LATIN

Paper 9788/01
Verse Literature

General comments

Most candidates chose the Virgil rather than the Catullus option for the set text, and most chose the unseen literary criticism (**Question 9**) rather than the theme essay. In almost all cases candidates' knowledge of their set text was excellent, and there were some very sophisticated and persuasive answers, both in the commentary questions and in the essays. There was – as with the similar Greek paper – a tendency to spend a little too long and to make a few too exaggerated claims about the effects achieved by the sounds and positions of words. This was most noticeable in the answers to **Question 9**.

Specific comments

1 The translations were generally very good and most candidates were able to give thorough answers, with lots of references to the text, to the questions about Virgil's narrative style and the effectiveness of the last six lines. Few made much of the fact that is Evander speaking these lines, and that they are a performance designed to impress Aeneas. All candidates assumed that the *mirabile dictu* of line 12 was to be attributed to Virgil rather than Evander. But, overall, there were some very impressive answers.

2 The comments here would be similar to those made above on **Question 1**. Detailed reference to the text was deployed to answer the questions and **Sub-Question (ii)** in particular was very well answered. It was pleasing to see some candidates comment on the cinematic qualities of Virgilian narrative. The translations were just about all accurate.

3 While the translations offered were accurate, the candidates really came into their own here with some arresting and sophisticated analysis of Catullus 11. Knowledge of other parts of the set text was skilfully deployed to come to an evaluation of the tone of Catullus' address to Furius and Aurelius. On the other hand, though it did not affect marks, there seemed to be too easy an equation made between Lesbia and the historical Clodia.

4 Again, this was very well answered. The translation was very accurate and the question of the pathos in Laudamia's situation was deftly handled, with specific reference to and persuasive use of the text. **Sub-Question (iii)** was also well handled, with sensible and intelligent things said about how the reference to Troy places Catullus' grief for his brother in a more expansive and destructive context.

5 All the candidates who opted for Virgil chose this essay. There were very many good essays, and some excellent ones. In nearly all cases an outstanding knowledge of the set text was on display. It was particularly heartening too to see so many candidates writing confidently about the Augustan context, and how Virgil's poem is both a part of and apart from it. Some genuinely sophisticated literary criticism was enjoyed. One surprise, though: a certain lack of reference to the various views of modern critics to the question of Virgil's relation to the Augustan regime.

6 No essays.

7 This was extremely well answered, though it was not a popular choice. Technical vocabulary was used accurately and appropriately, and Catullus was persuasively presented as a Hellenistic poet, in the shorter poems as well as an epyllion such as poem 64. Knowledge of metre, the different subjects of Catullus' oeuvre, and the various lengths and tones of the poems were also used to demonstrate Catullus' range and versatility.

8 This question was also very well answered although not popular. Strong answers ranged over a large number of Catullus' poems, arguing compellingly that the different metres, the different addresses, the different styles and so on all amounted to a very various depiction of love in poetry. This all came together – as expected – in the concluding use of poem 85 to show not just variety but also contradiction in the depiction of love.

9 Almost all candidates attempted this unseen literary criticism option with – it has to be said – varied success. **Sub-Question (i)** invited candidates to show how Lucretius achieved a passionate intensity. There were some very good answers that dealt well with, for instance, the juxtaposition of *religio* and *scelerosa* and *impia* in line 4 and the extreme diction of the line, and so on. There were also a few answers that seemed to think that the listing of stylistic features, with some brief and implausible remarks achieved by such features, was sufficient. In most cases, as well, more could have been made of the compellingly concise conclusion of line 22. **Sub-Question (ii)** was better answered, with many candidates able to comment on *tremibunda*, on how the passive verbs stress the helplessness of Iphigenia's position, and on how marriage and sacrifice are blended. **Sub-Question (iii)** had some of the implausibilities witnessed in **(i)** repeated. Alliterations were easy enough to observe, but it is not clear how the alliterative 'm's of line 13 or line 20 signify imminent doom. Alliteration does not normally signify anything specific, though genuinely onomatopoeic alliterations are exceptions to this (very possibly disputed) general observation. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to say that those same alliterative 'm's of line 13 have the effect of catching the reader's attention, making him or her more likely to think carefully about what the words *muta mente* mean, and what that signifies about Iphigenia's situation. Also, while the candidates were invited to use two examples, it would have been reasonable to consider the effect achieved by so much alliteration, namely, one of controlled anger.

