GCE

Latin

Advanced GCE **A2 7818**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3818**

Report on the Units

June 2007

3818/7818/MS/R/07

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Latin (7818)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin (3818)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

2471-2480 - Latin Literature 1 Commentary

General Comments

These papers set the candidates tasks of appropriate difficulty across the range of texts studied and that produced a broad range of marks, with a good number of candidates achieving high scores as rewards for their learning.

There was, however, a sense that not so many of this session's scripts were as pleasurable to read as in the past; there were more answers which, though they scored high marks, were more mechanically presented, with rather less of a feel for the texts themselves than for the notes and other resources which some candidates were reproducing.

The 9 and 15-mark questions continued to fulfil their purpose of rewarding candidates for their knowledge of the content, the 'storyline' of the texts. Very many candidates rightly scored full marks on these questions, showing detailed recall of the information required. Few candidates, the Examiners are happy to record, answered the 9-mark questions at excessive length and comments in the Reports from previous sessions concerning the focus on content rather than style in the 15-mark questions have clearly been 'taken on board' this time. There was, however, a significant number of candidates who did not read the questions fully and included references to lines outside those requested in the question. The obvious need for careful reading of the question cannot be emphasised enough.

In the 30-mark questions there were many fine and thoughtful responses. It was here though that the sense of mechanical recall of information sometimes replaced the real feel for handling the text. There were many scripts where stylistic discussion predominated over understanding of the content, and where references to stylistic points were not supported by real discussion of the Latin. 'There are several rhetorical (or even rhetoric) questions in these lines', 'there was much anaphora', 'Cicero employs polyptoton and triocolon regularly here' without any quotation from the text itself, are typical instances of this approach. This will inevitably be characterised and banded as 'discussion limited in scope and depth' or even 'signs of misunderstanding of the text' when the script is assessed.

A number of scripts, *prima facie* more than previously, in fact exhibited no Latin at all in answers to these questions: this will limit a candidate's score to band 3 (or below) even if everything said is perfectly correct.

There are still candidates who confuse alliteration and assonance. Though more candidates seem able to discuss how these stylistic features add emphasis, there are some quite fanciful suggestions about the emotional impact of certain letters. Candidates who are less sure of themselves will still proclaim that there is significance in authors' use of punctuation, though it surely did not appear in classical texts, and there are a significant number who confuse spondees and dactyls, or claim their significant presence without good cause.

Finally many less surefooted candidates revealed their uncertainty very clearly indeed by not making it clear in their answers that they knew what the Latin they were discussing actually meant. There were quite numerous errors of translation and many places where uncertainty about meaning appeared. Centres should note this. While it is not always necessary to translate every word quoted, candidates really ought to demonstrate to the examiners that they do know the meaning of what they discuss.

More positively, it was felt that where two 'trigger' words were covered in a 30-mark question, more candidates attempted to deal with both.

There were no rubric errors encountered, but signs that quite a number of candidates did not finish their answers.

The Quality of Written Communication was generally excellent, and most candidates rightly were awarded the full 6 marks for each question. Some candidates do not write clearly: it is good to remind candidates that spacing their work will allow them to edit and make changes to their answers maintaining legibility. In particular, where candidates are permitted to use word processing, might the examiners politely ask for double-spacing to become the norm?

The examiners, as ever, wish to offer their genuine thanks to all the centres and candidates whose work they have assessed, for all the hard work and scholarship which they know continues to underpin the scripts which come to them. It is much appreciated and bodes well for these candidates' future studies.

Comments on Individual Questions

Cicero

1)   **a)**   This was generally well-answered.

    b)   There were many good and full answers, however, some candidates restricted themselves to stylistic discussion without full reference to the Latin here, particularly referring to rhetorical questions (this session's most fashionable style point) or anaphora without saying what Latin was under discussion. A number of candidates also restricted themselves to only certain parts of the text. Not all candidates seem fully to have understood the relevance of the discussion of the *contio* and this indicates the need to grasp the content of a passage as well as its style.
There were some excellent commentaries on the style points in the *ergo* to *fuit* sentence, but a number of candidates let themselves down by not being specific enough about exactly which Latin words were being repeated and given significant places in the word order.
A number of candidates gave discussion of Clodius' character rather than Cicero's rhetoric- again an indication of loose grasp of the content of the passage and/or failure to read the question fully.

    c)   This was generally well-answered though quite a lot of candidates missed out discussion of *familiarissimus et idem comes Clodii*, and some thought that Clodius was setting out from Rome rather than to it. Some also thought that Causinius' discussion of Clodius' bilocation was simultaneous with the discussion of the fateful day.

2)   **a)**   This was well-answered and the context clearly remembered, often in some detail.

    b)   Again those candidates who did not score the highest marks here tended to concentrate on style much more than content and were not sure exactly what points Cicero was making; they grasped that the first sentence, for example, contained a powerfully emphatic list of important words, yet did not quite see how and why they were important. The same was sometimes true of the point about slaves and property with good comments on the anaphora of *vestra* yet uncertainty as to why Cicero was making this point. This is what gave some responses their feel of mechanical reproduction of style notes rather than really grasping what Cicero is saying. There was much good discussion of the powerful imagery of Milo with the bloody sword, but on the other hand, numerous candidates who limited their discussion either to that section or omitted it completely.

    c)   This was well-answered, though the identity of the consul and *summo viro* was

frequently not known or mistaken as being Milo himself.

Virgil

1) **a)** A surprising number of candidates did not identify Jupiter's interlocutor correctly, with Juno and Venus often being offered, and even Pallas and Turnus mentioned. 'Alcides' was not always revealed as Hercules. This inevitably led to these candidates scoring fewer marks on the second part. Otherwise this was well answered.

b) Most candidates answered this well, with full recall of the points being made. There were those who did not know who Sarpedon was, and some blamed Jupiter's own whim rather than fate for the doom of Pallas. In the best answers, candidates fully related the points Jupiter makes to reassuring and comforting Hercules.

c) Some candidates did not read the question fully and so started their discussion too early, at line 8, for instance. While this did not prevent all of them from discussing the required text fully, some did find their time prejudiced by this. In the best answers, candidates discussed both content and style and were able to use the unpleasantness of Turnus at the beginning and end of this section as reasons for sympathy for Pallas. There was much sound to good discussion of the moment Pallas' shield was penetrated despite its design backed up by the anaphora of *tot* and so on, and of the significance of *frustra, ingens pectus, calidum telum* and *una eademque via sanguis animusque sequuntur*. Not every candidate went beyond the minutiae of style discussion into the content the style supports and the resulting sympathy for Pallas, but most at least saw the implicit connections.

2) **a)** This was generally well-answered. A common weakness was omission of Juno's releasing the ship. Some candidates focussed too much on the details of the wraith of Aeneas.

b) Most candidates saw the difference between shame and despair here, though some saw them as synonyms and some seemed to be rehearsing more general past essays on Turnus' emotions without quite distinguishing them. Again there was much pointing out of style features but not always relating them to the points being made, for instance in the appeal to Jupiter and the discussion of the ship being driven onto rocks. Candidates made good sense of Turnus' thoughts of his abandoned men, however.

c) This was mostly well and thoroughly answered. Some thought that Turnus did plunge into the water, though.

Tacitus

1) **a)** Both parts were generally well-answered. Some reversed the order of Percennius' occupations, and in the second part focussed on him rather than the larger situation.

b) This was generally well-answered, though some candidates prejudiced their time by adding unnecessary stylistic discussion. One point not always fully understood was that the soldiers' playing by the rules had so far got them nowhere.

c) Here there were many good, full and thoughtful answers. In the best answers, candidates discussed both content and style, but quite a number, sensing that Tacitean style is important, focussed on that to the expense of content, and insecure recall of the meanings of some key words. The extent to which candidates grasp the meaning of the text is particularly important in Tacitus, so that the quality of the style can be seen as it should be, a support for the conveying of meaning. A clear statement of the points Percennius is making would have been a helpful start to some answers.

