rock, surrounded by trees, although the trees were the part that was missed most frequently.

(d)   Where candidates had the ability to scan, a few did not gain full credit by missing the dipthong and mistaking *prae* for two short 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)   This question was usually answered correctly, with candidates stating that he told them to take up weapons and make war on the dreadful race.

Question 2

(a)   This question did not pose a problem for those who knew the story and had learnt the set text carefully; sometimes there was some confusion as to how to express *animis* and *figite* in English.

(b)   On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most stating that they were going to arrive in Italy and would be able to enter the harbours.

(c)   This question tended to be answered quite well, with many responses referring to the prediction that terrible hunger would force them to eat their tables; fewer candidates referred to the Trojans not being allowed to put a wall around their city until the prophecy had taken place. Some answered the question successfully by discussing style features such as the sibilance in line 8 and the retardation of what the Trojans would have to do before they could build their wall.

(d)   Candidates were able to name Celaeno, although there was a plethora of spellings.

(e)   A good many candidates were able to make two points and refer to both content and style. The metaphor of *gelidus sanguis* in the line 10 hyperbaton was discussed frequently and its effect elucidated. Some candidates drew attention to *iubent* in line 12 as an unusual way for the men to communicate with their leader and the men's doubt as to whether the harpies were goddesses or horrible birds was referenced, along with the fact that they still prayed to them.

Question 3

Most candidates showed that they had understood the question and gave a personal response although specific references to the plot of the set text was lacking in many cases. There was a tendency not to write in adequate detail as a Level 3 answer requires a good range of appropriate points with clear and detailed explanation as well as detailed analysis of evidence. Candidates achieved Level 1 or 2 marks by giving imprecise responses to the question with some or minimal engagement with specific aspects of the text. Some answers argued that the literary techniques enhanced the plot but did not include any examples from Virgil and resorted to general discussion of alliteration, anaphora and use of adjectives. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a specific detail from the text studied.

Section B: *Introducing Cicero*

Question 4

(a)   This question was frequently answered correctly with candidates showing understanding of how Cicero joined in with those who had come for the spa.

(b)   Use of the targets' title was a popular choice of answer: *iudices* as well as the repetition of *mihi*. Candidates followed the instruction to quote the Latin in their answers.

(c)   Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. Varied translations of *hebetiores* and *acres atque acutos* were interesting to read.

(d)   The metaphor *habitavi in oculis* was a popular choice, which required the quotation and an explanation to gain full credit. Candidates referred to the vivid image of the doorkeeper and his zeugma with *somnus.* Again, the instruction to give Latin quotations was heeded.

Question 5

(a) Full marks were gained by making two points with a relevant quotation for each. The most popular answer was discussion of the superlatives *lectissimum ornatissimumque*. There was also much reference to the use of first person verbs and the pairing of *requiro et flagito*.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to explain Cicero was pointing out that Scipio is defending someone that has insulted Scipio's own family honour.

(c) On the whole the section was translated fluently with varied choices for the translation of *requirit*. Some confused *vis* meaning you want with the noun *vis*. There was a tendency to muddle the idea of undertaking the role and picking up the burden into one thing.

(d) Many were able to attain full marks by making two points with a relevant Latin quotation for each. There was much reference to the invocation of the gods; *spoliatorem vexatoremque* was another popular discussion point as well as the polyptoton *spoliata … spoliatorem*.

Question 6

There were some spirited answers to this question; the most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was making a personal attack and how he was doing it, using specific references to the speech, and then discussion of the basis for Cicero's argument against Verres, also giving specific examples from the speech. Less successful responses often lacked depth in the examples and did not always contain enough detail for a 10 mark question. A number of candidates answered about an attack on Scipio rather than on Verres, having misunderstood the meaning of the word defendant. Some candidates focused heavily on Cicero's rhetorical techniques but struggled to link this material to the question.

LATIN

Key messages

The examination requires candidates to answer questions on the two prescribed texts: one prose and one verse. The questions allow candidates to demonstrate their skills in comprehension and translation. Candidates are also required to show an 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.

It is necessary for candidates to describe character, action and context and to select relevant details from the texts. Candidates should be able to explain meanings and reference and translate sections of the texts 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.

General comments

Overall, candidates demonstrated a sound comprehension of the works of Virgil and Cicero. The majority of candidates were able to translate the prescribed texts with fluent accuracy and responded with confidence 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. Candidates should read the questions carefully to identify style questions. For the questions asking for reference to both what the author says and how he says it, it is not adequate for candidates simply to translate two phrases as there must be some element of analysis. Performance on scansion was sound with many candidates executing this with poise, although some candidates missed the question out. With regard to the general level of response, candidates engaged well with both the verse and prose selections and demonstrated the ability to analyse the style and content of the prescribed texts and produced personal responses to the literature. Candidates should be reminded to look at the marks available for a question to ensure they are making a suitable number of points. Examination technique was good on the shorter questions, while the 10 mark questions were approached with less assurance. Specimen papers, past papers and mark schemes are available which are a useful aid to examination preparation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid* Book 3

Question 1

(a) The first question was largely answered well with most candidates giving a confident translation. There were many interesting renderings of *inruimus* and *partem praedam*. Common errors were to confuse *toros* with *tauros* and *opimis* with *optimis*.