10 No essays.

11 Answers to this question demonstrated not only good knowledge of *Aeneid* 8, but also some surprisingly detailed knowledge of Lucan. All the candidates were able to deploy this detailed knowledge to write well organised and mainly persuasive answers. For the most part, there was a good understanding of the notion of 'epic'.

12 This was not a popular question, though strong responses required (and showed) a good knowledge of both Virgil and Ovid; knowledge of the Augustan context was used to analyse the concept of 'Roman' as it might apply to 'epic' poetry.

LATIN

Paper 9788/02
Prose Literature

General comments

Cicero's *Pro Caelio* proved more popular with Centres than Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* but, in both cases, candidates displayed a very impressive knowledge of the text and a detailed understanding of the literary and rhetorical features of the language. The two-hour paper allowed candidates sufficient time to answer all questions in depth and few, if any, time issues were evident.

A number of scripts were difficult to read: it was often the case that the longer the answer, the less legible the writing. As will be reiterated later, candidates should aim to be concise and precise in their responses, even on the essay questions, and not feel that they need to write three pages for a 10 mark question (as several candidates did!), writing down everything they know about a passage and sometimes losing focus on the actual question.

The best answers tended to be those which focused on the question asked, quoted only relevant detail from the text and consisted of short, well-structured paragraphs; to obtain full marks for a context answer it was also advisable to include a short introduction and concluding statement.

A major weakness appeared to be the background knowledge of many of the candidates. Though candidates often knew the structure and argument of the *Pro Caelio* very well, knowledge of the background to the case, including Cicero's relationship to Caelius and enmity towards Clodia's family were often not known; and, likewise, those studying Sallust displayed only hazy knowledge of Sallust's reasons for writing the *Bellum Catilinae* and the historical events leading up to the Catilinarian conspiracy. It is important that the prose set texts are treated as both literary texts and, if relevant, historical documents. Candidates can expect to be asked about key events referred to in the text.

To conclude, the two major factors which discriminated excellent candidates from the good were **(a)** the method employed to answer questions on literary technique **(b)** knowledge of the historical background.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*

Question 1

(i) Few candidates received full marks here since there was little reference to Sulla's campaigns in the East, the consequent effects on Rome of *luxuria* and resulting debt, the situation which allowed Catiline to rally so many to his cause. Several candidates did not seem sufficiently aware of the importance Sallust himself attaches to his long introduction to the *Bellum Catilinae*, though they did show knowledge of the theme of moral degeneration.

(ii) There were several very good answers here, focusing on Sallust's rhetoric but also relating points to the theme of moral decay. Answers did not fall into the trap of merely listing rhetorical terms; for example, the homoioteleuton exhibited by *innocentia pro malevolentia* was not only mentioned, but it was noted that the fact that 'innocence' and 'ill-will' were being treated as the same in Rome, as emphasised by the same endings, highlighting the growing lack of trust in Rome. Answers also showed how the military language (e.g. *invasere*) mirrors the idea earlier in the passage that the moral decay stemmed from the time of Sulla's military campaigns. One or two answers over-emphasised Sallust's use of asyndeton, though it was neatly suggested that the long lists might

suggest the swift spread of the decay. In general a wide variety of features of the language was mentioned.

(iii) Translations were reasonably accurate though there were a number of omissions; several translations neatly reflected Sallust's use of asyndeton but could not quite match his alliterative *pudorem pudicitiam* – but accuracy was all that was required here, though it was a pleasure to read a stylistic rendering exhibiting Sallustian *brevitas*! Problems included *promiscua* which was omitted by a few and *visere* which was weakly translated as 'to see'.