2) **a)** This was generally well-answered, though some gave too narrow a focus on the content of the preceding section 34.

b) The comments about the 30-mark question on the first passage are also relevant here. Though the best candidates produced thorough and thoughtful answers, there was some discussion of style almost in vacuo. Again it would have been a good idea for candidates to start with a statement of what Germanicus is trying to say and then go on to how the style supports that rather than plough on in the less organised way some candidates employed. At times stylistic discussion was a little unfocussed, with some rather vague references to alliteration and assonance rather than word order, inversion and vocabulary.

c) This was almost universally well and thoroughly answered, with clear recall of the events being described.

Tacitus

1) **a)** Candidates wrote many good and thoughtful answers to this question. In less sure answers, candidates tended to focus on style rather than content so they answered rather mechanically; establishing the content, the point being made at the beginning might have helped them fix the style/content balance rather better. Not everyone was sure to whom the rhetorical questions in the first few lines were being addressed. The allusion to the centaurs was often misunderstood in terms of its place within Ovid's 'argument'. The reference to the winds was also not securely understood. That said, there was fair understanding of most of the stylistic points, albeit at the mechanical level.

b) This was generally well and thoroughly answered.

c) This was generally well-answered, but quite a significant number of candidates did not fully read the question, which specifies 'after the dinner party' and so did not do themselves full justice, by confining themselves to things happening while the party was still continuing.

2) **a)** this was generally well-answered, though some candidates wanted Ovid to be permanently tied up, rather than just until the *furor* had passed.

b) Most candidates could recall the details of the myths mentioned, but only in the best answers did candidates really answer the question by linking them to Ovid's, or 'Corinna's' situation. The identity of *Schoeneida* was not always known.

c) There were some candidates who, perhaps after essays on this topic in the course of their work on this text, discussed the sincerity of Ovid's feelings rather than how he shows his shame and anger. The rhetorical questions at the start of the section were often very well discussed indeed, as was the girl's silent reaction, though the connection with Ovid's shame was not always made implicit despite the mention of 'legal language'. The best candidates accurately and thoughtfully discussed the style features and linked them successfully to the points being made, though there were also mentions of style points without that crucial linkage and some not very successful attempts to link alliteration with particular emotions.

2491 - Latin Literature 2 Translation and Essay

General Comments

The quality of candidates' answers remains high. Accuracy of translation is very encouraging indeed and it is good to see the examiners' advice on 'policing' the quality of translation within Centres continues to be followed. There were fewer examples of whole centres offering inaccurate dictated or printed translations. Candidates answering the Ovid questions seem to have learned the translation offered them in the recommended edition thoroughly, and the examiners hope that this will not detract attention from a detailed discussion of the meaning of the text.

The errors encountered in translation remain much the same, in particular the omission of key words, especially conjunctions, or the 'telescoping' of translation of a section of the text, where detailed recall has proved more elusive.

Please remind **candidates to write translations on alternate lines**. It is absolutely vital for the annotation of scripts, that examiners are given sufficient space.

Essays continue to be of a high quality. There is measurably surer analysis now than in the earlier years of examination of this unit. In fact in many essays the quality of analysis is very high, but not as well supported by text reference as the examiners would like. Athough this is testimony to the work on analytical thinking done within centres, candidates should be reminded that text reference is crucial, as is reference to both 'halves' of the text too, where two half texts have been studied. To balance this, there are many examples of lengthy essays, and in this session that does often seem to have been an indication of quality. Given that analysis is becoming better developed, the surest candidates are adding a lot of text references to their work, and this leads to fuller essays, though again the examiners would remind candidates that length is not the only criterion for success, and they must beware of prolixity for its own sake.

There were no examples of rubric errors, most candidates completed all the questions attempted, and most candidates achieved a well deserved full mark for the quality of their written communication.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Translation

Cicero

(i) This was generally accurately translated, though the following weaknesses arose:
- handling of the double negative in the first section
- omission of *hoc, primum* and/or *ipse*
- handling of the subjunctive tenses.

(ii) There were many very sound and sure translations of this passage, except for:
- omission of *aliter* and *−ve*
- telescoping of *vicissitudines* and *ordines* into one phrase
- omission of the first *et* in the last section
- translation of *posteris* as 'ancestors'.

Virgil

(i) There was a range of achievement in this passage, many fully accurate versions, but a good number of 'boss shots' in various sections, for example,
- confusion of the proper names; which were Italians and which Trojans
- omission of *quandoquidem*
- mention of wives or marriage contracts at the sight of *coniungi*
- misunderstanding of the forms of *quisque* throughout the passage
- inaccuracy in the tense of *habebo*
- telescoping of *malo* and *sinistris* into one 'bad'
- mistranslation of *laborem.*

(ii) Common errors in this otherwise accurate translation included the following:
- translation of *longo* as if it were *longe*
- taking of *deus* as plural and failure to see its connection with *dextra*
- the impression that Mezentius is setting his weapon free at the sight of *libro*
- misunderstanding of who is described as *indutum*
- omission of *ipsum*
- translation of *stridentem* as 'striding' and omisson of *eminus.*

Tacitus

(i) There were many very accurate translations here, despite the following mistakes:
- omission of *iam*
- confusion in translating *veteres* and *priscis*
- translation of *imperatoribus* as emperors.

(ii) There were relatively few examples of this translation: they were almost always very well done, the only weak point being poor translation of *certaturus*.

Ovid

(i) There were a good number of completely accurate translations here; those who tripped up did so at the following places:
- omission of *subducto corpore*
- omission of *leniter*
- translation of *inoffensos*, perhaps inevitably as 'inoffensive'
- omission of *at*
- misprision of the tense of *iturus*
- failure to notice the person of *audirem*
- omission of *leviter.*

(ii) Again there were many really, even completely accurate translations of this, except for the following:
- *in adversos* not taken with *montes*
- inaccurate rendering of the tense of *pressurus.*

Section B: Essay

Cicero

The essays on Cicero were often of high to excellent quality, with some full and carefully thought out analysis properly connecting points from the text to the 'admirable' qualities of the speech.

There was, though, quite a variation in the number and spread of text references. Even where candidates had studied both halves of the text, references to the first half outweighed those to the second. In the best answers candidates had clearly recalled the text details well and thoroughly, especially about Clodius' character. In discussion of the quality of the speech, relatively few candidates pointed out the possibility that Milo was probably as bad as Clodius or that their meeting could have been a chance one, and that Cicero might be admired for making as much of a speech as he did out of that material.

Virgil

The best essays on Aeneid X showed clearly their authors' ability to find a range of ways in which the book was more than a 'battlefield casualty list', going into discussion of the gory horror of war, the presentation of good story telling, the development and interplay of characters such as Pallas, Lausus, Mezentius, Turnus and Aeneas. One area which might have been more fully developed was the role of the gods. Those who saw the gods as bringing in a theological, philosophical or ethical, or even dramaturgical component to warfare were few but their answers were well rewarded. There was a range of quality in discussion of text points. Some candidates used detailed discussion of text examples to support their analysis, but many were less thoughtful e.g. remembering that Larides and Thymber were identical twins but not recalling that their deaths were different, or mentioning that Juno withdrew Turnus from battle but not really discussing why she did so or why this might be significant. The answers of some candidates were limited to recounting the storyline with occasional analysis. Such essays do not score highly.

Tacitus

The best scoring essays here referred to points across the whole of the text, but there was a 'first half only' tendency, which rather excluded discussion of Agrippina and Tiberius, and even Germanicus in some cases. But presentation of the soldiers and their leaders was often very soundly recalled and in the best essays candidates considered not only bringing characters to life but doing so 'dramatically' referring to incidents with high emotional impact or even to the 'theatrical' nature of the history, with leading characters interplaying and the army as a kind of chorus.

