

Report on the Units

January 2007

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Latin (7818)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin (3818)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2471 – 2480	Latin Literature	1
2491	Latin Literature 2	6
*	Grade Thresholds	11

2471-2480 - Latin Literature 1 Commentary

General Comments

Many candidates performed well with a number scoring marks in excess of 100. Again many scripts showed evidence of excellent preparation done within centres, and a rewarding sense of the appreciation and understanding of the authors and works studied.

The requirements of all three types of question seemed to be grasped by a good number of candidates, though some were still prone not to discuss both content and style in the 30-mark questions and some were tending to include style discussion in the 15-markers, where really comprehension and recall of the storyline (in effect recall of the translation) is usually the key. Few candidates this time wrote at too great length on the 9-mark questions, and this is gratifying to note.

Candidates displayed a highly commendable recall of the content and 'storyline' of all the texts.

There were some, but not too many, signs of candidates running out of time, and the quality of written communication in all answers was almost always good enough for the award of full marks.

The best quotations are not always achieved by copying a whole sentence; a focus on the key words or phrases that contain the information to support discussion is the ideal. Quotations that have a first and last Latin word and a set of dots in between are less helpful. It is important that when candidates quote the Latin, they should show they understand its meaning accurately, as there were quite a few mistranslations and misunderstandings, and it was not unknown for Latin references to bear no sign of grasp of the meaning, and therefore often the relevance within the answer, of the words quoted.

A pleasing number of candidates in the Virgil questions scanned the lines they discussed where the scansion was relevant to the answer. While most did this accurately, there were some who spoiled their understanding by confusing spondees and dactyls and their related effects.

Other technical terms of style and rhetoric were generally well-handled, though some candidates are still not considering the effect of a stylistic device in terms of expressing the author's message to his audience, and restricting themselves to merely giving the technical term.

Some candidates limited their potential for high marks in the 30-mark questions by adopting a comprehension-based rather than an analysis-based approach to discussion, by not always pulling their points together in terms of the 'trigger' words, or by limiting the parts of the text from which they drew discussion points.

The Examiners express their sincere thanks to candidates and centres for the quality of much of the work they have marked, and for the hard learning and excellent teaching that must have been behind this quality.

Comments on Individual Questions

Cicero

- 1 (a) This was generally well and fully answered, though some candidates tended to give much more detail than was really required eg of the inn at Bovillae, and the history of enmity between the two men. The immediate reason for the killing, the slaves' supposition that their master had been killed, was often not fully discussed.
 - (b) Candidates displayed a good knowledge of the key rhetorical devices though at times with some confusion over technical terms. Some did not quite see what the essence of Cicero's argument actually was and just listed pieces of rhetoric, others merely quoted and translated sections of the passage without significant analysis and quite a few of the candidates who did not score highly only referred to the first couple of sentences.
 - (c) On the whole this was answered with excellent detail. Some candidates, however took this to be a general question about relations between the two men rather than discussion of the actual lines specified.
- 2 (a) This was generally answered very well, though some omitted the ideas that the gods favoured Rome and so engineered the death of Clodius to protect her.
 - (b) There were a number of very good and fully discussed answers to this question, but here a large number of candidates did not use the full range of lines, restricting themselves chiefly to the beginning of the allotted section. This led to answers that were 'limited in depth and scope'.
 - (c) There was very clear recall of the elements lacking in Clodius' funeral, but not many candidates mentioned Cicero's contention that it was not right for the effigies of famous men to give Clodius honour or that the gods had put madness into his agents.

