

Report on the Units

June 2006

3818/7818/MS/R/06

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 2006

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
*	Chief Examiner's Report	4
2471 – 2480	Latin Literature 1	5
2491	Latin Literature 2	15
2492	Unprepared Translation 1	20
2481 – 2490	Latin Literature 3	22
2493	Unprepared Translation 2	27
2494	Latin Composition or Comprehension	30
*	Grade Thresholds	35

Introduction

General Comments

This year saw an increase of approximately 800 candidates entering individual AS units, the great majority of whom were from Centres new to OCR. However, there was a much smaller increase (399) in the number of candidates aggregating at AS (total entry 1273). At aggregation at A2 level, there was also a small increase of 100 candidates.

The large number of resit candidates once again had an effect on the outcomes of Unit 2492 (Unprepared Translation 1), generating a high proportion of A grades. Analysis of the performance on this Unit included a consideration of the effects of the shortened Defined Vocabulary List.

While candidates demonstrated well-developed linguistic skills on the three language units, on the literature units they showed a deeper knowledge of the content of the texts (manifested in accurate responses to context and translation questions as well as essays), counterbalanced by a weaker grasp of stylistic analysis. Candidates should be reminded of the large proportion of marks allocated in the Literature 1 and 3 Units to stylistic analysis, and of the consequent importance of developing this skill.

Candidates should also be reminded of the importance of spacing out their responses; many candidates used as little space as possible in the answer booklets: those candidates who know they are likely to make lots of deletions and alterations would be advised to use double spacing for normal work and triple spacing for translations.

2471-2480 - Latin Literature 1 Commentary

General Comments

These units set candidates suitable tasks of appropriate difficulty enabling the majority to perform well to excellently, with a good number scoring marks in excess of 100. Again many scripts proved a delight to read, showing signs of considerable hard work done within centres, and a rewarding sense of the appreciation and understanding of the authors and works studied. Though there are still a number of candidates who do not refer to the text in Latin in their answers, the majority concentrate on discussing the Latin in front of them, rather than just at second hand through translations.

The requirements of all three types of question were grasped by and familiar to most candidates. It is hoped that those centres who have entered candidates for this examination for the first time in this session, will have felt welcomed and encouraged by the papers. Generally candidates displayed a highly commendable recall of the content and 'storyline' of all the texts. Noticeably fewer candidates this year wrote at great length on the 9-mark questions, and this is gratifying.

On the 15-mark questions, a number of candidates tried to go beyond what may be generally seen as comprehension questions on the content of the passage into discussion of style as well. While the examiners welcome that demonstration of knowledge and skill, this has sometimes led candidates to miss the point, or unbalance their time, and so centres might wish to be reminded that these questions are usually testing knowledge of the content first, and the 30-mark questions going beyond that into the issues of style.

In the 30-mark questions, of course, content and style go hand in hand. Answers which only concentrate on content were not uncommon, particularly in the Livy and Horace, but there were a number of answers which only dealt with style. Both do have to be dealt with for the highest marks to be awarded.

The 30-mark questions, however, were often extremely well done. These questions test the kinds of knowledge and understanding that anyone reading these texts for pleasure or instruction will ask of the Latin. Their structure and nature are now becoming familiar, but not, we hope, less demanding as a result. Candidates are answering these questions with encouraging ease and confidence but not, we again hope, with a merely mechanical approach to literary study.

The number of candidates who answer these 30-mark questions without any reference to the Latin is now declining, but centres should note that quotation of at least four examples from the Latin text is looked for and that if there are 2 'trigger' words to be confronted in the question, both ought to be covered for high marks; these 'trigger' words are not always merely synonyms! Higher marks are likely to go to candidates who use the whole of the specified passage lines as a source of answers. Some restricted themselves to too narrow a scope here.

There were many examples of the correct use of technical terms in style and rhetoric, and fewer stabs at high sounding technical terms. The knowledge of how the features of style work is becoming clearer. A simple reference to 'emphasis', however, is less likely to gain high marks than demonstration of understanding what is being emphasised and why and how.

A point connected with that, alliteration was much less confused with assonance in these units than in some previous years. The examiners concede that it is sometimes difficult to be specific about how these sound effects work, but it may be worth remembering that even literary Latin was intended for oral recitation and that perhaps alliteration and assonance simply give the reciter a 'springboard' for emphasis at a significant moment. This may be a useful approach to an answer for the candidate who finds it hard to explain what the effect of alliteration might be but knows there is something there.