Ovid

This essay proved to be a good differentiator. Many candidates' work showed that they had enjoyed reading the *Amores* and even found Ovid an interesting if not always congenial character. In the best essays, candidates were able to recall the text in detail and move easily from text examples to an assessment of what kind of man Ovid was. Some candidates confused matters by becoming embroiled in discussion of whether we saw the real Ovid here or just a literary 'persona' and in some cases it was clear that candidates were rehearsing classroom essays set under that kind of title. The question on the paper actually asked for rather less than that. Some candidates thought that a real character and a literary one had to be completely separate so did not always take the chance simply to recall and discuss the text, and most of these rather dourly failed to see the possibility of humour in Ovid's picture of his life and love. There was some good discussion of his not always 'politically correct 'attitude to women, not all of it from female candidates. There was a curious fascination in some candidates' work for seeing an Ovidian fondness for military language, for example 'eheu' and 'ei mihi' which did not quite hold water. A good minority of candidates plodded through the poems, often referring to them only by numbers, occasionally making a point about Ovid as they went, and some gave the impression that the poems as we have them were all in a chronological order, which may not have helped their understanding.

2492 - Latin Unprepared Translation 1

General Comments

Most candidates found this passage well within their scope. Knowledge of Latin vocabulary was not a significant problem, but a few words caused general confusion. Of the constructions, indirect statements, indirect commands, the use of the gerundive to express purpose and ablative absolutes were mostly handled well. The observance of phrase boundaries was generally good.

Common errors include problems handling:
- voice, with actives and passives switched indiscriminately
- the use of a participle as a noun
- future tenses which candidates fail to recognise.

The marking scheme allows ample scope for candidates to earn bonus marks for good English. Virtually all candidates gained at least one mark, and many at the top end gained the maximum of ten. However, most of the bonuses gained were for sensible handling of indirect statements and ablative absolutes (every instance of which carries a bonus mark). Marks were also available for improving on a literal version or choosing a particularly appropriate word, phrase or idiom; far fewer of these marks were awarded, as translations were often written in unnatural English or revealed a distorted story line. Centres should advise candidates that, to be sure of receiving the bonus mark for each indirect statement, the word 'that' must be used to introduce the English clause in order to avoid ambiguity.

Too many candidates continue to produce translations based on the incorrect presumption that each Latin word has a single English equivalent, which will always be correct in all contexts. By AS level, it is expected that candidates will demonstrate a more flexible approach to handling vocabulary; indeed bonus marks are often available for the selection of an English word that is not in the Defined Vocabulary List (though the use of one of the DVL meanings is always credited with ordinary marks).

Comments on Individual Questions

Vitelliani … lacrimabant: many candidates did not construe *victos*, failing to appreciate that it was a perfect passive participle used as the object of the verb. *Secuti sunt* generated the usual crop of passives. *Legatos* is one of the handful of words in the DVL which always confuses candidates, most of whom know only one of the meanings given in the DVL; here 'commanders' *vel sim.* was not acceptable. The final use of the gerundive in *ad pacem petendam* was handled very well by most candidates. By contrast, very few candidates appreciated that modern idiom requires connecting relatives (here *quae*) to be replaced by demonstratives, and so few bonus marks were awarded here. The ablative absolute was translated accurately, if not always idiomatically. *Victi victoresque* created problems for those who could not locate the 'and' in the correct position and for those who could not work out which noun was which. A bonus mark was available, but very rarely awarded, for those sensitive to the imperfect tense who translated it 'began to weep'.

Otho … paratos esse: in the first sentence many candidates did not think clearly enough about the story line: 'Otho was waiting for an announcement of a fight' would be a possible rendering of the Latin, but it is simply not what the story line requires here. A bonus was available for rendering *nuntium* as 'news', and a reasonable number of candidates gained this one. *Fugientes* is another example of a participle used as a noun, and once again a high proportion of candidates did not handle this a basic level, few gaining the bonus mark for 'fugitives'. *Res* always seems to cause difficulties in unseens, and here *res perditas esse* was no exception; while 'that things had been lost' gained the full marks, a bonus was available for rendering the indirect statement accurately and another for something like 'that the situation was lost'. The

only problem in the next sentence occurred when candidates were unfamiliar with the expression *proelium committere*: 'commit *to* the battle' was common but not acceptable. The last sentence was generally handled well.

Otho … non placet: many treated *aversus* as a main verb with no subsequent link. *Consiliis* was difficult and so a wide range of meanings was accepted. In the next sentence the main difficulties were the prolative use of the infinitive *obicere*, and the splitting into two of the clause by *inquit* (many candidates did not appreciate that the construction of the first half continued beyond the *inquit*). Very few candidates found something better than the literal 'price of my life' for *vitae meae pretium*. Since candidates were not expected to be familiar with the correlative pair *quanto … tanto*, a gloss was provided: however, few candidates fully understood and most gave versions such as 'the more you show greater hope…' or 'the more greater the hope you show…'. A bonus was available for the few who recognised the correct English expression: 'the greater the hope you show…'. Many candidates did not recognise the future in *erit*.

Alii … consumpsit: 'some' and 'the others' were not acceptable for *alii*. Again the future tenses were often missed, as were the comparatives. Of the weaker answers the most popular was 'in this place' for *haec locutus*. Most candidates translated *iuvenes* as the subject of *movebat*, rather than its object. Many who recognised *locutus* translated this as he 'spoke with authority'. Only in the best answers did candidates recognise the balanced pair *iuvenes auctoritate, senes precibus*. Apart from widespread ignorance of *inviti* ('all those invited') and the usual confusion between *cibus* and *cena*, the last sentence was handled very well.

Gladio … invenerunt: the great majority of candidates translated the first of these two sentences without a mistake. The ablative absolute was handled well, but *morientis*, another substantive use of the participle, caused similar problems to the earlier examples. Many confused *uno* with *una*: 'found him together with a wound'. Most knew *invenerunt*

2481-2490 - Latin Literature 3

General Comments

Once again, there were many excellent analyses of the Latin passages this year. In the best answers candidates focused on the Latin passage, and were not drawn too far from it into more general issues about the set texts. The majority of candidates organised their time well, and were able to draw all their answers to a conclusion. A few scripts caused the examiners some difficulty as the writing proved hard to decipher: this is particularly an issue when referring to the Latin text, as examiners must mark what they can read. Clear handwriting and proper paragraphing can make it much easier for work to be understood and credited. The very best answers tend to be concise and focused.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates achieved a high score for this, as they wrote clearly with a high degree of literacy and a wide vocabulary. There were a very few candidates whose organisation or handwriting hampered the Examiners, but this was to a lesser degree than last year.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Commentary

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the Latin text and an intelligent response to it. The majority of answers made clear reference to the Latin, indicating which specific words supported or illustrated the point that was being made. However, there were a few responses where the focus was more on the analysis of a translation/paraphrase; in extreme cases, this could undermine the examiners' confidence in the quality of understanding of the Latin text. There are also some unhelpful ways of referencing the Latin text which make the assessment of what is written more difficult. Quoting an extended passage in Latin (in some cases 3-4 lines in length) is not, in itself very useful, especially if the candidate makes little explicit direction to show what was important; providing a translation of an extended passage, in a similar way, contributes little. A number of responses contained phrases with letters marked out or words underlined (to show, presumably, alliteration or word order) without any explanation; some lines in verse authors were scanned, but the point of doing this was not always made plain in the discussion. Translation can often provide a straightforward way to show that the candidate understands the parts of the passage being quoted: it is very helpful if complete phrases are used and the translation matches the words quoted exactly. Where there were minor slips made, this can be attributed to the stress of examination, and by itself this does not affect the mark awarded: so too the confusion of Cicero, Clodius and Milo, which cropped up this year, as it did last year, and was only an issue when the confusion happened for an extended period (e.g. a paragraph).