Virgil

- 1 (a) Very well answered indeed with lots of well recalled detail, though some candidates were clearly quite unsure exactly whom Pallas commanded.
- (b) Some candidates provided literary analysis here, which the 15-mark questions do not really require, but the best found this question very congenial as it really simply required recall of the detail of what Pallas said and did. Some found the reference to *numina* and *mortali hoste* a little puzzling.
- (c) A few wrote with great enthusiasm and confidence in answering this question, though some did not separate 'vivid' and 'moving' sufficiently, and there were a number who restricted themselves to discussion of content, and whose analysis of what made the deaths of some victims 'moving' was superficial. However, the example of Thybris and Larides was generally well analysed and, on the whole, most candidates proved that they could deal with a wide variety of points and give depth and scope to their discussion.
- 2 (a) This was almost always very well answered, though some omitted to point out that Mezentius escaped and Aeneas therefore turned on Lausus.
- (b) This was one of the best answered of all the 30-mark questions in these papers. Candidates covered discussion of a wide range of points and knew how the text could be seen as 'moving' picking up well on the points where pathos is aroused and the many stylistic features which convey that emotion. Clearly these lines had become familiar through the study of the text in the classroom. Some did not correctly identify whose *imago* was mentioned in the last line, however, or whose *ora* were *pallentia*. The 'triggers' 'vivid' and 'moving' are not just synonyms in these lines- though they do rather intertwine- and some candidates covered 'moving' to the exclusion of 'vivid'.
- (c) On the whole the answers to this question were good and characterised by well recalled detail. Some thought that Lausus was to be returned to the shades and ashes of his already dead father, which is not so, and quite a few candidates omitted Aeneas' chastising Lausus' men for hanging back. Some overplayed their view of Aeneas' kindness to Lausus by thinking that Aeneas was soiling his own hair, as a gesture of mourning.

Livy

- 1 (a) Generally answered very well and with sound understanding and precise detail. The commonest blemish in answers was not to mention Scipio's contention that Sophoniba's future was for Rome to decide.
 - (b) Some candidates did not grasp the idea of the first and second duties which Masinissa owed to Sophoniba as her husband, but most answered with clarity and good detail. The commonest weakness in answers was not to pick up what was meant by *sibi ipsa consuleret*- ie commit suicide.
 - (c) Candidates usually dealt very well with the description of Masinissa's anguish, in terms of both content and style, though there were some heavily content biased answers here. Some candidates powerfully criticised Masinissa for his effeminacy at this trying time- we are producing some quite hard hearted young people it seems. Sophoniba's calmness and dignity were well discussed, though many had *nullo trepidationis signo* as with 'no trepidation' rather than 'with no sign of trepidation' and her sarcasm in her words to the slave was quite rarely noticed, despite Livy's best efforts.
- 2 (a) This question was very well answered, often with much supplementary detail.
 - (b) In this question the candidates generally gave the passage good coverage in their search for points and came up with pleasing references to both style and content. A few candidates did not read the question thoroughly and 'overshot' by including the next few lines too, sometimes at the expense of detailed discussion of the actual lines specified.
 - (c) There were good, clear and detailed answers here, though some candidates unbalanced their answers by discussion of only Hannibal's words. Some also rather spoiled their answers by quoting unnecessarily from the Latin, without indicating that they knew what it meant.

Horace

- 1 (a) This was almost always well answered. However, some candidates omitted the reference to ships being re-launched, in otherwise full answers.
- (b) Candidates tended to focus on the single point that death comes to all, rich and poor alike, and forgot that one should therefore cut back long hopes and that after death there is no enjoyment.
- (c) There were many good, full and detailed answers here, on what had obviously been a well studied and well enjoyed poem. A few candidates showed their grasp of Horace's use of word order for emphasis and his choice of words to bring a detailed sensual picture of Pyrrha and the boy. In some answers there was some naivety, with utterly predatory Pyrrhas destroying entirely innocent boys, and the less good answers focussed on events in the *grato antro* at the expense of the outcome of the relationship.
- 2 (a) Though there were some very good and very full answers here, there was a distinct tendency to focus on content rather than style, though Horatian stylistic features do abound in these lines. Perhaps this was a less familiar poem to some candidates. Some again restricted their answers to the first six or eight lines, and therefore limited the scope of their answers.
- (b) A good number of candidates answered this fully enough, but there were some who were unsure of what was being discussed in these lines, that Necessity, Hope and Loyalty are the subordinates of Fortune and the last two, and especially Fides, more reliable and less fickle.
- (c) Generally well answered, not least by those who had answered the other questions well, but there were some who confused this with Ode 2, in view of the shared references to Caesar and post civil war guilt.

2491 - Latin Literature 2 Translation and Essay

General Comments

The quality of response on this unit was good, with some excellent answers in both the translations and essays. There were still, however a number of wayward translations presented by candidates who were clearly treating the set text translations as unseens. There were a few centres where inaccurate dictated versions had clearly been provided to all the candidates. As ever, these can only be marked as wrong.