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

Some candidates, in discussing style, wrote of the author's 'frequent use of commas' (or similar). Such discussion of punctuation is at best anachronistic. If candidates mean that the author achieves his effect through the use of a number of short, pithy and memorable phrases, the examiners would very warmly invite them to say so more explicitly.

There were few signs of candidates running out of time, and the quality of written communication in all answers was almost always good enough fully to deserve the full marks available.

Some candidates did well to mark up Latin quotations by underlining. It is useful to remind centres that the best quotations are not always a copying of a whole sentence; 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 show an accurate understanding of its meaning, as there were some mistranslations and misunderstandings, and quite a lot of random Latin words used in such a way that proof of knowledge of their meaning was not clear.

In all the areas covered above, the examiners would commend the 'advice to centres and candidates' appended to this report.

Some candidates are leaving very little space between answers. Candidates should be advised to offer examiners space for annotation after the answer. If annotation and marks have to be 'squashed' into a tiny space it is harder to make that annotation clear and useful.

Comments on Individual Questions

Cicero

- 1) (a) This was generally well and fully answered, though some candidates concentrated a little too much on Milo's domestic and travel arrangements, at the expense of discussion of details of the fight up to the point where the passage starts.
- (b) Generally well answered. Most candidates gave full details here, some going on, perhaps at the expense of time, into discussion of the style of the lines. Some candidates did not fully justify including discussion of the slaves being prevented from helping their master. Otherwise a good range of points was covered.
- (c) There were many very good and full discussions of this section, often with several more than four examples adduced. The best discussions of the rhetorical features included full discussion of the emphatic effects of the anaphoras e.g. of *nihil*, and the several tricolon crescendos. Some candidates here discussed style more than content and that was a pity as the line of argument itself contributes to the persuasiveness of the argument, particularly the final discussion of self defence as a mitigating circumstance; 'never eschew the obvious', is good advice on this sort of question.
- 2) (a) There was quite a long list of possible points candidates could make here. Some tied themselves up a little too much with discussion of Milo's travelling arrangements including points mentioned in the passage rather than before it. More detailed reading of the question is recommended here.
- (b) This was generally very well and fully answered, with candidates showing a sound grasp of the arguments used. The point about the high ground was sometimes missed out, however, and mention was not always made of the fact that the last line or so of the set Latin is a rather pointed rhetorical question. This led some candidates to miss its point completely.
- There was lots that candidates could include in their answers here and many were very full and detailed indeed. Some candidates did not provide a full discussion of the mock dialogue towards the end of the passage. Higher marks are always likely to be awarded to those who see examples from the whole of the lines set rather than just a part. Again the favoured section by those who did not use the whole passage was that which referred to Milo's domestic and travel arrangements - clearly a popular feature of Cicero's presentation of the defence with many candidates. Stylistic and rhetorical features of the passage were often very well handled indeed, though weaker candidates often simply used the phrase 'for emphasis' in their discussion.

Virgil

- 1) (a) Most candidates answered this fully and accurately. Some omitted the point that Jupiter was criticising the gods for disobeying his instructions. Some included references to points he only makes later in the text.
- (b) Generally a well and fully answered question.
- (c) This was often answered with full and detailed discussion of both content and style, with lots of good and focussed quotation from the Latin. One point not always fully grasped was the sarcastic or petulant tone Venus uses in lines 12-13 (*equidem credo ... arma*). Others thought that lines 14-16 were a genuine apology for the Trojans' disobedience of Jupiter's will, which is not quite right.
- 2) (a) Generally well answered, though a number of candidates did not see the word 'conversation' and only discussed what Juno had said about Turnus' future. Reference to what Jupiter has told her, about the role of Venus is needed too for the full marks.
- (b) Some candidates here did not cover both the 'triggers' in the question, omitting to discuss the vividness of Juno's departure and launch into the sky. But there were many good discussions of the vivid depiction of the wraith of Aeneas, with good and focussed discussion of the style and content of the Latin. Less good answers tended to focus on style more than content - both are required and content is usually the easier to discuss. Candidates may want to be reminded that the 30 mark questions are not only about style. Some candidates did not notice *quales* and *fama est* as introducing a figure of speech and had wraiths flitting before dead and sleeping people actually on the battlefield.
- (c) Some candidates here restricted their discussion simply to the verbal threat Turnus offered Aeneas and omitted the spear and sword. Some also failed to explain that the ground Turnus was offering Aeneas was his grave, and thought Turnus was genuinely offering him a home in Italy, though this would not be much of a threat!

