LATIN

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

Key Messages

- Candidates displayed a sound knowledge of the set texts.
- Time management seems to be an issue for some candidates. In whichever order the questions are done – and there was some variety – there seems for quite a few candidates to be a problem in properly completing four questions in the 2 hours and 30 minutes. Candidates would generally benefit from guidance in planning their time. However, there is only one more year of the paper in this format. It is hoped that the changes to the 2016 paper will ease timing issues.

General Comments

All candidates took the Virgil option and, of those, the majority took the option of essay 5 rather than essay 6. The vast majority of candidates took the option of Unseen Literary Criticism rather than the theme essay. The performance of candidates this year was stronger than last year. However, while there were some superb answers – both to commentary and essay questions – there were no answers that were quite able to sustain excellence through all questions. The overall impression, though, was that candidates knew their set texts very well, and were able to answer all different types of question.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

(i)   Well answered. Most candidates picked up the physical effects on Aeneas in lines 1-2; some commented on the (apparent) inconsistency contained in line 3. Most commented well on the rhetorical questions in lines 5-6, and on the various ways Virgil; describes Aeneas' uncertainty in lines 7-8.

(ii)   Most translations were accurate.

(iii)   Very well answered. Lines 18-19 – with their editorial comment – were well commented on, as was *omnia tuta timens* in line 20. The violent and extravagant vocabulary of lines 21-25, with its clear Bacchic associations, was well analysed.

   However, some candidates used their time ineffectively by commenting on uninteresting word order, alliteration of little consequence, and words near caesurae. It would have been better to concentrate on the meaning.

Question 2

(i)   Well translated.

(ii)   Well answered, as a rule. Candidates observed that Dido keeps secrets from her sister, and that the tomb of her husband is specifically and eerily described. While there were some unconvincing comments about the effects of the *v* alliteration in lines 11-12, there were some good comments on the appearance of the owl in line 14. There were some good comments on the first three words of line 16.

(iii)   Candidates seemed to like the provocation of this question, and there were some very good answers. Specifically, candidates picked up on Aeneas as *ferus*, and the strange comparisons to Pentheus and his double vision, the Eumenides, and Orestes and his mother (Greek tragedy rearing its head). On lines 25-30 candidates were good at observing Dido's deceit of her sister.

Questions 3 and 4

No candidates answered the questions on Catullus.

Question 5

Most candidates answered this question. There was some very good knowledge on display, most especially of the way Dido might be modelled on Medea, and Anna on the nurse in *Hippolytus*. Some candidates also made valiant attempts to include the definition of tragedy – or the tragic – in Aristotle's *Poetics*. Overall, though, candidates were alert to the ways in which Dido's experience could be called tragic: the involvement of the gods, her own lack of responsibility (variously analysed), and so on.

Question 6

Few chose this essay option. Strong answers used Virgil's interest in psychology as a way of showing that there was something vital about the description of Dido and Aeneas' relationship in book 4.

Questions 7 and 8

No candidates answered the questions on Catullus.

Question 9

As usual, this question – with the odd exception – was not as well answered as the first three questions, even though some candidates tackled the Unseen Literary Criticism either as their first or their second question.

There was a little too much easy resort to GCSE-style answers, observing but not analysing (in no particular order) alliteration, anaphora, word order. There is a lot to say about this passage, mainly about the pairs of syntactical forms matching Narcissus and his reflection. To be fair, some candidates did comment on this very well (see e.g. lines 13-14).

Question 10-17

Very few candidates answered these questions, therefore a report cannot be produced.

LATIN

Paper 9788/02
Prose Literature

Key Messages

To score high marks in **Section A** candidates needed to translate accurately, recall details from beyond the context passages printed and, most importantly, discuss the required passages showing an understanding of the author's style and intentions. Most candidates avoided mere narrative when answering questions requiring analysis but a few tended to retell the story without sufficient focus on the question asked.

Essays in **Section B** should aim to cover a variety of episodes from the chosen prescription and show an understanding of the wider context, whether historical, cultural or literary. Whilst many candidates wrote very detailed essays with relevant quotation and reference to the text, a number of answers were quite limited in scope and did not refer to the wider context.