Centres might again like to note that the commonest mistake in translation is the omission of words, particularly conjunctions and adjectives.

Centres are reminded that accurate translations which avoid omission of words and general paraphrase will score full marks.

Centres are reminded, again, that candidates should write their translations on alternate lines.

The quality of analysis in essays was gratifying. As with the examination on the same texts in the June 2006 session comparatively few essays were presented merely as a list of points from the text without discussion relating them to the question being asked, and the range of discussion points and argument balance in the best essays was extremely encouraging. However, some centres are still not producing essays which contain reference to both 'halves' of the prescription where two half texts have been studied, and this restricts their achievement of the highest marks. Length of essays is becoming less of an issue, with fewer examples of either too short or overly long and 'wooly' essays.

The examiners would once again like to offer their real gratitude to candidates and to those who have taught them in centres, for the high quality of work they have produced and the clear enthusiasm for Latin literature which their work has displayed.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Translation

Cicero

- (i) Generally done capably; very few translated *porro*; many did not see any difference between *petitionem* (campaign, candidature) and *comitia* (election procedure). The first *ut* was usually noticed, but the second was often omitted. Few saw the frequentative nature of *dictitabat*. Many left out *dilectu*, a few, confusing *deligere* and *diligere*, translated it as 'love'.
- (ii) There seemed to be quite a few 'unseen' attempts here. Those who knew the text managed well the relationship between Milo and Clodius. The commonest error was taking *praedicatam* as being from *praedicere* rather than *praedicare* and so translating it as 'predicted'. Moreover omissions, sometimes of whole clauses or sections, were not unknown.

Virgil

- (i) Much of this was very well translated by the majority of candidates; though there were a number of errors of omission or misconstruction. Some thought *divum pater* was 'divine father'; quite a few failed to see the motion of *in sedem*. Many omitted *unde* or *arduus*, or both. Several did not pick up that *Dardanidum* is a genitive plural. Taking *considunt* as 'sit/sat' rather than 'take a seat/sit down' was common. Quite a few did not translate *versa* as a perfect, and the majority translated *abnueram* as an aorist rather than the pluperfect which English grammar, as well as Latin, requires here.
- (ii) A popular choice, but not uncommonly approached by candidates more or less as an unseen. Several failed to see that *timentem* described the object, not the subject, of the sentence. *tristia* was usually given as 'sad' rather than 'grim' or 'severe' as it should be. Hardly anyone saw the past tense of *decebat*. *namque* was left untranslated by most, the subjunctive force of *negares* was often missed, *possem* ignored, and *incolumem* likewise. A surprising number of candidates translated the present jussive subjunctives in the final line as future indicatives, or badly compressed the two parts of this into one.

Livy

- (i) Quality of translation did vary here. *deductis* was often not seen as 'launched' but loosely rendered as 'arranged' or 'lined up'; *veris* was not surprisingly translated as 'men' (or even 'true men'), and *principium* as chief or headquarters, by those candidates who seemed to tackle this passage unseen. *machinas* and *tormenta* were often seen as complete synonyms. The structure of the antecedent and relative clause in *quem ... mittit* was not always grasped, *Uttica (sic)* was not uncommon, *cura* was sometimes omitted. The last two lines tended to be more accurately translated.
- (ii) As with the first Livy passage, so there was a range of standards here. The commonest errors noted involved: misunderstanding of the gerundive in *iungenda pace* and *habenda*, the structure of the *tunc dederint* sentence, which was often loosely paraphrased rather than fully translated, *fuisset* being taken as *fuit* or *erat* and again the force of the gerunds in *statuendo* and *cohibendo*, *quanto ... eo* was quite rarely translated properly. This passage seemed unfamiliar to many candidates, though those who had prepared it found it no problem.