Livy

- 1) (a) Almost universally well and succinctly answered.
- (b) Some candidates included discussion of Scipio's rejection of the girl prisoner in Spain as an example of his self control, but that is not in this section of the text. As a result, these candidates did not grasp the real point Scipio makes in the first few lines of the passage. But understanding of the remaining points in these lines was fine.
- (c) Generally this question produced good, full and focussed discussion. This question often showed very good knowledge of meaning and content in many candidates. But this was a place where style sometimes predominated over content; both need to be understood for the highest marks to be awarded. Most candidates dealt with both rebuke and respect – some omitted the last two lines (from *vince animum*) from their discussion.
- 2) (a) This was usually well answered. Candidates knew that Hannibal wanted to avoid battle, or at least battle in that time and place. The second part was sometimes not fully answered, the point that Hannibal wants to use his own history to warn Scipio not to 'push his luck' with fickle fate was not always grasped.
- (b) There were many fine answers to this question, with good discussions of both style and content. One commonly omitted point, interestingly, was the very first phrase, with its forceful message that Scipio has not been bamboozled by Hannibal's flattery in any way at all. But quite a number of candidates were more limited in their style discussion on this question, even where, as often happened, the recall of the detail of the content and meaning of the Latin was very firm indeed.
- (c) This was almost always well and fully answered, with candidates showing a very sound grasp of the meaning of the Latin.

Horace

- 1) (a) Many candidates went into detail about the natural disasters which start this poem, sometimes at the expense of discussion of the gods using these phenomena as a punishment for the sinful Civil War.
- (b) There were many excellent answers to this question, with both content and style being addressed. There were good discussions of the effect of the rhetorical questions and the desperate search through the list of deities to discover at least one that might help Rome. These were accompanied by good and focussed discussions of individual words and phrases, and word order.
- (c) The one weakness here was failure to identify the Caesars, in particular, not identifying Mercury with Augustus. Making that identification explicit was thought to be vital for full marks.
- 2) (a) Many candidates had clearly studied this poem thoroughly and could discuss both style and content cogently. There were excellent discussions of the *cervicem roseam* and *cerea bracchia*, the repetition of *Telephi*, the liver and its bile, cooking imagery and so on. Some candidates, however, failed to note that Horace is still expressing feelings right down to the end of the passage, in some cases not going beyond *ignibus* or *uror*. This produces discussion which is 'limited in scope'.
- (b) Almost always well answered.
- (c) Most candidates found this straightforward, as there is a wide choice of potential examples. The instruction 'Briefly discuss' requires candidates to show that they know **why** the chosen phrase is relevant to the question; in some cases translation can almost suffice, but there are points here which require more. A good example is the reference to finding where the late rose lingers, where the late rose is all the more precious and extravagant, and some did not point this out, merely seeing 'any old rose', as it were, as an example of luxury.

AS Latin Literature - Advice to Centres

WHERE CANDIDATES ARE APT TO FALL DOWN

- Not knowing the detail of the storyline and content of the texts
- Not translating accurately, especially omitting words
- Not commenting on both content and style in 30 mark questions on Lit. 1
- Not backing up points by reference to the LATIN (Lit. 1)
- Confusing technical terms in their discussion of style or not showing understanding of how those stylistic features work
- Not making a wide range of points in the essay
- Not showing knowledge of the whole text in the essay

ADVICE ON AVOIDING THOSE PITFALLS

Commentary Questions

- Do be aware of the approach to the exam set out above and in the introduction to the mark schemes. These are meant to be helpful to teachers as well as to the Examiners. Past papers and their mark schemes are valuable too of course!
- Do work on the candidates' knowledge of the 'storyline' of the texts, even/especially in texts where there are separate poems/letters rather than one continuous piece.

Knowledge of the content of the text is valuable in its own right and therefore vital for all types of questions set.