There were many well-focused analyses of the passages, particularly the verse authors, and common technical terms were used sensibly and appropriately to support discussions. A small number of candidates discussed punctuation, and a few brought in terms from criticism of verse that were inappropriate to discussion of prose (e.g. enjambment). In some answers, alliteration (or assonance, or consonance) was identified without any comment as to its effect in the particular context identified. A number of terms were overused or misunderstood (e.g. *chiasmus*).

The majority of responses showed a good understanding of the Latin text, so the main discriminator was the quality of discussion. The best answers drew on the full range of the passage. 18-mark questions are perhaps more demanding, as they are more open ended and allow for a greater degree of choice on the part of the candidate. In the best answers, candidates

selected points from the beginning, middle and end of the passage and organised an effective answer. There are still too many candidates who try to write too much, which makes it harder for examiners to assess what they have written. There is no suggestion that candidates should cover every point in an 18-mark question, though the examiners understand that this is difficult for candidates to judge for themselves under the stress of exam conditions. 9-mark questions have a more limited scope, so there are fewer ways to secure full marks.

There were a few responses which betrayed an uncertain understanding of the Latin text; in some case that led to very brief answers to the questions set or to answers that were very general and hard to credit highly.

Cicero

Question 1

In their answers to (a), most candidates commented on the repetition of *tam* and the vocabulary used, including discussion of alliteration. In better answers, candidates discussed the effect of *erga nos* (line 2) and distinguished between *non modo … irascuntur* and *sed etiam … fastidiunt* (lines 2-3). Many noted that *speratum atque exoptatum* emphasised the importance of election day for Milo, and discussed the emphatic *cruentis manibus* together with the *augusta centuriarum auspicia.* In (b), the contrast between *non credibile* and *non dubitandum* was well made, though some candidates seemed to feel that Cicero's use of *hic* and *ille* (as here and elsewhere in the speech) reflected a pejorative use of *ille*, rather than a regular use of *hic* to refer to 'my client'. *Interfecto Milone regnaturum* was well discussed by some, who were clearly aware of the language Cicero chose to point suspicion towards Clodius. The rhetorical questions were also commented on, as well as the language of the final sentence which contrasted Clodius' and Milo's attitude towards the law: some candidates explained the distinction made between *per naturam fas esset aut per leges liceret* (lines 10-11). In (c), not all candidates observed the line numbers in the question, and relevant points made were credited. Cicero's use of a witness, the repeated *audistis* and the emphasis on Clodius' name were all discussed to good effect. Many candidates discussed the use of short and emphatic phrases in this passage, together with the carefully chosen alliterations (*stata sacrificia nosse negotii nihil* (lines 17-18)) and striking word order (e.g. *illo ipso, quo est profectus, die*). The lively evocation of Clodius' *insanissima contio*, together with the tricolon *quem diem … quam contionem … quos clamores* (lines 20-21), was also analysed. The contrasts of the final sentence, including the repeated *manendi* were also noted.

Question 2

In (a) many candidates noted the language (e.g. *res ipsa … luceat* (line 1-2)) and the tricolon (*nullo scelere …nullo metu …. nulla conscientia* (lines 2-3), leading to the emphatic *Romam revertisse, recordamini, per deos immortals!* (lines 3-4). The succession of phrases that follow (*quae fuerit … quae oratio* (lines 4-5) were less well discussed, and few commented on *ardente curia*. Candidates found the final section of this passage more demanding, and some were unsure to whom reference was being made in Cicero's somewhat oblique language, though many did comment on the use of tricolon. (e.g. *totam rem publicam … cuncta populi Romani arma* (lines 7-8). In (b) many commented on Cicero's description of Milo's supporters (*semper a senatu, sapientissimi hominess* (line 13)) and the further use of a tricolon (*facti rationem … defensionis constantiam* (line 14)). Some candidates were again unclear about the contrast between *inimicorum* and *imperitorum* (lines 15-16). Candidates were able to select significant vocabulary (e.g. *animo irato et percito* (line 17), *trucidaret inimicum* (lines 17-18), *patriam liberare* (line 19-20), *secum auferret gloriam sempiternam* (lines 21-22) and discuss its effectiveness.

Virgil

Question 1

Although in (a) candidates were generally clear about Juno's tone, and selected good examples from the text to illustrate this, a number misidentified the reference of *tu potes* as Jupiter rather than Venus. There were many lively discussions of these lines, and the best answers were able to focus on the detail to good effect. There was generally good recall of Venus' words earlier in the book which Juno throws back at her here. Many candidates commented on the indignant questions and the use of enjambment and alliteration. There were a few answers in which candidates were less clear about the references back to the Trojan War; but most discussed the effect of *inrita iurgia iactas* (line 15) as the final words of the speech. In some answers to (b) candidates ignored the line reference, though credit was given to those who showed how the behaviour of the gods prepared the way for Jupiter's authoritative pronouncements. Candidates commented on the effectiveness of the description (in line 20); some noted the archaic *infit* and the majority the impact of his speaking on both heaven and earth (in lines 21-23). There were good discussions of the imperatives in line 24, and the enjambment of the powerful *haud licitum* (line 26). A few commented on the emphatic *quisque secat spem* (line 27) and the authoritative *nullo discrime habebo* (line 28). There were some good discussions of the final powerful sentences and some interesting comments on the relationship between Jupiter and fate.

Question 2

In (a) most candidates were able to disentangle the repeated *hoc*, and there were many pertinent comments on Mexentius' address to his horse. In better answers candidates looked also at the enjambement of *omnibus* in line 3 and the effect of *maerentem*. There were some excellent discussions of Mezentius' words, with some significant differences of opinion about his expectation of the outcome. Many pointed to the word order in these lines and the use of alliteration. A number of candidates discussed the long standing relationship between warrior and horse (*diu … viximus* (lines 4-5), *pariter* (line 8), *consueta … membra* (lines 10-11). Many pointed to the heroic description of Mezentius prepared for battle (lines 11-12) and the speed of his return to battle (*in medios rapidus* (line 13). The powerful emotions of the final lines of the passage were also discussed (lines 13-14). In (b), there were a few candidates who made *Aenean* (line 15) the subject, but most seemed clear about what was happening, though not all pointed out the significance of *laetusque precatur* (line 16) in contrast to Mezentius' attitude towards the god, here and elsewhere. A few made effective comments about the half line (line 18). Most candidates made some well-focused comments on Mezentius' words to Aeneas (e.g. *erepto, saevissime, nato* (line 20), *nec mortem horremus* (line 22), *venio moriturus* (line 23) and the ironic *dona* (line 24). There were many discussions of Virgil's use of *ter* in this passage, and most had a very clear idea of what was happening. However, some weaker answers could not disentangle the order of events and the focus of the Latin at specific points. A number of candidates made rather general references to the scansion of some lines and the use of elision, without necessarily linking what they said to particular examples. Many commented on the visual emphasis at the end of the passage and the striking use of *immanem … silvam* (line 29), together with the interlaced word order.