Horace

- (i) Many translations of this passage were very accurate. Some who saw it unseen perhaps did not see the accident of *scriberis* or the placing of *fortis et hostium victor*, or the meaning of *quam rem cumque*. *Vario* was surprisingly often translated as 'Varus'. In this paper the correct spelling of proper names is of importance, as this is prepared text material. Other errors in this passage were chiefly sins of omission or not noticing significant case endings as on *nescii*, *duplicis* and *saevam*- these were not always paired up with the correct noun. *pudor* was probably the commonest omission in the last stanza and some unseen translators gave that fact away very clearly in their reference to 'huge blame' in the last line.
- (ii) The few candidates who translated this passage performed well. Where there were mistakes, they were almost universally to do with the misplacing of the correct nouns and adjectives. Virtually every noun and adjective pair suffered from this, as candidates seemed to have forgotten that it is the endings not the word order that proved the inter-word linkages in Latin, especially in verse. The other frequent slips here included the misspellings of proper names, the misunderstanding of *utcumque* often taken as a simple variation on *ut*, and not noticing the vocative in *Tyndari*.

Section B: Essay

Comments on Individual Questions

Cicero

There was a spread of quality of response to this essay. Those who were not sure in their grasp of the content of the speech inevitably tended to write undetailed essays with few allusions to the text and limited range and balance in discussion and analysis. But most candidates took their chance to recall the finer moments of Cicero's picture of Clodius' lifestyle and also discussed the comparison with Milo. Most candidates who went into detail did know the storyline of Clodius life and relations with Milo accurately. A few noted that Cicero's uses of narrative and rhetoric may well go beyond the 'truth' and/or brought into their answers sometimes knitting the point in well, that Cicero had personal hostility to Clodius and that the speech was not meant to be a biography but an invective with political overtones.

Virgil

Candidates showed a good full and detailed knowledge of the text. Quotes in Latin appeared quite frequently, often well incorporated into the discussion. Quoting the Latin is not vital but always worth rewarding if done properly. Some candidates offered a considered view of what constituted a 'hero', analysing in terms of prowess on the battlefield, respect for one's enemies when dead if not when alive, relationship with the gods and fate. The weaker answers tended to be a regurgitated narrative of the storyline of book 10, with a small amount of discussion of 'heroism' inserted at some points, chiefly the gory moments of killing. The best answers avoided mere narration and discussed a range of heroes, their characters, strengths and weaknesses. Others focussed on Aeneas alone, or only discussed heroes as killers. Only a few explored the connection between the hero and the gods, though a pleasing number tried to discuss the differences between Virgil's and Homer's 'heroes', sometimes rather superficially along the lines of 'Homeric heroes shallow and bad, Virgilian ones complex and good'.

Livy

There were some very good answers to this question though some illustrated the need to have studied both halves of the text at least in English. Those candidates who had studied the second half only were particularly prone to this, covering the parley and the battle of Zama under the headings of 'battlefield commander' and restricting 'dealing with other people' only to giving Hannibal's speech short shrift and encouraging his men before the fight. The dealings with Masinissa were a chance too often missed by these candidates. Some candidates discussed the burning of the camps only as examples of good tactics, omitting the interesting details of Scipio's possible trickery or deceit over the preliminary negotiations and the spying centurions. Few thought that Scipio was anything more than an exemplar of everything good and decent in Romans, only those candidates who showed a very detailed recall of the storyline ventured the idea that Scipio was too good to be true.

Horace

There was a range of quality in these essays. Some tended to be a regurgitation of the poems that came under the several bullet points, and others recalled Ode numbers but not much about the content of each poem. Political poems were often not very fully discussed, beyond a simple 'Horace worked for Maecenas or Augustus' and so wrote poems about them. There were signs of confusion between the tenets of Stoicism and Epicureanism and poems about the gods were often scarcely discussed. A number of essays were clearly adapted from classroom work done under similar but not quite identical titles. The best answers easily grasped a range of possible themes included under the phrase 'outlook on life' and made sensitive and well supported comments based on detailed recall of a range of Odes set, and there seemed few restricting themselves to half the text only. A few took the discussion of poetry seriously too (even if they only used Ode 6 from the paper itself) and even the difficulty of establishing any kind of real *persona* for Horace from his work; though that last point might take one beyond AS level, it was certainly worth inclusion.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin 3818/7818
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2471-80	Raw	120	93	81	70	59	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2491	Raw	90	70	62	54	47	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3818	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7818	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3818	70.5	90.9	97.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	44
7818	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2007