Perhaps read through the text first in English and establish a good *précis* of the content.
Ensure awareness of

- who is speaking where there is speech or dialogue in a text
- who characters are and what they do through the course of a text

Perhaps get students to pursue the development of a character through the text and share this with the group, or to summarise a particular section of the narrative or argument each and share that, or *précis* a poem each and share that.

In the course of work on the text or for revision:-

- perhaps produce small sections of the text for testing along the lines of
- 'this is the bit when what happens?'
- 'what has just happened before this bit?'
- 'what happens next?'
- perhaps test along the lines of 'what part in the story is played by (person or object or place)?'

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

- Do spot the potential 'trigger' ideas in a passage when preparing to teach it. See what mood or tone the author is communicating and how that communication takes place, and encourage candidates to do this for themselves too.
- The triggers are what the author intends and so will be what readers will perceive eventually for themselves- they are not just an examiner's construct!
- Go out hunting for passion, anger, excitement, suspense, tension, sympathy, shame, deceit, forcefulness in argument, indeed whatever the author seems to want to convey and what Latin words, phrases and stylistic features best communicate these.
- Encourage candidates when they practice and do commentary exercises for the 30 mark questions, to support their points with at least four references to the text. Candidates need to show that they understand what the Latin means, even if they do not translate everything they write.
- Look at examples of good quality answers to identify the ways in which they have been well expressed.

Essays

- If possible, do not skimp on the time devoted to preparing candidates for the essay. The essay is often the place where candidates can show off their knowledge of their favourite bits of the text.
- Do think ahead about the kinds of essays that might be set. There is a finite range of possibilities; remember that examiners must set essays that will cover points from the whole text not just one half of it, so the titles will be quite broad in their coverage.
- Essay titles will contain key words rather like the 'triggers' in the 30-mark questions of paper 1. It is sound to try to imagine what those might be when you prepare the work.
- Encourage candidates
 - to attempt to define the trigger words in their answers
 - to make a good range of analytical points; the more the better
 - to use all the bullet points if they can, though they need not structure the essay just around them

E.g. in the 2005 Livy essay "‘Romans good, others bad’ is this a valid statement of Livy’s approach", a range of discussions (within the context of the text) of 'good' and 'bad' is really needed-

- Are characters morally good/bad?
- Are they good/bad at their jobs?
- Are any characters both good and bad?
- Are any Romans bad?
- Are any foreigners good?

It is answers to several of these 'sub-questions' that shape a good essay.

- These points must be supported by a range of pieces of evidence from the text, of course.
- Evidence must come from both halves of a text for a candidate to achieve the highest marks. References do not have to be in Latin, though if discussion of stylistic points is useful e.g. in discussing the qualities of poetry or rhetoric, Latin quotation is valuable.
- The papers are not in 'watertight compartments'. It is 'OK' to include as examples in essays, references to the text from the translation passages on the same paper, and from the passages covered in paper 1 which the candidates have done only minutes ago.

Translation

- Sometimes candidates' answers show that translation work on the text was rushed. It is important to devote time to going through the text and arriving at a translation, perhaps as a first reading together in class, then to test it.
- Set texts are probably harder than AS candidates could manage as 'Unseens' so the teacher's role in leading translation work in class will clearly be important.
- Some responses to translation questions can be quite wide of the mark and do sometimes come from loosely translated printed or internet based translations. Be careful therefore not to let candidates 'source' translations for themselves.
- So do 'police' candidates' translation work.
- A large proportion of translation marks are lost through the omission of words, so care needs to be taken over this when preparing and testing translation.
- Translation questions are often places where a candidate who has learned up the translation can do very well, even if that candidate is less sure-footed in the commentary and essay sections. So it is worthwhile making that point to such candidates to encourage them.

2491 - Latin Literature 2 Translation and Essay

General Comments

The quality of response on this unit was very good indeed. It is particularly gratifying (on behalf of the candidates) to see that advice concerning policing the quality and accuracy of translations is being taken in centres. There were measurably fewer wayward translations presented as 'unseens' by candidates. There were fewer (though sadly, still some) centres where inaccurate dictated versions had clearly been provided to all the candidates. Inaccurate translation can only be marked as such.

The most common mistake in translation is still the omission of words, often vital conjunctions such as the first *et* and *aut* in a pair that mean **both ... and** or **either ... or**. Candidates need further instruction to write their translations on **alternate lines**. Where it is impossible to read candidates' translations marks can not be awarded.