Question 2

(i) Most candidates knew that the letter is ascribed to Manlius and sent to ex-consul Marcius Rex. It was not always explained that Manlius was writing from Etruria. A full explanation of the circumstances of the letter also required reference to Catiline's actions at the time: setting out for Manlius' camp after unsuccessful attempts to assassinate Cicero, for example. The knowledge here displayed was better than for 1 **(i)** but one or two candidates were unable to put the letter in context.

(ii) There were several good answers here showing how Manlius tries to justify his actions. A major omission tended to be his reference to previous times in history when the plebs had seceded from the senate, leading to legislation being passed to relieve debt– an important argument in favour of Manlius' actions in the face of the violence of the money-lenders. Candidates commented well upon the emotive language e.g. *deos hominesque testamur, more maiorum...maiores nostri* and the emphatic nature of the language, including use of polyptoton, anaphora, repetition of ideas and strong vocabulary. Again, the historical background knowledge tended to be the weakness, rather than the ability to analyse the literary merits of the piece.

(iii) One or two candidates could not translate accurately and lost all 5 marks. This was a pity as it significantly affected their overall performance. The long sentence from lines 12-15 caused particular problems and the force of the present subjunctives following *obtestamur* was lost at times.

Cicero, *Pro Caelio*

Question 3

(i) A surprising number of candidates could not translate this extract accurately, especially as it came quite early in the set text. Several mistranslated *sectam* and *rationem* and did not understand the contrast between *re* and *verbis*. *honeste* was often wrongly translated as 'honestly' and *exstiterunt* as 'existed'. Those who translated poorly tended to be the candidates who performed less well on this paper overall.

(ii) A few candidates knew the names of all three philosophical Schools (Epicureans, Academics/Peripatetics, Stoics) and could define what they stood for, but many gave no information beyond what could be understood from the passage. The reference to Stoicism is particularly central to Cicero's argument in this passage.

(iii) There were many impressive answers here. Undoubtedly the best answers were those that included a brief introduction and conclusion, explaining what Cicero's argument is here, namely that it is very difficult for young men in Rome to remain virtuous all the time owing to the sheer number of enticements and pleasurable distractions on offer and that, for that reason, they should be cut some slack.

A number of very long answers did not address this argument at all despite the wording of the question clearly stating 'show how Cicero reinforces his argument.....'. In fact several candidates launched into the first rhetorical feature they could spot e.g. the polyptoton of *multa...multas...multarum* without any reference to Cicero's argument at all. These answers then tended to develop into a long list of rhetorical features, not all of which were relevant to the wording of the question which referred to 'the use of colourful language': it was hard to see how the repetition of *et* could be regarded as especially 'colourful'! In other words, this seemingly straightforward question did require a certain amount of thought about what details to select and then how to relate those details to the argument. A few answers did this successfully and duly received the full 10 marks. Good answers at the very least related the language to the argument:

for instance the word *conroborata* was shown to be effective in describing how men 'thoroughly toughened' by experience were being taken in (*caperetur*) by the plethora of pleasures on offer, the point being that if such men were taken in, what chance did the young (Caelius included) have?

The personifications of *natura* and *virtus*, the list of senses, and the metaphors of the slippery and overgrown paths were amongst the 'colourful' features candidates were expected to discuss. Answers which did not discuss the final metaphor of the *via..inculta* were unlikely to gain full marks due to this serious omission. Examiners are likely to be less lenient in future years on candidates who merely list rhetorical features in an effort to gain marks: they will not be penalised for irrelevance but at the same time they will not gain the marks available for cogent and clear argument related to the question, which will be at least 2 marks for a 10-mark question.

It cannot be emphasised strongly enough, however much of a cliché it may sound, that candidates must read and answer the question set, rather than regurgitate their pre-prepared notes. Nevertheless, the level of knowledge shown by most candidates about Cicero's rhetoric was highly impressive.

