

# LATIN

Paper 0480/01  
Language

## Translation:

A few of the requests made in previous years may be reiterated:

Candidates should write on alternate lines, and we would prefer not to be offered several alternative translations.

Candidates should pay attention to legibility and to the vocabulary and general help given.

Candidates, where they have worked in rough before producing a final version, should make it clear which version is the final version; there is no need to reproduce the Latin text.

The passage began with four sentences with verbs in the present tense; many candidates chose to put these into a variety of past tenses. That said, the majority of candidates handled the various tenses well, though the pluperfects of *accidisset* and *speraverat* did cause some problems. It was unfortunate that a few candidates did not pay heed to the vocabulary given, as it is there to help them; most commonly *familia* and *corrumpo*. There were a number of variations for *cives* and *milites*, where the meaning is best expressed straightforwardly.

The longer sections in the second half of the passage were generally well done and it was very pleasing to see the more able candidates accurately construing Caesar's instructions and their sequence.

There was a tendency for every past participial phrase to be treated as an ablative absolute, which affected how Ganymedes' actions in polluting the water system were translated. Some candidates did not pick up accurately the indirect statement of Ganymedes' thoughts nor the force of the result clause in the penultimate sentence. Vocabulary was generally sound (though there were the usual confusions of the *tamen/tandem*, *quem/cum* type. *studium* and *idem* (*eodem*) were relatively poorly known, as was, for some, surprisingly, the phrase *quam celerrime*).

## Comprehension:

This comprehension passage was answered soundly or better by most candidates. A few candidates may have used up a lot of time by either writing out a translation of the passage or drafting out full scale answers before writing up a neat copy.

- (a) This question produced some interesting answers, especially from those who did not fully understand the variations in tense and person, particularly *victum esse*.
- (b) Less able candidates tended to suggest that the friends were terrified, though this was not penalised.
- (c) As with various instances in the translation, some candidates ignored *navalia*, given in the vocabulary.

The majority of candidates answered (d), (e) and (f) effectively.

Occasionally in (g) candidates ignored the effect of the comparative in *incautior* and here, ironically perhaps given what has been said about using vocabulary help, just used the vocabulary translation. There were, perhaps understandably, some convoluted answers involving killing or death through a misunderstanding of *moratus erat*.

- (h) *metum* was not as well known as might have been expected.
- (i) This question was generally answered well, which might have been expected with some vocabulary help, though sometimes the force of *clam* was attributed to *iusserit* rather than *inter*.

The derivatives question was, by and large, soundly done, though a number of candidates did not seem to know what a derivative is and a number of vocabulary and loosely associated words were offered rather than close matches to the original. Few chose to offer a derivative for *paene*, but it was pleasing to see both 'peninsula' and 'penultimate' appear from those who did.

# LATIN

Paper 0480/02  
Literature

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 A Two Centuries of Roman Poetry*

### Question 1

- (i) Generally answered well. Candidates were able to pick out vivid sections; some needed to say why the part they had chosen was vivid or what made it so in order to achieve high marks.
- (ii) Part (a) was generally answered well. Part (b) produced a wide range of ideas with some more relevant to the context than others.
- (iii) Generally answered well, with candidates recognising 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

This question was generally answered well and produced some excellent responses which were very well thought out. Successful answers made reference to points such as: 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 many 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 gained more credit if they made 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 varied opinions which were very interesting to read. Most answers referred to rhetorical techniques and gave examples from the text. A successful way of achieving a good mark was to choose a selection of techniques, give an example of each and say why each one was effective. Techniques which were 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 a list of technical terms with no examples could not gain a high mark.