The quality of analysis in essays was also very high. Fewer essays are presented as a list of points from the text without discussion relating them to the question, and there is accordingly a wider range of discussion points and ideas. The scripts from some centres contain essays which do not refer to both 'halves' of the prescription where two half texts have been studied. In some cases this was the only thing preventing candidates from full or nearly full marks for otherwise excellent work; full marks reward those candidates who demonstrate the required **broad knowledge** of the text. Some candidates produced essays of extraordinary length considering the time available. Some of these candidates did produce particularly full, well argued and well illustrated work, however, centres should not feel that length is the major criterion for success.

In most cases, the quality of written communication on this paper was very high and most candidates were awarded the full marks. Few candidates seem to have been short of time. There were no rubric errors.

Both candidates and teachers are to be congratulated on the high quality of work candidates produced for this unit and the enthusiasm for Latin literature which candidate work displayed. It is hoped that those centres entering candidates for this examination for the first time will have felt welcomed, supported and encouraged by the examination.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Translation

Cicero

- (i) This was generally accurately translated. The weaker points were:
- misuse of proper names; 'Gaius Causinius a *Scholar*' was common as was the use of *Interamnas* as merely part of his name
 - the Examiners felt that 'and' was not close enough for *idem* at least 'and also' was needed.
 - *iam pridem* was often omitted
 - both *subito* and *repente* needed to be translated in the correct places to ensure full marks; one 'suddenly' to cover both was not sufficient.
 - *constituisse* was not translated correctly or even omitted altogether.
- (ii) Again this was really accurately translated. Commonest weaknesses were:
- omission of *quidem* and mistranslation of *videbantur* as present
 - *nescio quo modo* translated literally sometimes, leaving the sentence structure rather confused
 - *obdurerat* and *percalluerat*; the tense was wrongly identified
 - the force of the *nam* in *quonam modo* was not seen; 'how on earth' or similar was really sought here.

Virgil

Much of this was very well translated by the majority of candidates; points of importance were:

- there was a range of translations of *Idaliae*; *Idaliae* was not accepted but *Idalium* and *Idalia* were, provided the preposition 'at' or 'of' or 'in' was included.
- but for *domum*, 'house' 'home' 'dwelling' 'abode' and even 'shrine' or 'temple' were deemed acceptable by the Examiners
- *exigat*: some candidates did not notice the subjunctive
- *hic* was quite often omitted
- *magna* was quite often attached to *Karthago* and/or *dicione* omitted
- *iubeto* perhaps inevitably, was translated as 'I order'
- *premat* again the subjunctive was not always noticed
- *inde* was often omitted
- there was some misunderstanding of what was meant by *Tyriis*
- *pestem belli* often came out as just 'war'
- *medium* was sometimes omitted
- *exhausta*; the Examiners were looking for more than 'endured' the best translations were along the lines of draining the cup of danger or enduring right to the end
- *vastae* was often taken with *pericula* or *maris*, indicating the vital need to perceive properly how the endings link nouns and adjectives in verse.

- (ii) Again a pleasing number of really accurate translations were offered. The chief points on which Examiners need to comment being:
- omission of *ad* and *undam* and/or *lymphis*; one reference to water was often thought enough, wrongly
 - *prato* was quite often omitted or wrongly translated
 - *lecti*; perhaps inevitably some candidates had young men 'standing around his bed', or seeing *lecti* as plural 'his beds' or 'their beds'
 - *ipse* was often omitted even by otherwise excellent translators
 - *rogitat*: the Examiners insisted on the frequentative being noticed
 - *remittit* the force of *re* was often not noticed
 - *revocent* and *ferant* were often not seen as subjunctives of purpose
 - *maesti* was quite often taken with *mandata*
 - Allowances were made for a range of translations of the graphic present tenses and the loose verse singular/plural usages.

Livy

- (i) Many candidates achieved very high marks on this passage. Those who did not chiefly fell at the following fences:
- the omission of *saepius* or at least failure to see it as a comparative
 - omission of one or more of the first *et*, the first *seu* and the first *aut*
 - the translation of *imperatorem* as Emperor was, of course, not accepted
 - *ipsi*: this was often left out of translations that were otherwise good
 - *componi* and *geri*: active translations of these were accepted by the Examiners.
- (ii) Again there was a lot of good, accurate and full translation. The main obstacles to success proved to be:
- omission of *ita*
 - *temptata*; translations such as 'used' or 'spoken' were common, and not accepted
 - *in castra* sometimes translated as 'in the camp'
 - *ventum*; the Examiners expected and sometimes saw references to wind. 'So that there should be wind in the camp' appeared several times.