Question 4

(i) Almost all candidates realised that the charge in question was that Caelius tried to poison Clodia and that the poison had been given to a friend Licinius to give to Clodia's slaves at a bath house. Several candidates were less sure about how Cicero had earlier poured scorn on the bath episode, resorting instead to retelling the story in the passage itself.

(ii) There were many very good answers here with the sarcasm and scorn being brought out well by almost all answers. It was clear that most candidates knew this passage very well. The ironic references to Clodia as *imperatrice* and *mulieris beatae ac nobilis familiaris* were particularly well explained. The best answers fully explained the humour behind the comparing the bath (*alveus*) to the Trojan horse (*equus...Troianus*) and the allusion to the whore Helen (*muliebre bellum*), contrasting the bungled and ill-advised ambush by Clodia's men to the well-planned and cunning device of the Greeks. A few candidates did not successfully explain the double entendres towards the end of the passage e.g. *lux* = 'light' or 'publicity' or exploit to the full the humour of the contrast between the life spent by Clodia's young men in the dining-room and life under public scrutiny as witnesses in the court.

(iii) This passage was translated well: for candidates who lost marks some words and phrases which caused particular difficulty were *navent aliam operam, dominentur sumptibus* and *fortunis*. A few did not understand the force of the subjunctives in the passage.

Question 5

Of the few candidates who answered this question, all scored well under AO1, showing awareness of the four main speeches in the *Bellum Catilinae* and how Sallust attaches importance to them as a means of characterisation or creating drama. The analysis of the speeches was particularly impressive, seeing as three of the speeches lay outside the prescribed Latin text.

Question 6

Though candidates gave a balanced account of the portrayal of Catiline with close reference to the text and therefore scored highly for AO1, the answers tended to be less successful for AO3, which required a knowledge of Sallust's stated purpose for writing the *Bellum Catilinae* i.e. 'the unprecedented nature of the crime and the danger it caused'. However, candidates were good at showing how Sallust created a memorable and 'larger than life' character who was a product of the moral degeneracy in Rome, in many ways monstrous but also capable of displaying admirable qualities such as energy, leadership and, in the final battle, outstanding bravery.

Question 7

This question proved not quite as easy as it seemed. Many candidates focused too much of their answer upon Cicero's attack upon Clodia, rather than upon Cicero's portrayal of Caelius. Many did not discuss Caelius' youth, during which he was allegedly involved with Catiline, his successful posting to Africa, his recent brave prosecution of Antonius, his move to the Palatine or his subsequent affair with Clodia and these were all serious omissions. Consequently marks for AO1 were sometimes low. Though it was possible to argue that by blackening Clodia's character Cicero paints Caelius in a better light, candidates should also have discussed how Cicero deals with Caelius' relations with his father and his 'reformed character' which exhibited all the qualities required for success as a lawyer. Candidates should also have shown an awareness of the fact that Cicero himself had once been Caelius' mentor and had more recently been on the opposite side of him in court. The best answers argued that despite the fact that Cicero won the case, the picture of Caelius which emerges is not all white.

Question 8

This question was equally as popular as **Question 7** and was also misinterpreted by a few. Candidates generally showed very good knowledge of the structure of the speech, including various technical terms for the various sections of the speech; candidates were good at pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of Cicero's argument, in particular the evasive, almost flippant, way in which he deals with a number of the charges. On the other hand, candidates were poor at explaining the personal situation that Cicero was in, his relationship to Caelius and his enmity to Clodia's family and how these factors were likely to make his account extremely biased and therefore less convincing. Many candidates seemed to be answering a pre-prepared essay on 'humour' choosing to interpret 'wholly convincing' as 'purely humorous': as a result some of the argument became tangential to the question asked. Candidates did convincingly argue at times that Cicero's humour is often used to cover up the weaknesses in his argument – and that therefore his case is not 'wholly convincing'. Others took the question to mean 'Did the judges at the time think that the case.....was wholly convincing?' – presumably yes, since Caelius was voted 'innocent'! The question was really asking the candidate for his/her own personal response to Cicero's speech and whether, in fact, the original judges may have made the wrong judgement.