(b) Many candidates were able to make two points and refer to both content and style. Enjambement was a popular choice, which required a quotation and explanation to gain full credit. The *taetrum odorem* in the hyperbaton was also noted frequently and its effect explained. Some candidates drew attention to lines 6 – 7: *contactu immundo* with the verb *foedant* as well as the *horrifico lapsu* in line 4.

(c) Most candidates were able to state that they went into a cave/under a hollow rock, surrounded by trees, although the trees were the part that was missed most frequently.

(d)   Where candidates had the ability to scan, a few did not gain full credit by missing the dipthong and mistaking *prae* for two short 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)   This question was usually answered correctly, with candidates stating that he told them to take up weapons and make war on the dreadful race.

Question 2

(a)   This question did not pose a problem for those who knew the story and had learnt the set text carefully; sometimes there was some confusion as to how to express *animis* and *figite* in English.

(b)   On the whole, candidates answered this question confidently, with most stating that they were going to arrive in Italy and would be able to enter the harbours.

(c)   This question tended to be answered quite well, with many responses referring to the prediction that terrible hunger would force them to eat their tables; fewer candidates referred to the Trojans not being allowed to put a wall around their city until the prophecy had taken place. Some answered the question successfully by discussing style features such as the sibilance in line 8 and the retardation of what the Trojans would have to do before they could build their wall.

(d)   Candidates were able to name Celaeno, although there was a plethora of spellings.

(e)   A good many candidates were able to make two points and refer to both content and style. The metaphor of *gelidus sanguis* in the line 10 hyperbaton was discussed frequently and its effect elucidated. Some candidates drew attention to *iubent* in line 12 as an unusual way for the men to communicate with their leader and the men's doubt as to whether the harpies were goddesses or horrible birds was referenced, along with the fact that they still prayed to them.

Question 3

Most candidates showed that they had understood the question and gave a personal response although specific references to the plot of the set text was lacking in many cases. There was a tendency not to write in adequate detail as a Level 3 answer requires a good range of appropriate points with clear and detailed explanation as well as detailed analysis of evidence. Candidates achieved Level 1 or 2 marks by giving imprecise responses to the question with some or minimal engagement with specific aspects of the text. Some answers argued that the literary techniques enhanced the plot but did not include any examples from Virgil and resorted to general discussion of alliteration, anaphora and use of adjectives. The most successful responses argued both sides of the question and supported each point with a specific detail from the text studied.

Section B: *Introducing Cicero*

Question 4

(a)   This question was frequently answered correctly with candidates showing understanding of how Cicero joined in with those who had come for the spa.

(b)   Use of the targets' title was a popular choice of answer: *iudices* as well as the repetition of *mihi*. Candidates followed the instruction to quote the Latin in their answers.

(c)   Most candidates were able to translate fluently into good English. Varied translations of *hebetiores* and *acres atque acutos* were interesting to read.

(d)   The metaphor *habitavi in oculis* was a popular choice, which required the quotation and an explanation to gain full credit. Candidates referred to the vivid image of the doorkeeper and his zeugma with *somnus.* Again, the instruction to give Latin quotations was heeded.

Question 5

(a) Full marks were gained by making two points with a relevant quotation for each. The most popular answer was discussion of the superlatives *lectissimum ornatissimumque*. There was also much reference to the use of first person verbs and the pairing of *requiro et flagito*.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to explain Cicero was pointing out that Scipio is defending someone that has insulted Scipio's own family honour.

(c) On the whole the section was translated fluently with varied choices for the translation of *requirit*. Some confused *vis* meaning you want with the noun *vis*. There was a tendency to muddle the idea of undertaking the role and picking up the burden into one thing.

(d) Many were able to attain full marks by making two points with a relevant Latin quotation for each. There was much reference to the invocation of the gods; *spoliatorem vexatoremque* was another popular discussion point as well as the polyptoton *spoliata … spoliatorem*.

Question 6

There were some spirited answers to this question; the most successful answers outlined examples of when Cicero was making a personal attack and how he was doing it, using specific references to the speech, and then discussion of the basis for Cicero's argument against Verres, also giving specific examples from the speech. Less successful responses often lacked depth in the examples and did not always contain enough detail for a 10 mark question. A number of candidates answered about an attack on Scipio rather than on Verres, having misunderstood the meaning of the word defendant. Some candidates focused heavily on Cicero's rhetorical techniques but struggled to link this material to the question.