Tacitus

Question 1

Many candidates responded well to Tacitus's powerful language, though there were also some weaker answers where the difficulty of the Latin caused problems for candidates. In (a) many candidates were able to identify Lentulus and discuss the key features of the scene. The use of alliteration here (*proviso periculi* (line 1) and vivid present tense (*circumsistunt* (line 2) were much discussed, and many identified *rogitantes* as a frequentative. The abrupt phrases (*simul ingruunt, saxa iaciunt* (line 3)) were identified and commented on, as was the effect of all this

activity on Lentulus. One repeated error was a confusion of *repetentem (line 2)* with *repente* (used in line 6). The majority of candidates identified and discussed the change in the mood of the soldiers, though not all clearly linked the relationship between the moon and change of mood. Candidates picked out both particular words (e.g. *noctem minacem* (line 6)) and effective word order (e.g. *claro repente caelo* (line 6)). Many pointed to the powerful parallelism of *prout splendidior obscuriorve laetari aut maerere* (line 10), though some candidates found the Latin challenging. In (b) many pointed to the emphatic positioning of *utendum* (line 13) and the pointed *in sapientiam vertenda* (lines 13-14). In some answers candidates were less clear about the role of Drusus in these lines, but most were able to explain his plan and the effectiveness of its implementation. In some answers candidates analysed the effect of the tricola in lines 15-16 (*vigiliis, stationibus, custodiis* portarum; *se inserunt, spem offerunt, metum* intendunt). The questions addressed to the common soldiers were discussed at some length, and the effectiveness of the repeated reference to Percennius and Vibulenus was commented on, as also the repeated *statim* (line 21). Many discussed the final four lines of the passage and showed how Tacitus' language conveys the return to normality once the soldiers' *amor obsequii* had returned.

Question 2

This question was generally well done. The unusual word order at the start (*arguere Germanicum omnes* (line 1)) suggests the extent of the criticism of Germanicus: the emphatic *peccatum* (line 3) leads on to the references to his family (*cur filium parvulum, cur gravidam coniugem* (lines 3-4)). The powerful language describing the rebels (*inter furentes et omnis humani iuris violators* (line 4)) was pointed to by many, and the effectiveness of Tacitus' description of the family was well brought out. Most candidates picked out phrases to answer the question (*diu cunctatus, aspernantem uxorem* (line 5), *multo cum fletu* (line 7), *muliebre et miserabile agmen* (line 7-8), and discussed the significance of Germanicus' wife and son; some commented on the different reactions of Germanicus and his wife. In (b) many discussed the opening line and the comparison of Germanicus' camp with a conquered city. The effectiveness of the narrative at focussing on the reaction of the soldiers (the short phrases, the questions) was also analysed in some depth. The repetitions of *non … non … nihil* in line 12-13 were also used to good effect, and most candidates drew attention to the soldiers' reaction to the use of the Treviri as protectors for Germanicus' family, particularly his son whose close relationship with the soldiers was commented on. Some commented on the emphatic abstract nominatives (*pudor, miseratio* (line 14)), and the short contrasted phrases (*orant obsistunt, rediret maneret*) which brought the passage to a conclusion.

Ovid

One difficulty with Ovid is that he often uses repeated descriptions or ideas: on this paper there were the repeated descriptions of the light in the bedroom in Passage 1 and the list of mythological figures in passage 2. Some candidates seemed to ignore this repetition, while others made an attempt to show how Ovid varied his approach on each occasion and what the effect of the repetition was. Some candidates showed an interest in the scansion of the line, and tried to use this to inform their analysis. The **caesura** was not always recognised, and there were candidates who scanned lines without making explicit reference to the scansion in their discussion.

Question 1

There were some excellent discussions of (a). Many candidates explored the tone of the introduction and the repeated descriptions of the light in the bedroom; in the best answers candidates successfully teased out the effect of the delayed entrance of Corinna and the expectations of the reader when she appears (*verecundis … puellis* (line 7)). Some perhaps concentrated too much on the content of these lines without making any stylistic analysis. Most

noted the emphatic *ecce* (line 9) (and a few commented on the *caesura* after *venit*), and discussed the impact of her dress and the contrast with *timidus pudor* (line 8). Many candidates brought out the point of the comparisons with Sameramis and Lais, though there was some uncertainty about who these women were. In (b) there were some excellent answers in which candidates discussed the emphatic and surprising *deripui tunicam* (line 13) and commented on the military vocabulary used in the subsequent struggle (*pugnabat* (line 14), *pugnaret, vincere nollet* (line 15), *victa est … proditione sua* (line 16). The discussions of Ovid's reaction to Corinna standing before him varied, though in the best answers candidates looked at how Ovid varied his exclamations and commented on the effectiveness of his choice of verbs: *premi* (line 20) was too often identified as a perfect tense, parallel to *vidi tetigique* (line 19), even by those who could translate it correctly. The effectiveness of *singular quid referam?* (line 23) and *cetera quis nescit?* (line 25) were generally well discussed. A number of candidates pointed out that Ovid's interest was largely focused on what he could see, though many pointed out the significance of *lassi requievimus ambo* (line 25).

Question 2

In their answers to (a) most candidates discussed the repetition of *militat omnis amans* and pointed to the humour of *habet sua castra Cupido* (line 1); many also commented on the use of an interlocutor in line 2. Many candidates then followed through Ovid's examples to show how this comparison works in a variety of aspects; they discussed the use *anaphora* (e.g. line 4), enjambment (line 12), word play (e.g. lines 4, 6) and other techniques. Most were able to identify humour, and trace how the comparison becomes rather strained by line 12. The (b) question caused some candidates difficulty: in the best answers candidates looked at each of the four examples, and made one or more appropriate stylistic comments about each. The couplet dealing with Achilles was probably dealt with most effectively, and the majority of candidates commented on the imperative in line 16. Some candidates were unsure what to say about *Atrides* (line 19), though a number did look beyond this poem to others in *Amores 1* where the poet seems interested in hair: some answers did not identify either *Atrides* or *Priameide*. Relatively few candidates made the point, with reference to the final example, that love happens even to gods. In (c), not all candidates were able to explain that the poem returns to the poet himself (*ipse ego* (line 23)) and shows the effect of love on his lifestyle. The military vocabulary (*in castris aera merere suis* (line 26) & *agilem et nocturna bella gerentem* (line 27), together with the strong verbs (*inpulit* (line 25) & *iussit* (line 26)), links back to the opening of the poem, and many commented on the effectiveness of ending with *amet*, as the word brings the poem full circle.

Section B: Essay

There were some excellent essays that were a pleasure to read: well-focused, clearly organised and lively in their response to the question. There were also a number of essays which reflected too closely work done in advance of the exam; for example, essays which reflected a range of issues raised in class discussion which were then listed together without any explicit reference to the question set. There were also a number which showed evidence of a wider understanding of the author which resulted in an essay focused on, for example, the depiction of character by Tacitus, with the main examples discussed Tiberius and Nero, rather than material that was explicitly drawn from the set sections of *Annales* 1. The essay question was tackled last by the majority of candidates. In some cases, this meant that the essay was harder to read, and that the later stages were not so effectively planned.

Cicero

This essay proved fairly straightforward, and candidates adopted a number of approaches. Some discussed the speech in its historical context and compared the facts of the case to the version provided by Asconius. However, there was no requirement for candidates to adopt this

approach, and many looked at the speech as a rhetorical exercise, and sought to show how it was constructed by Cicero to provide an effective defence. Many candidates made use of the passages for comment to provide examples of the way Cicero attempted to manipulate his audience, but they also brought in a range of examples from other parts of the speech. The best answers provided an assessment of what the candidate found convincing or otherwise about the speech, and backed this up with evidence drawn from the text. Some less strong answers referred vaguely to the ways Cicero blackened Clodius' name and to the techniques he used.

Virgil

In the best answers candidates presented a detailed discussion of the glorification of war in this book of the *Aeneid.* Most candidates were able to document their views with reference to the text and showed a good understanding of the various voices in this book. In the best answers candidates used both detail of individuals and extended analysis of sections of the book. Many candidates showed an awareness of the *Iliadic* background of this book, and attempted to show how Virgil's view of war was different from that of Homer, perhaps because of his own experience of civil war. The view of some candidates was coloured by their view of the *Aeneid* as propaganda for Augustus, which sometimes was expressed rather starkly. In some of the most convincing analyses candidates looked at the detailed evidence of the book and distinguished narrative from Virgil's 'authorial' voice. Many were struck with the 'redemption' of Mezentius by the end of the book and also by Aeneas' excessive reaction to the death of Pallas, and his subsequent response to the death of Lausus. There were many excellent answers, and relatively few that did set out an argument closely related to the title.