General Comments

Tacitus' *Annals* proved more popular than Petronius' *Satyricon*. The candidates who answered on Petronius showed evident enjoyment of his satire and gave detailed responses. The overall standard of the responses on Tacitus was slightly higher than in 2013 due to better-structured and argued context answers. Several essays did not make any reference to *Annals XIV*, which is prescribed for reading in English.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

   (i)   Candidates recalled the details about the 'bald old man' just before this passage very well indeed, including the fact that his name is Trimalchio. Details from the printed passage itself are not required or credited in questions of this kind.

   (ii) Very detailed answers were given with most focussing on the eccentric behaviour of Trimalchio. The best answers also discussed the persona of the narrator and the element of surprise both here and throughout the Cena e.g. *'cum has…miraremur…'*.

   (iii) Translations were generally very accurate.

Question 2

   (i)   Candidates understood that Trimalchio is here showing off about the size of his estates. To show the hyperbolic nature of his boast it needed to be explained that Tarracina and Tarentum are over 200 miles apart.

   (ii) Candidates understood that Trimalchio is being pretentious here and trying to show how learned and educated he is. The mistakes he makes e.g. that Homer did not recount the twelve labours of Hercules and absurdity of his stories e.g. the story about the Sibyl needed to be explained more fully.

   (iii) Translations were accurate but some renderings of '*efflaverat*' could better have suggested how Trimalchio is blowing hot air.

Question 3

(i) This question had no right or wrong answer especially but did expect candidates to recognise that this is a typical passage of Tacitean ambiguity. Few candidates achieved full marks since they did not, at the very least, discuss both possible causes – an accident or an act of deliberate arson organised by the emperor. Several answers included a lot of detail from the passage but did not argue consistently.

(ii) Many candidates answered this question very effectively, pointing out the pace of the narrative, the use of military language, the pathos created by the human suffering described, and the sense of confusion and despair. The best answers combined good textual reference and quotation with pertinent comment. A few candidates lost sight of the key words in the question 'vividly' and 'dramatically'.

(iii) A few phrases caused difficulty: it was not sufficient to translate '*vociferabantur*' as 'were saying' and accurate translations of '*qua Palatium et Maecenatis hortos continuaverat*' ('<u>by which</u> he had joined….') were infrequent.

Question 4

(i) A few candidates tended to focus on details about Epicharis we learn later rather than before this passage. Most included the details about her approaches to the officers of the fleet at Misenum and Volusius Proculus in particular. Many candidates achieved full marks on this question.

(ii) The translation of this passage was done less well. A number of words and phrases caused difficulty: e.g. *plura*, *neque senatui quidquam manere*, *accingeretur*. A number of candidates did not appear to understand what Epicharis was actually saying.

(iii) This question asked about the presentation of the 'conspirators' as a whole, not just Piso. Many candidates argued successfully that the conspirators are shown to be acting selfishly rather than for the good of Rome and there were excellent discussions about the lifestyle at Baiae. The later references to Silanus and Vestinus and how they concerned Piso and the other conspirators were less well discussed. A few candidates focused their answer exclusively on Piso himself and therefore lost a significant number of marks.

Section B

Question 5

This question proved more popular than 6. Very detailed responses were given with an array of examples from various episodes. The focus tended to be on Trimalchio himself. Some answers did not clearly differentiate between 'satire' (which admittedly does seek to entertain but in a certain way) and 'entertainment'. Some comparison to other satire either ancient (e.g. Juvenal) or modern, or both would have been helpful to improve the argument.

Question 6

There were too few responses to make general comment.

Question 7

The best responses tackled the title head on, trying to define the notion of impartiality and discussing whether it is possible or even desirable for any historian to avoid bias. As with **Question 8** it was important to discuss the nature of ancient historiography. A few candidates made pertinent comparisons to Sallust and even Thucydides for which they gained credit. Strong candidates suggested an explanation for Tacitus' attitude towards Nero, given his own experience of Domitian's regime. It is important, as stated on the examination paper, where relevant for candidates to make reference to the wider historical, social, political and cultural context (and also in this case 'historiographical') context. A number of candidates confused the English terms 'impartiality' and 'partiality' resulting in apparently illogical argument. Most candidates tried to argue that Tacitus lives up to his claim to write '*sine ira et studio*' by his use of varied sources, alternative versions of events etc. Better answers also admitted his hostility towards Nero's regime and then went on to discuss whether or not this makes him 'flawed'. Some candidates saw 'flawed' and 'partial' as one and the

same thing, which tended to limit their argument. Reference to *Annals XIV* was generally limited. Overall, the argumentation could have been stronger.