Horace

- (i) Allowance was made here of course for text variations in the first line of the passage. Issues that caused candidates problems, though most produced fine translations, were:
- omission of *hoc* (or *te*) and even *dic* in the first 2 lines
 - *Sybarin* was not accepted as a translation
 - *amando*: the Examiners did accept 'by (your) love'
 - accurate translations of *militaris* and *militares* were equally acceptable
 - *frenis*: the Examiners were looking for 'bits' and did not think 'reins' close enough (and 'rains' and 'reigns' even further away)
 - *flavum* was often omitted
 - *cautius* was often translated 'as cautiously as'
 - *gestat*: 'are' or 'has' were not accepted
 - both *saepe*'s needed to be present in the translation for full marks
- (ii) Those fewer candidates who translated this passage mostly performed well. Where there were mistakes, they chiefly included:
- *iturum* being read as *iterum*, *iter*, or *iter iterum*
 - *serve* without the subjunctive being spotted
 - not seeing how *dura aetas* fitted in with *refugimus*
 - omission of *nova include*

Section B: Essay

Comments on Individual Questions

Cicero

Most candidates showed a very fine and often very detailed recall of the text, though some limited themselves to the passages they had just discussed in paper 1. That is fine as a starting point of course, but wider knowledge will be better rewarded. Many made a fine attempt at relating their text knowledge to the question of Cicero's superbness as a defence lawyer, showing that they could analyse a broad range of ways in which Cicero defended Milo well, including the use of rhetoric, sometimes illustrated with well discussed quotations from the Latin. Though not vital for success in the essay, this is always liable to be well rewarded.

Quite a lot of candidates, rather refreshingly in terms of their ethics and outlook, felt that Cicero could not be thought of as a good defence lawyer because he did not always tell the truth. Some of these answers missed the point of what Cicero was trying to do and how he was doing it. Some candidates found themselves confused about the role of truth telling after reading the Asconius commentary, which is not required reading for the study of the text and did not always assist understanding. The essay required knowledge of how Cicero selects, uses and 'spins' the few key 'facts' about the death of Clodius, and its political background as discussed in the text.

Many made the very useful point that Milo was not acquitted, and that therefore Cicero's defence had failed. Though the details of the political history outside the text itself are not required, this was rewarded, though not insisted upon.

Virgil

This was very well answered, with candidates showing a 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. Most candidates noted that Virgil wanted to show war as a horrible gory business and illustrated that side well. Many also commented on war as a means of gaining honour and a means of showing honour - a game with rules and codes of practice whose breaking shamed the offender, and again that was well illustrated. The role of the gods and fate was quite often mentioned and illustrated but not always fully analysed. Some answers acknowledged that the role of the gods enabled war to be seen as a place where men were the playthings of larger forces, or where the sufferings of individuals on the field was part of, or the cost of, the ultimate triumph of good. Others drew attention to the contemporary situation for Virgil's readers, the end of the civil wars and the hope of peace they were trying to grasp and that was rewarded.

Livy

Answers to this question were very good. Some candidates were very well prepared and discussed the characters of Scipio, Sophonisba and Massinissa, yet said nothing about Hannibal because they were not aware of the second half of the text, as Hannibal's speech at the parley with Scipio is a very good illustration of 'bringing characters vividly to life'. In the best answers there was evidence that candidates had thought about defining the 'trigger' phrase in the question. Some concluded that the 'bad' characters such as Hannibal and Sophonisba, or weak ones such as Masinissa, were more understandable and visible as real people than say Scipio, who may seem 'too good to be true'. That depth of understanding was rewarded, as was the point that to Livy's contemporaries, brought up in the Roman value system, Scipio's excellence was indeed underlined by the author. There was some evidence of candidates not engaging with the essay question and reproducing classroom essays. Candidates must answer the questions on the exam paper and pre-learnt essays are unlikely to score highly if the set question is not fully addressed.