Tacitus

There were a wide range of responses to this title. In the best candidates offered convincing analyses of the ways Tacitus presents his material, and drew on a good range of examples from within the set text. In a very few answers candidates focused on one aspect of Tacitus' writing in isolation from the rest, but most chose to argue that Tacitus uses a variety of means to maintain the interest of his readers. In some weaker answers candidates were rather vague and general, though as a rule candidates displayed a good knowledge of detail and were ready to use the passages to illustrate what they wanted to say about Tacitus' use of language. A number of essays read as if prepared in response to a different question, perhaps one done as part of the course; a little more organisation of what was written would have made a more effective answer to this specific question.

Ovid

There were some excellent responses to this title: many tackled head on the issue of popularity and defined different audiences (contemporary to Ovid, modern) against which to test the popularity of the poems. In the best answers candidates demonstrated an excellent grasp of the poems in Book 1 and chose examples to illustrate the reasons for popularity they put forward. There were some less focused answers in which candidates put forward a range of issues about Ovid's *Amores,* but failed to make these relevant to the title. A number of candidates tried to put Ovid's elegiac love poetry in context, though their understanding of Propertius and Tibullus was limited.

2493 - Latin Unprepared Translation 2

General Comments

This year's entry, while much larger than in previous years, was less well prepared. Some candidates made no attempt to guess intelligently the meanings of unknown words and demonstrated knowledge of a limited range of meanings of the more common words. A widespread ignorance of commonly occurring phrases points to a lack of wider reading of literature, especially of works by the named authors. Elementary phrases such as *his rebus gestis*, *consilium caperet*, *naves solvit*, *media circiter nocte*, *orta luce*, *qua in re*, *magnae manus*, *voces reddidit* and *love natus* all caused difficulties for a large proportion of candidates.

Many candidates tried to translate each Latin word as they encountered it, with little or no attention given to Latinate word order. Particular problems were caused by the interruption of a clause by another word or phrase; for example in the clause *'rustice, vidisti si quas hoc limite,' dixit, 'ire boves'*, only a few candidates showed that *ire boves* was an integral part of the syntax of the words preceding *dixit.* It would appear that many candidates had become accustomed to a standard pattern of word order in Latin sentences, presumably under the influence of some language courses; the consequence of this was a widespread inability to cope with any deviation from the perceived norm, which of course in 'real' Latin is a frequent occurrence.

Many candidates appear to approach unseen translation with the conviction that the Latin will not make any sense; as a result they make no attempt to adhere to a coherent and sensible story line. Such candidates need to be reassured that each passage will tell a story that develops logically; even the verse passage, though it may have some bizarre content, will nevertheless make consistent sense overall. How many candidates would accept the notion of a 'female bull' in any other context than a Latin verse unseen? It should be pointed out that individual words translated accurately but in no sort of context will not score highly.

Candidates also need to be reminded that up to ten bonus marks are awarded in each passage for the use of appropriate English expression. Every time a word or phrase appears that sounds unnatural when translated literally, a bonus mark will be available for any reasonable improvement. For example, in the Caesar passage, the literal 'for the thing' (*pro re*) is very feeble; 'according to circumstance' is much more meaningful and gains a bonus. This year few candidates gave any thought to improving on the literal; often the few bonuses awarded were gained almost by accident rather than from a conscious attempt to improve on the literal. There were, however, a few strong scripts which were awarded the full ten bonus marks on both passages. A disappointing trend was for candidates to write a correct version and then cross it out and replace it with something incorrect; a few more moments' reflection and attention to the story line might have prevented this.

Many candidates appeared to believe it acceptable to provide alternative versions of words, phrases and even whole clauses. This practice is not acceptable and, where a candidate gives two alternatives, of which one is wrong, no credit will be given. It is, however, acceptable to write 'lit.' followed by a literal version in brackets following an improved rendering. Some candidates left gaps rather than guessing; this is poor practice as a wrong guess can still be partially correct.

Comments on Individual Questions

Caesar

Some candidates employed a range of nautical and military terminology correctly, which was commendable. Examiners noted that a high proportion of candidates seemed unfamiliar with 4th declension nouns.

His rebus gestis … caperet: half the candidates could not deliver a sensible rendering of the opening *his rebus gestis*; it should be clear from the English introduction that 'wage' (by far the most popular choice) was wholly inappropriate in this context. The ablative absolutes were generally handled well, though a small percentage of candidates converted *Labieno relicto* into a main clause without later modification to the syntax or punctuation. Many candidates thought that Labienus was the name of the land, and a number left his name in the ablative: this was penalised. *Milibus* was unknown or confused with *militibus* by very many candidates. *Portus* was almost universally treated as the singular subject of a passive *tueretur*. Most candidates tried to turn the phrase *rem frumentariam* into two independent ideas, such as 'corn for the state'. In fact the word *res* seemed to cause difficulty almost every time it appeared, despite its frequency of use in both Caesar and Ovid. Many candidates were confused by the use of *quae* to mean *ea quae*. For *gererentur* 'were being waged' was not accepted. Half the candidates confused *cognoscere* with *intellegere*. The separation of *consilium* from *caperet* prevented most candidates from seeking a link between the two words. *Pro tempore* and *pro re* called for rational thinking, but rarely received it. The many candidates who knew only the meaning 'before' for *pro* gained little credit. Bonus marks were available for the more sensible 'appropriate to the time and circumstances'. Nearly all candidates noted the first of the purpose clauses, but many failed to see the continuing purpose clauses.

ipse … conspexit: a bonus mark was awarded to candidates who added the name 'Caesar' to *ipse* to remove ambiguity. Many candidates did not translate *pari* correctly. *Quem in continente reliquerat* was often translated as 'that had been left on the continent'; had the agent 'by him' been added full marks would have been awarded. For *ad solis occasum*, both 'at sunset' and 'towards the west' were accepted; a large minority of candidates did not recognise the phrase at all and wrote about 'opportunities'. Most of the candidates who understood the basic meaning of the phrase *naves solvit* lacked the confidence to write simply 'he set sail', preferring safety with 'he set sail the ships', thereby losing the chance of a bonus mark. Very few candidates gave anything acceptable for *provectus*, either omitting the sense of the prefix or having to guess through ignorance of *vehor* (confusion with *profectus* was widespread). Despite its position, *circiter* was routinely removed from its context and taken with *provectus* or *intermisso*. Most candidates failed to grasp that *Africo* and *vento* were two distinct winds. Intuition was needed to work out a sensible meaning for *intermisso*; 'having been sent between' was both the commonest rendering and meaningless. Most saw the meaning of *cursum tenuit* (though there were many curses); a small percentage earned a bonus with the improvement 'he could not hold his course'. Most candidates confused *longius* with *diutius* or failed to see the comparative ending. *Delatus* was almost universally 'delayed'. Half the candidates did not recognise *orta luce* as a time phrase. *Sub sinistra*, admittedly a relatively uncommon usage, was accurately rendered by fewer than half the candidates (something better than 'under the left' was needed); the worst error was to take *sub* with *luce.* Only a few candidates clearly understood the import of *relictam* (that Britain was being left behind as the tide and wind carried him further away from it).

tum … laudanda: almost everyone translated *tum rursus* correctly, but only some made sense of *secutus* ('cutting' was frequent, while many made the participle agree with the tide). In *ut eam partem*, *eam* was frequently omitted. Whilst 'capture' or even 'seize' was accepted for *caperet*, a bonus was available for the more adventurous 'reach'. *Qua* was almost universally 'which' and very few candidates made *optimum* agree with *egressum*, as *qua* proved by far the more attractive alternative. *Aestas* was regularly confused with *aestus* and *superiore* rarely translated

correctly. *Qua in re* (for which the basic 'in which thing' gained full marks but 'in this enterprise' gained two bonus marks) defeated all but a few candidates; most did not see that *qua* qualified *re*. Because *fuit* was separated from *laudanda* by two other words, half the candidates did not recognise the gerundive of obligation.

