LATIN

| Paper 0480/01 |
| Language |

Comments:

Question 1: Unseen Translation

The first 4 or 5 sentences provided a sound introduction for most candidates, and those who translated them well tended to go on and translate the rest of the passage satisfactorily. For some the superlative *doctissimus* caused problems, as did the second part of that sentence in getting the order correct. *solebat* was not well known, nor were *pace* and *cotidie*. The latter two particularly provided some interesting and inventive translations which led, in some cases, into the next sentence about the activities outside the city. There were many good translations of *consilium cepit* which conveyed the idea and meaning in good modern English, though many missed the participial force of *egressus*. *antequam* was translated variously as 'before' and 'until', both of which seemed to fit the meaning well. *Camillo duci Romano* caused problems for some and led to confusion later with which side the teacher and Camillus were on. Inevitably, perhaps, there was a crop of 'books', 'freedom' and 'freedmen' for *liberos*. In both these instances, candidates should be encouraged to think about the logic and sense behind the story and to look back at what they have written. *urbem in potestate tua* also caused problems of attribution and the meaning of *potestas*. Candidates tended to recognise the ablative absolute of *quo audito* but did not always translate it well and there were many variations, sometimes unsuccessful, when trying to give a good rendering of *ira incensus*. Camillus' statement about the way Romans wage war was equally well translated as both a particular statement for the encounter and as a universal principle of Roman warfare, for example 'Romans do not wage war against boys'. The complex sentence explaining Camillus' actions was handled well, though there was a tendency to translate the ablative absolute as another indirect command dependent on *imperavit ut*. There was also a tendency not to express the idea of purpose in *verberarent*. However, it was mainly in the latter stages of the passage that many candidates fell away. Good candidates managed to express all or most of the elements of the finishing sentences, including the result clause and correct attribution of *omnium* to *consensu*. Very few translated *qui nuntiarent* in a way that showed that they understood this to be a purpose clause then followed by an indirect statement. *dedere* was not well known, as also *tradere* earlier on. It was in these sentences that those who had become confused earlier on started to make nonsensical statements about what was actually happening.

In general, candidates should be reminded to write on alternate lines and to set their work out neatly. Both of these allow for candidates to reframe their work on checking and for the Examiner to see clearly what the actual final version is. Candidates should also be encouraged not to give alternatives for words. Some candidates wrote a complete version out before producing a neat copy and some also wrote out all the Latin and a working draft before attempting a neat copy. This was clearly very time consuming and most who worked this way did not finish either the draft or the final version. This was also true in a number of cases for the comprehension and it is difficult to discern the benefit of attempting to write a full translation before answering comprehension questions.

Candidates can help Examiners by making sure that their answer papers, if separate sheets are used, are in the right order and that the Examiner is not required to hunt for the answers.

Question 2: Comprehension

It was good to see candidates of all abilities have some success in answering the questions set on this passage. Nonetheless, the passage did provide a good differentiated test of ability and only the really good candidates answered questions in sufficient depth to achieve nearly full marks.

The high mark questions **(a)** and **(c)** allowed good candidates to show the depth of their understanding as did the sentence for translation **(h)** in which many failed to spot the past infinitive force of *fugisse* and how to fit in *quem* successfully.

The word *telum* was often not related correctly, with candidates too often using the word 'sword' in **(e)** and or some other precise weapon in **(i)**. *comitis* in **(e)** was not well known. **(b)** occasionally caused confusion with the idea of handing over Alcibiades alive or dead, weaker candidates often opting for Lysander asking Pharnabazus to kill Alcibiades which gained a little credit. This was also true in **(d)** where Alcibiades was woken by the sound of the flames rather than just hearing the flames. There were some inventive suggestions as to how Alcibiades got out of the blazing cottage (including fireproof clothing) but, by and large, most candidates got the general, if not precise, idea of what he did.

Derivations were handled well, though here too there were some startling neologisms and 'mis-derivation'.

LATIN

Section 2

The general standard was very good, and most candidates were capable of confident translations of both Virgil and Cicero. The majority of candidates translated the prescribed texts fluently and tended to perform well on most questions, with very few lacking any ability to translate Latin. To judge from the general level of response from candidates, both the verse and prose selections were well-understood and candidates were able to comment on both style and content in the prescribed texts and produce personal responses to the literature. Most candidates' answers reflected good examination technique and understanding of the requirements of the paper.

Section 3

Section A Two Centuries of Roman Poetry

Question 1

   (i)   Generally answered well. Candidates were able to pick out vivid sections but occasionally lost marks by not saying why the part they had chosen was vivid or what made it so.

   (ii)   Part **(a)** was generally answered well with part **(b)** producing a wide range of ideas with some more relevant to the context than others.

  (iii)   Generally answered well with candidates recognizing Cleopatra's links to snakes.

  (iv)   Generally answered well with candidates being able to see the contrast in depiction of the deities.

   (v)   Generally answered well. Most candidates were able to translate fluently.

Question 2

   (i)   Generally answered well.

   (ii)   Generally answered well.

  (iii)   Generally answered well. Most candidates were able to translate fluently.

  (iv)   Generally answered well with the majority of candidates able to scan.

   (v)   Generally answered well. The majority understood this memorable simile and could comment on why it was suitable or unsuitable in an equally valid way.

  (vi)   Generally answered well, although some candidates did not mention the root being soaked.

Question 3

The question was generally answered well, provoking some excellent personal responses which were very well thought out. Successful answers referred to things like: the Romans being a warlike nation; national pride; pride in rustic beginnings; religious beliefs; respect for heroes; hatred of traitors; support from the gods. Candidates who answered well supported each point with a reference to the text. Some candidates wrote a great deal, but there were plenty of succinct answers which received full marks.

Section B Introducing Cicero

Question 4

    (i)   Generally answered well.

    (ii)   Generally answered well. Most candidates were able to translate fluently.

    (iii)   Generally answered well. Most answers referred to Roman disapproval of foppishness.

    (iv)   Generally answered well. Candidates lost marks if they did not make two distinct points using two separate pieces of evidence.

Question 5

    (i)   Generally answered well. Most candidates were able to translate fluently.

    (ii)   Generally answered well.

    (iii)   Generally answered well.

    (iv)   Generally answered well.

    (v)   Generally answered well.

    (vi)   Generally answered well.

Question 6

Generally answered well with candidates giving very varied opinions which were very interesting to read. Most answers referred to rhetorical techniques and gave examples from the text. A successful method to get a good mark was to choose a selection of techniques, give an example of each and say why each one was effective. Techniques referred to included: appeals to emotions; sarcasm; mockery; humour; analogy; rhetorical questions; anaphora and tricolons. The use of technical terms was not a specific requirement but, by the same token, a list of technical terms with no examples could not gain a high mark.