Overall, there were many entertaining and well-structured essays to read and the vast majority of candidates are to be congratulated upon their depth of knowledge and understanding of the text. A number of essays gained full marks. It was clear from the responses that candidates had enjoyed reading and studying this speech and that is, perhaps, the most pleasing and satisfying thing that emerged from reading the scripts.

LATIN

Paper 9788/03
Unseen Translation

General comments

There was a wide range of performance on the two passages set. Time pressure did not seem to be an issue and all candidates completed both passages. Candidates often scored similar marks on **Question 1** and **2**, which was often boosted by a high mark on the scansion. Only a few candidates scored high marks for 'style', with many being content to translate literally with little or no attempt to rework the Latin into idiomatic and fluent English, and a few candidates ended up with only 1 mark or even 0 marks on each passage. It must be remembered that 10% of the marks are available for the style of candidate's English translation and that, in theory, a purely literal translation will gain no extra credit. The 'style' marking grids did successfully discriminate between excellent candidates, who could translate both accurately and idiomatically, and good candidates, who were perfectly capable of analysing grammar and syntax but could have benefited more by thinking harder about what the author is actually saying and how he is saying it. This proved especially true of the Ovid piece for which many candidates did not convey the meaning of the passage as a whole. Nearly all candidates would have been well advised to think more carefully about Ovid's thought processes.

Names of people and places which candidates can reasonably be expected to have met before or exhibit typical *–us* or *–um* endings will not always be explained in the glossary. Abbreviations such as M. and C. can be left as they are.

Those candidates who appreciated the elegiac metre were able to work out lengths of final syllables and hence a number of key agreements. A few candidates who had scanned correctly did not apply the knowledge of lengths of final vowels when translating. There is usually a good reason behind the choice of the two lines for scansion. The final syllable of a hexameter or a pentameter may always be marked as an anceps (x).

Please note that from 2011 the 'style' mark descriptors may be adapted and that the scansion question will demand division into feet and the marking of the main caesura in addition to marking the lengths of syllables.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Section 3

Question 1

Livy
***hac oratione...traiecit*:** the opening ablative absolutes were translated well, with a variety of idiomatic translations of *accensis* accepted (e.g. 'kindled', 'inflamed', 'roused'). The numbers of troops in the first sentence were also dealt with accurately, though it is preferred if candidates write out numbers in full rather than use numerals. *eius* was often mistranslated as 'his' rather than 'this'. A few candidates realised that 'however' was not a suitable translation for *autem* in this context: 'moreover' or 'in addition' were accepted. The separation of the object *ceteras omnes copias* from the verb *traiecit* caused problems for a few, especially where candidates translated *traiecit* as 'crossed' rather than 'sent across'.

***ibi...exercitibus*:** the ablative absolute *quibusdam suadentibus* was translated well and the consequent indirect command introduced by *ut*, but a few candidates confused *suadeo* with *persuadeo*; *in tres tam diversas regiones*: a common error was to translate *in* as though it were taking the ablative; *Punici exercitus*:

Punici was often treated as a noun; *proximum* proved hard and was often taken as if it referred to an understood feminine *regionem* rather than a masculine *exercitum*; the meaning of *adgrederetur* = 'to attack' caused a few problems, perhaps because candidates were more used to the prefix *agg-*; most candidates translated *ratus* well as 'thinking' but many did not spot that *periculum* introduced the following *ne* clause: 'a danger that....'; *in unum*: again, many did not spot that *in* + *acc*. means 'into' here; good attempts were made to get the force of *contraheret* = 'to draw together' but *par* = 'equal' was often confused with *pars*.