accessum est … abdiderant: most produced something sensible for the impersonal passive, though 'entered' and 'sailed' were not quite on target. *Meridiano* generated a host of wild guesses, though many got it right. 'He was not seen by the enemy' for *neque hostis est visus* was just as common as the correct 'the enemy was not seen'. The following *ut postea Caesar ex captivis cognovit* defeated a few. *Manus* was almost universally singular despite the clear plural ending on the qualifying *magnae. Multitudine navium perterritae*, with easily identifiable endings, was frequently 'a crowd of terrified sailors'. Problems with this phrase led inevitably to further errors with *quae*, which many wanted to mean 'who'. *Octingentae* was usually eighty, occasionally eight, but rarely eight hundred. *Una* was often 'together'; many candidates did not see its agreement with *tempore*, again because the phrase was split by the verb. Few noted the pluperfect tense of *erant visae*. The commonest error in the final sentence was treating *loca* as singular (a bonus mark was available for 'on higher ground').

Ovid

quisquis es … vaccam: most began well with accurate renderings of *quisquis es*, and most gave something acceptable for the rather odd use of *hospes* ('guest', 'host' and 'friend' were all acceptable). The first problem came with *armenta*, which should have been easily guessable from the introduction to the passage; 'armed men' was a frequent attempt. Because *haec* was separated from *armenta* by a word and line break, half the candidates missed the connection. The much more difficult elliptical expression *vidisse nega*, by contrast, was handled well by most candidates; indeed very many earned at least one of the bonus marks available for improving on the literal 'deny to have seen'. The glossing of *neu* as equivalent to *et ne* appeared to help few candidates; most took it to mean 'nor'. The clause *neu gratia facto nulla rependatur* was almost certainly the most difficult in the passage, and only a small minority saw its meaning; most treated *nulla* as 'nothing' and made *facto* a participle agreeing with either *nulla* or *gratia* (which was nearly always taken as ablative). Most candidates handled *nitidam cape praemia vaccam* successfully, but quite a few thought that *cape* was 'head' (occasionally even 'cape'), many failed to offer a guess for *vaccam*, despite obvious modern derivatives, the use of the word in last year's verse passage, and the clearly defined context.

et dedit … abire: most candidates made *accepta* agree with *voces* rather than with *vaccam*. Most candidates scored bonus marks for rendering the underlying sense of *dedit* 'he gave it to him', *voces* ('words') and *reddidit* ('replied'). Very few connected *eas* with *ire*; the great majority thought it was part of *esse. Lapis* caused an unprecedented explosion in the rabbit population of Britain. Most thought *iste* was a simple alternative for *hic*. Many were able to connect *furta* with the more widely known *fur* and produced a sensible meaning. Equally many failed to recognise the future of *loquetur*. The most popular renderings of *simulat* were 'as soon as' and 'at the same time'. Only a few candidates saw that *Iove natus* meant ' the son of Jupiter'.

mox redit … tauro: *mox redit* was nearly always correct; *versa pariter cum voce figura* was nearly always wrong, because few could see that *cum* was dependent on *pariter*, or that *versa* was the participle of *verto* agreeing with *figura*; many imagined the penning of verses, even figured ones. The majority of candidates found *'Vidisti si quas hoc limite,' dixit, 'ire boves'* difficult: few saw that inversion of *vidisti si* was necessary, treating it instead as introducing an indirect question; many did not connect *ire boves* with the first half because of the intervening *dixit* and despite the punctuation, writing 'go cattle' as a lame coda; 'oxen' was common for *boves* despite the context and the feminine form of the qualifying *quas*, which itself was rarely linked to *boves*. In the next sentence, the imperative *fer* was rarely known, *opem* was nearly always 'work' or 'task' and the *–que* misplaced. In the final sentence of this section the word

order and agreements caused serious problems for nearly all candidates, half of whom parted company with all common sense by writing of a 'female bull'; *iuncta* was linked as often to *tauro* as to *femina*, while *suo* was indiscriminately 'his' or even 'your', but rarely the 'her' that the context demanded.

at senior … silicem: most handled the first two of these lines well, the main difficulty being an appropriate guess for *merces*. *Illis* was indiscriminately 'these' or 'those' (only the latter was accepted). The tenses of *erunt* and *erant* were the only other difficulties encountered. Pleasingly *risit* was known to almost all. Vocabulary weaknesses made *perfide* and *prodis* problematic for many, as they did with *periura* and *silicem* in the last line.

Scansion

The scansion was generally well done, with far fewer candidates than in previous years losing marks for the final syllable of each line; the message that the anceps is always acceptable seems to be reaching centres and candidates. *Hospes* at the end of line 4 should have a short second syllable but, because candidates could not be expected to know this, a macron was accepted. In line 7, however, the final *a* of *figura* has to be long, and so the few who marked this syllable short were penalised.

The commonest error occurred in the middle of line 4, where many candidates tried to invert the sequence of dactyls and spondees.

Candidates must write out the Latin and write the schema above the Latin words. This year, for the first time, a few candidates failed to write out the Latin. Also candidates must use blue or black ink **not red ink** to write out the quantity marks. Quite often candidates changed their minds over quantities, changing one to another, leaving scripts unreadable. Rather than leaving this ambiguity, it would be better to write out the Latin and the scansion again.

2494 - Latin Composition or Comprehension

General Comments

More candidates entered for this unit than last year. The numbers taking Section A (prose composition) rose slightly and Section B (comprehension) quite significantly. As a result, approximately twice as many candidates did Section B as Section A. Nearly all candidates followed the rubric, although one or two candidates for Section A failed to write versions on alternate lines. There was evidence of good practice amongst individual centres and candidates (see below). Very few candidates appeared to have run out of time during the examination. The paper was of comparable difficulty with last year's and the two options were of comparable difficulty. Both prose and comprehension candidates generally were confident and competent within their chosen options.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Prose Composition

This section was usually well done, although there was a slight increase in the number of candidates getting lower marks. The overall quality of the prose was impressive, with many candidates showing a pleasing understanding of Latin accidence and syntax. Most candidates secured at least several style marks and many scored the maximum possible. More style marks were awarded than in previous years, which is an encouraging sign. Hardly any candidates left blanks and there were pleasing attempts at creativity when candidates' vocabulary failed them. The tendency to omit connections noted in last year's report was not as much in evidence. There was, perhaps, a rise in the number of candidates falling back on a "stock" verb any time vocabulary failed them.

"To defeat the Alamanni decisively": there was obviously an issue of vocabulary with "decisively". Virtually all candidates attempted this with varying degrees of success – *bene*, *facile*, *celeriter* commonly featured, although it was pleasing to see some candidates attempting the compound *pervinco*. Others attempted such paraphrases as *multis necatis* or *omnibus interfectis*.

"Julianus ordered ... the city of Augst": either *impero* or *iubeo* could have been used. Most candidates used the correct construction for the verb they had chosen, but there were some *ut* constructions after *iubeo*, the principal parts of which were not always known. The phrase *castra pono* was sometimes not recalled, with *castra* (occasionally *castram*) *facio* appearing instead. Augst often appeared in the genitive, demonstrating a lack of familiarity with the Latin way of translating this.

"he himself stayed at Rheims with another army": he himself was regularly translated as *se ipse*; the correct use and formation of the locative was not widespread. "Another" was usually done by *alius* or *alter*.

"But before he could ... skilled in raids": there was an almost universal inability to tackle temporal clauses successfully, with most candidates opting for *ante* or *prius* instead of the required *antequam* or *priusquam*. A few candidates seized the opportunity to put the verb in the temporal clause into the subjunctive. Many candidates translated the "savage tribe skilled in raids" effectively, but a good for tribe often eluded them.