Question 8

As with **Question 7**, it was important for candidates to define the key terms in the question. Most candidates understood the difference between the terms 'historian' and 'historical novelist'. They showed how Tacitus includes the kind of drama, suspense and human interest expected in an historical novel using e.g. the murder of Agrippina, the great fire and several of the scenes of suicide of the conspirators including the death of Seneca as good material. A few who answered the question did not appear to know what a historical novelist typically does and so inevitably their argument tended to be weak. Candidates should not be afraid to make comparisons to ancient or modern authors (in this case e.g. Bernard Cornwell) in essay answers. In essays significant credit is given to candidates who can refer relevantly to the wider context, in this case both historical and literary. A number of candidates seem to view essays as extended context questions and think it sufficient to discuss a selection of episodes without really addressing the question asked. Such approaches may achieve high marks for AO1 but are unlikely to achieve more than 6/12 or 7/12 for AO3.

LATIN

Key Messages

To score well on **Question 1** accurate translation into English is required. The best answers also exhibit successful reworking of the Latin into idiomatic English, for which up to 5 marks out of 50 marks are available. Experience of Cicero's typical hortatory style would have enabled more candidates to achieve 4 or 5 marks for Style and Fluency.

Question 2: **(a)** An appreciation of poetic language and word order and experience of Latin love poetry were required to produce accurate translations of elegiac couplets.   **(b)** Candidates needed to scan an elegiac couplet.

It is clear that Centres are reading a variety of authors in preparation for the unseen translation paper as is the intention by not prescribing authors.

General Comments

The general standard of translation was very high. Most candidates scored comparable marks on **Question 1** and **2**, with marks levelled out by better marks for scansion on **Question 2** than on Style and Fluency on **Question 1**.

Question 1

Overall the Cicero passage did not cause undue difficulties. Few candidates had problems with the imagery at the beginning of the passage; a number struggled with the extended exhortation from *quare…sentiat*. An area for improvement is the reworking of the Latin into English idiom. Candidates need to use more vivid vocabulary rather than literal translations.

ut saepe…ingravescet: all candidates understood that Cicero is comparing the *res publica* to people suffering from an illness. *morbo gravi…febrique*: there was some confusion between nouns and adjectives here and the *–que* was sometimes ignored; *iactantur* provided an early opportunity to gain credit for style: 'are tossed about' better than 'are thrown'; *istius* was well translated by most who realised that it refers to Catiline; *reliquis vivis*: some did not spot that this phrase is in the ablative and took it as a dative – even though this is grammatically possible, it was not allowed given the context; few spotted that *ingravescet* is future indicative: 'will grow worse'.

quare…comparare: this section proved more difficult due to a succession of jussive subjunctives: *secedant*…*secernant*…*congregentur*…*secernantur*…*desinant*. Most candidates translated one or more of them as jussives but there were quite frequent confusions with the present and future indicative; *a bonis*: though this means 'from good (citizens)' 'from the good (things)' was accepted; *insidiari domi suae consuli*: this proved difficult since several did not take *insidiari* as deponent thus leading to further grammatical errors; *suae* was taken by some to agree with *consuli* despite its feminine ending. *obsidere…comparare*: this section was translated well with most knowing the meaning of *curiam* and the use of ad + gerundive to express purpose.

sit…videatis: Even those who missed the jussives in the previous section recognised *sit* as one; a few did not know the meaning of *denique* but found the following lines up to *virtutem* quite straightforward except that *in nobis consulibus* means not 'in our consuls' as many translated it but 'in us consuls' (Cicero himself being one of them). The abstract nouns were often translated rather blandly and candidates missed the opportunity to gain style marks for translating e.g. *auctoritatem* as 'influence' rather than 'authority' and *virtutem* as 'courage' rather than 'virtue'. *ut…videatis* caused problems due to misagreement of a number of

words e.g. *profectione* with *omnia*. Style credit was given for translating *oppressa* as 'crushed' rather than 'oppressed'. Several were not familiar with the abstract noun *profectio, -onis*.

his ominibus…nefarium: Most read *ominibus* as *omnibus*, *his ominibus* in fact means 'with these omens'. Very few took *proficiscere* as an infinitive, translating it correctly as the imperative of a deponent verb 'set out' but many treated *nefarium* as a noun rather than an adjective agreeing with *bellum*.