Carthaginem.....mari: most candidates knew that *statuit* = *constituit*; the stress of *suis* = 'its own' was often missed; *omni bellico apparatu*: 'warlike' was not acceptable for *bellico* = 'of/ for war'; many worked out that *apparatu* here means 'equipment', but many understandably went with the rather weak 'apparatus'; *sitam* was often judged to be a noun rather than adjectival = 'situated' and *opportune* = 'conveniently' was parsed as an ablative of a noun rather than an adverb; surprisingly few candidates saw that *super portum* is a straightforward prepositional phrase = 'above a harbour'; *satis amplum* = 'big enough' was translated well and many sensibly worked out *quantaevis classi* = 'for any size of fleet'; only one or two candidates spotted that *unum* here must effectively mean 'the only one'; *nostro...mari* a few candidates thought this referred to the Mediterranean Sea rather than merely 'our (from a Roman point of view) sea' between the east coast of Spain and Italy.

nemo...intraret: many gave idiomatic translations of the impersonal passive 'iretur' = 'they were going', though 'he was going' gained one mark; *classe circummissus* = 'sent around with the fleet' caused problems since many seemed to confuse *circummissus* with *circumdatus*; credit was given for spotting that *moderari* is deponent even if *moderari cursum* = 'to control the speed' was often rendered by the bare 'to moderate the course'; the pluperfect force of *iussus erat* was sometimes missed; a number of candidates did not realise that *ita* introduced the final *ut* clause = 'in such a way that....'; a few did not take *classis* as the subject of *intraret*.

Conclusion:

Overall, the knowledge of vocabulary displayed by the candidates was very good and most made sensible attempts to work out words they may not have met before. The syntax did not cause undue problems but a lack of understanding of basic case usage did e.g. *in* + acc. An appreciation of Latin word order and phrasing also proved important, emphasising the need to read through the passage a number of times in order to appreciate the structure of the longer sentences. Candidates who tried to deal with isolated words and phrases as they met them without appreciating how they fitted into the overall structure of the sentence often came unstuck. Candidates generally understood the storyline of the passage at the beginning and the end, but often lost the sense in lines 4-6.

Question 2

(a) Ovid

The Ovid extract proved challenging not so much in terms of the difficulty of knowing the vocabulary but rather of understanding the underlying meaning. Candidates who translated literally word for word often came unstuck since they had not thought clearly enough about what Ovid is saying, both about his dead friend Celsus and his own exile (*mea funera*). Despite not understanding the metaphorical meaning of *mea funera*, many candidates translated the last eight lines well. Those candidates who knew that the work *Epistulae ex Ponto* was written from exile might have used this knowledge to their advantage.

***quae...est*:** these first four lines were generally translated well; *quae* was on occasions translated as 'when'; *rapto* was translated in a number of acceptable ways e.g. 'death' (as in the title), 'snatched away', 'taken from us'; the split passive verb combination *est...facta* = 'was made' caused little problem; *umida* = 'wet' was occasionally wrongly rendered as 'warm'. The idiomatic *dictu* = 'to say' caused few problems but the inversion *fieri nec* caused a number of candidates to omit or mistranslate the *nec*. Pleasingly few candidates confused *invitis* with *invitatis*.

***nec quicquam...amor*:** these lines proved more difficult, with line 6 especially hard: the very best candidates realised that *sumus*, as well as being a poetic plural, would not make sense as a present and translated it correctly as 'since I have been on the Black Sea'; only one or two realised that one had to understand the negative idea from the previous line with *perveniat...precor* i.e. 'and I pray that (nothing more bitter) may (ever) come'. There were frequent idiomatic translations of *imago* as 'a picture' and *tamquam praesentis* as 'as if he were here with me'. But *fingit* was often weakly translated as though from *facio*.