"slipped between ... reached Lyons": there were many interesting attempts at "slipped" – candidates who tried to convey a sense of stealth were rewarded. The result clause was well handled, although the some candidates forgot that named cities seldom take prepositions.

"They would have... quickly shut the gates": the conditional sentence was usually approached with confidence, with the vast majority of candidates knowing that the verbs needed to be subjunctive. A few candidates lost track of the construction part way through this lengthy sentence. Many candidates omitted the word "this" in the phrase "this city". Most candidates did not spot that this was a conditional sentence requiring *nisi*, the intervening fearing clause throwing them off the scent. The fearing clause was usually handled well, but the "afraid" often became a present participle. The verb "to shut" caused problems: some candidates did not know it, others were unfamiliar with its principal parts.

"Although they ... far and wide": the concessive clause caused no problems for most candidates. The main clause. however, caused difficulties in vocabulary (both "ravaged" and "far and wide").

"On hearing ... as they returned home": many candidates used the ablative absolute for "on hearing this", sometimes even with a connecting relative. "Cavalry" was generally known, although there was some confusion between singulars and plurals (*cum equitibus* became *cum equite* or *cum equitatu* became *cum equitatibus*). "As they returned home" was managed in a variety of ways, mostly effectively.

"He slaughtered ... they had captured": many candidates seized the chance to subordinate the first verb with an ablative absolute or a temporal clause. "Booty" caused some difficulties of vocabulary, with *praemium* being quite a common choice. "that they had captured" – many subordinated this with a perfect passive participle and were rewarded for it.

Good Practice
- Sensible attempts to use participles (but not always correctly)
- Good use of gerunds and gerundives
- Indirect commands and result clauses well known by most.
- Vocabulary glosses were better handled this year, with fewer candidates misinterpreting what the gloss had to offer.

Areas of Weakness
- Usage of pronouns, especially *ipse*.
- The present participle – it is not the same as in English.
- Temporal Clauses – these seemed to be the consistent area of weakness this year. Candidates did not seem to be aware of the differences between *ante*, *antea* and *antequam*.

Section B: Comprehension

Many candidates found the passage challenging, but made good attempts to come to terms with the questions and scored well. Grammatical questions were less successfully tackled this year than in previous years.

(a) This question was generally well done, although some candidates omitted either the *acriter* or the *diu* in their answers.

(b) Some confusion was evident here as candidates became muddled by the meaning of *liberos* and *libera*. Sometimes children were in evidence as were freedmen. The flexibility of the mark scheme meant that this did not always have a deleterious effect upon marks awarded.

(c) One or two candidates seemed puzzled by the gloss of *per [me] stat ne*. Many candidates did not know *liberator*, despite its English derivative. *orto* proved difficult for some. The phrase *rem geri*, whilst not always well managed, was not penalised since a stylish translation was not called for by the question. Thus "the thing was being waged" was accepted.

(d) Generally this question was well done.

(e) Most candidates scored well on this question, despite showing some slight misunderstanding, especially in the second half of the sentence. The correct attribution of fearing slavery at home <u>more than</u> abroad was required – although a lost mark here could be recouped elsewhere in the question via the flexible mark scheme.

(f) This question was not usually managed well, although a pleasing number of candidates did score highly. The majority of candidates took *dicta* as a main verb and then separated it from the *dedit*. More than a few omitted the *ubi*; the military meaning of *signa* was lost on many.

(g) Most candidates picked sensible phrases or words to comment on, but then did not fully develop the point they were making. This is the second year of including a reasonably literal translation of the passage. This is meant to help the candidates, yet it was clear that some candidates did not refer to it at all. As a result, these candidates often floundered and made comments that were contradicted by the translation that was on offer. Some candidates wrote about line length, punctuation, alliteration (there was, perhaps, an example of assonance) and even metrical effects. Candidates do not seem to be aware that the length of a line in prose depends upon the textual edition and that punctuation is supplied by the editor.

In general candidates wrote a basic response, but often did not develop arguments clearly or failed to realise that the question was asking about the passage being inspiring – not interesting.

Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations

0 mark

"The alliteration of "e" in *equis exigite e campo*" makes the passage exciting". It is not alliteration, and this is not what the question asks anyway.

1 mark

"Livy starts with an imperative, *agite*; this is inspiring" The candidate has identified a relevant Latin word, but does not really say anything about it.

2 marks

"Livy has an imperative, *agite* (come on) placed first word in the sentence for emphasis". This is much better, since it identifies not only a Latin word, but shows awareness of its meaning and the significance of its position.

3 marks

"Livy opens the speech with the clause *agite, iuvenes* (come on, young men). By placing an imperative first word in the speech, he grabs the attention of the listeners. This is followed immediately by *iuvenes* – an appeal to their youth. This phrase would make the cavalrymen pay attention and would inspire them." A much better answer, since the candidate has picked on two words rather than one, understands what it means and adequately explains why this would be inspirational.

For more assistance on style questions the section on "Tips" at the end of this report.

(h) Most candidates scored highly on this question, although there was some confusion about the phrase *in hostem pedestri pugna iam turbatum*, with many believing it to be something to do with a crowd of enemy.

(i) This question was well managed by most candidates.

(j) Most candidates latched onto the idea of there being joy in the city, but what happened in the army fighting the Sabines proved more difficult. The problem seemed to be one of vocabulary – *decus* was often not known or taken as *dedecus* and *accendit* was muddled with *ascendit*.

(k)   This question was generally quite well managed, the problems being omissions rather than misunderstanding. It was not always clear in candidates' answers who were being led by Horatius.

(l)   Like question k, the minor problems that arose were caused by omission. Many missed out the phrase *passim per agros fusi*; the phrase *ad praedam* was usually understood, but not the case of *hosti*.

(m)   This proved a very difficult question for all candidates; the mark scheme was applied as sympathetically as possible as a result.

(n)   The cases were usually known, but the explanations were sometimes vague. So die, "ablative – time" does not quite demonstrate full understanding ("ablative - time when" would).

(o)   Answers to this question varied in quality. The jussive subjunctive was allowed, but indirect command was the most obvious answer.

(p)   Examiners insisted on some sense of the prefix in <u>a</u>volat being present in the translation. As usual, *res* did not mean thing.

Areas of Weakness
- There was some evidence of confusion over similar words (*liberi*, *liberti* etc).
- Sometimes perfect passive participles caused difficulties, not so much with the meaning but with what they referred to.
- Longer sentence structure often caused candidates problems.
- Candidates are still too reluctant to stray from the literal, even when an idiomatic translation is called for.

Style Question - Tips
- Always write a separate paragraph on each of your three points (or however many points it may be). It helps to keep thoughts clear and focussed and also helps the examiner determine where one point stops and another begins.
- Always quote Latin.
- Explain what effect is achieved by the piece of Latin quoted AND explain how it achieves that effect.
- A potted summary of the content will get no marks.
- Never mention punctuation! Punctuation is modern and supplied by the modern editor of the text.
- Never mention enjambment, since where a word appears within the layout of a piece of prose will depend upon the margins and the typeface used.
- Do mention position of words inside **clauses** and **relative positions** of words (e.g. juxtaposition and chiasmus),
- Discuss repetition! There was a sort of tricolon in this year's passage and also three imperatives.

Advanced GCE Latin 3818 7818

June 2007 Assessment Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2471-80	Raw	120	95	83	71	59	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2491	Raw	90	69	60	51	43	35	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2492	Raw	90	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2481-90	Raw	120	87	77	67	57	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2493	Raw	90	66	58	51	44	37	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2494	Raw	90	68	61	54	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. 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	340	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3818	66.5	85.3	92.4	96.8	98.6	100.0	1520
7818	66.1	86.8	96.3	99.0	99.7	100.0	1440

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