Question 2

Due to a more detailed title than usual most candidates followed the thought–process of this Tibullus extract, despite perhaps the unfamiliarity of this type of love poem, where a man is barred from the house of his girlfriend. The vocabulary did not provide undue difficulties, though a few individual words caused problems as noted below. Most errors were due to incorrect analysis of grammar and syntax or a lack of appreciation of poetic word order.

nam posita est…petant: most candidates understood that *nostrae* is better translated 'my' (though 'our' was allowed) and had no difficulty with the delay of *et* in line 2. *difficilis* ('stubborn') was taken either with *ianua* or with *domini*: both being grammatically and contextually possible, both were allowed. The words *imber* and *fulmina* caused little difficulty. *Iovis imperio* ('by command of Jupiter') was translated as 'by almighty Jupiter' by a sizeable minority – only one mark was deducted since, despite two grammatical errors, it gets close to the sense.

ianua…meo: most candidates understood that Tibullus is here addressing the door directly but a few treated *ianua* as nominative, perhaps as a result of missing the jussive sense of *pateas*. A few treated *sones* as a plural noun and misplaced *furtim,* though most realised it means 'secretly', 'furtively'. *et mala…meo*: these two lines proved more difficult: candidates had difficulties finding the subject (*dementia nostra*) and therefore realising that *mala* is neuter plural; *ignosco* was confused by several with *ignoro*; candidates could not convince themselves, perhaps, that 'let those things be on my head' is also a Latin idiom and therefore did not always agree *capiti* with *meo*.

tu quoque…sono: most candidates correctly translated *ne…falle* which is an alternative to *noli fallere*; several did not see that *timide* is an adverb to be taken closely with *ne…falle*. *molli…lecto*: the lack of preposition caused difficulties for some so they did not realise it means '<u>from</u> her soft bed' but these lines did not generally cause many problems.

illa viro…timor: this last section proved more challenging in terms of vocabulary and sense. Candidates familiar with Sappho's poem mimicked by Catullus had no problem with *viro coram* ('in the presence of her husband') 'man' was not accepted in this context; *nutus conferre loquaces* elicited various responses of which 'to exchange meaningful nods' was probably the best; *blanda* ('flattering') was not known by some and *compositis notis* required a bit of thought: 'with pre-arranged signals' was one of the best renderings. The first *nec* is syntactically separate from the other two, a detail which caused problems for a few. Though most correctly realised that the last word *timor* is the subject of *vetat*, fewer worked out that *inertia* is the subject of *tardat* in a chiastically arranged set of clauses.

LATIN

Paper 9788/04
Prose Composition or Comprehension

Key Messages

- The best candidates were able to write stylish Latin whilst paying attention to the accuracy of case, gender, tense and mood.
- The vast majority of candidates chose the Prose Composition option rather than the Comprehension option.

General Comments

This year the candidates performed extremely well, most especially on the Prose Composition, in which the mean mark was over 30/40.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

First sentence	This was a difficult opening sentence, involving a deponent verb introducing a negative indirect command, which in turn contained a conditional sentence within indirect speech. Most knew *hortor* and the syntax of a negative indirect command. Only a few candidates managed to work out *Syracusans* by reference to *Romani*. The syntax of an open future condition in *oratio obliqua* was known by relatively few (the pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis received full marks; an imperfect subjunctive, ½). There were some splendid adjectives for both *lazy* and *riotous*.
Second sentence	Well done, as a rule, though only a few candidates knew *posco*. There was also some good use of the ablative absolute here for the first clause.
Third sentence	Again, this was well done. Most had a good verb for *despised* and most were also not fazed by *at what they had done*. There was from a few candidates a good use of *quo* introducing a purpose clause.
Fourth sentence	This sentence caused few problems, though more than expected did not seem to know how to form a locative.
Fifth sentence	Well done. Most candidates knew the syntax required for verbs of fearing. *Anyone* caused some problems but there were also some triumphs.
Sixth sentence	Notably in this sentence, many candidates chose not to translate *but in vain* in a literal (but idiomatic) way.
Final sentence	There was good use of the ablative absolute for *listened to their entreaties*, as well as for the first clause.

Section B

As only very few candidates attempted the comprehension, a full report on this cannot be produced. Overall, it was generally well done, although candidates fared less well than those who tackled the composition. Of the comprehension questions, **(iv) (viii)** and **(ix)** caused the most problems. Of the grammatical questions, **(x) (c)** identifying the tense and mood of *conflagrassent* and **(xii) (c)** explaining the case of *misericordia,* were found to be the most difficult.