saepe...caput: many candidates did not realise that here Ovid is reminiscing about the times he spent with Celsus, and that the repeated *saepe* marks a contrast between *lusus* and *seria*. It is always important to look out for such antithetical clauses in Ovid's elegiacs. Several did not identify *lusus* as a plural noun and this caused sequential errors in the translation of *gravitate carentes*. Most did know *carentes* + abl., but there was the almost inevitable confusion between *carentes* and *curantes*. Correct scansion of line 10 should have helped the candidates to work out the agreements but unfortunately this was not always the case: many did not work out the pairings *seria...peracta* and '*(cum) liquida...fide*'. *densius* was not always treated as an adverb. Many sensible suggestions were given for *summa* including 'greatest' for which credit was given but only one or two got the correct meaning 'final'. It proved important to scan line 13, and there was certain amount of resorting to guesswork as to how the words fit together; 'when my house (*domus...mea*) suddenly fell *(lapsa*) and collapsed (*concidit*) in great ruin' would have been more than acceptable; *subito* was occasionally treated as an adjective and wrongly paired with *ruina*; '*in domini...caput* = 'onto its master's head': the separation of *in* and *caput* no doubt caused confusion and few, once again, translated *in* + acc. correctly; *procubuit* = 'fell' from *procumbo* was confused with the Vergilian *procubo*, 'I lie down' but credit was given for the common rendering 'lay down upon'.

illum...suas: though many translated these lines literally correctly, few realised that *mea funera* refers to Ovid's exile, *frater* to 'his (i.e. Celsus') brother' and *in igne* to a funeral pyre; most realised that *foret* is an alternative form of *esset* and that *ponendus* is gerundive = 'had to be placed'; the deponent *consolatus* was often translated as passive and several did not appreciate that *iacentem* describes Ovid himself 'lying down' (metaphorically 'dead'); the last line was translated well except that few knew the word *usque* = 'continuously'.

Conclusion:

Where candidates lost the sense, their written English tended to deteriorate and the result was often nonsense. It is very important that candidates, however difficult they find an unseen piece, particularly in the case of verse, do write full English sentences which are grammatically correct and make sense. It is important constantly to bear in mind what the author is saying.

The mark obtained by candidates for **Question 2** was often comparable to the mark they scored for **Question 1**. In fact, several scored higher marks for **Question 2**, showing a better appreciation of Ovid's poetic style and technique than Livy's military narrative.

(b) The scansion question caused few difficulties. A few candidates thought that the first syllable of the 3rd foot of the pentameter was short. It is allowable in all cases to mark the final syllable of the hexameter and pentameter with an x (anceps).

LATIN

Paper 9788/04

Prose Composition or Comprehension

General comments

Most candidates chose to tackle the prose composition. There was some excellent Latin produced. Grammar and syntax tended to be accurate; there was a good understanding of appropriate word order, and the best candidates were prepared to attempt a variety of subordinate clauses. Some ventured into oratio obliqua, usually with no little success.

Specific comments

Many candidates began with an ablative absolute; some added a connecting relative. After such a promising start, there was a surprising lack of certainty over how to translate *for a moment*. In the second sentence most grasped the need for a result clause, but some did not render *so long*. Many candidates did well with a subjunctive for *was forced*. In the second sentence – often translated extremely well – there was some confusion over the syntax of indirect questions. *Let me mount the rostra* occasioned some ingenious circumlocutions, such as *da mihi occasionem ascendendi rostra*, though the parenthesis in this sentence caused some some trouble. For *a man* it was surprising to see such little use of *quidam* and, similarly, few candidates took the economical route of using *vix* for *with great difficulty*. It was pleasant to see that some candidates understood the predicative dative, though its use in the phrase *assisted by his friends* was perhaps a little roundabout. The last sentence was generally translated accurately and sometimes in indirect speech.

The candidates who offered the comprehension found it challenging, In particular, **Question (viii)** caused problems: few understood what was going on here. The grammar and syntax questions were not done well. None knew the answer to **(ix)**, and there were many misidentifications of case in (**xiv)** and of the uses of the subjunctive in **(xv)**. It is clear that most of these candidates would have struggled to have produced much accurate Latin had they attempted the prose composition instead.