Horace

Many candidates found this a congenial essay - and Horace a congenial character. There were lots of references to the text, most of them accurately recalled, and quite often quoted in Latin, which is useful but not crucial. In the best answers candidates analysed text details thoroughly illustrating what kind of person they thought Horace was and came up with a wide range of points about him. Humour, likeable self-deprecation, Epicureanism and the love of the simple life, his love of friendship and attempts at love all featured strongly. One weakness in quite a few essays was the absence of discussion of Horace's views of politics and Augustus, and that let some candidates down in otherwise very promising work. Candidates were rewarded for the worthwhile notion that ancient literary values make it hard to distinguish an author's 'real' character from his literary 'persona', though that was not insisted upon, it suggested a promisingly mature approach to discussing the work of this author.

2492 - Latin Unprepared Translation 1

General Comments

This year's paper represented a fair test, with a good range of constructions and vocabulary, but was perhaps slightly easier than last year's paper. A high proportion of candidates scored very highly on this paper. The number of candidates entered for this paper rose by 50% compared with last year.

There were a number of linguistic elements in the passage which caused problems for candidates. The most obvious of these was deponent verbs. Candidates frequently translate verbs about which they are uncertain using the passive voice. Whenever the agent is omitted from the passive version, as usually is the case, a mark is lost. Centres are strongly advised to make their candidates more familiar with the deponent verbs that feature in the Defined Vocabulary List since it is not good practice to switch voices without good cause.

The second pitfall was the ablative absolute construction. Only a minority of candidates had a clear grasp of how to render this construction sensibly into English. It is worth reminding candidates that at this level a bonus mark is awarded every time the candidate improves on a literal rendering. To succeed, however, they must ensure that by turning the phrase round they do not destroy either sense or grammatical accuracy.

Thirdly, knowledge of vocabulary. Candidates should distinguish *se* and *ipse*, *ceteri* and *alii*, *hic* and *ille*, *hic* and *ibi*, and *morari* and *mori*. Few candidates can handle *-que* correctly: most consider it enough put an 'and' wherever it fits into their translation; the result is nearly always a jumbling of phrases. Candidates need more practice in handling *imperator* and *legatus*, because they each have several meanings, of which rarely is more than one appropriate to any given context. At this level it is expected that candidates will select from the DVL the appropriate meaning of all Latin words; inappropriate ones are either penalised or do not qualify for bonus marks, depending on the degree of inappropriateness.

One of the reasons for slightly higher marks this year was the greater availability of bonus marks. The particular nature of the passage meant that more words and phrases than usual lent themselves to a good non-literal rendering. Most candidates scored at least four bonus marks and many scored the maximum of ten. However, it was quite obvious that many candidates pay no attention to achieving good English, often being content with versions bordering on nonsense, even though they are literally correct. It is recommended that centres impress upon their students during practice exercises the importance of stepping inside the story; this not only helps candidates to produce better English, but also assists the process of guessing intelligently when knowledge falls short.

A significant number of candidates provided alternative translations of words or phrases. Some used brackets, either for explanations or for more literal versions; others used forward slashes. Where an incorrect version is set alongside a correct one, marks will be lost, unless the candidate crosses out the incorrect work.

Comments on Individual Questions

Vespasianus ... acciperet: the only difficulties here were the deponent verb, *hortabantur*, and *militum*, which very many candidates associated with the English 'military' rather than the Latin *miles*. Weaker candidates did not know *nolebat*.

tres ... adiuverant: about half the candidates did not recognise the pluperfect tense (*missae erant*). Some struggled with the directions involved in *e Moesia* and *Aquileiam*. Very few left the accusative ending on the proper noun; those that did were penalised. Virtually all handled the purpose clause correctly.

milites ... crederent: the impersonal passive (*nuntiatum est*) caused far fewer problems than anticipated. The great majority also handled the subsequent indirect statement well. Many candidates did not know *quasi*, usually translating it as 'as'. *Rumori* was as often plural as singular.

ibi ... abstulerunt: *ibi* was often unknown. Although most coped with the structure of the participial phrase (*oppidum aggressi*), many did not know the meaning of the verb, usually opting for 'entered'. Few could handle *aliaque*: the *-que* was often misplaced; the neuter plural ending was recognised by only a few candidates; many simply omitted it altogether.

deinde ... eligere: about half the candidates, not understanding the function of *ne* after a verb of fearing, inserted a 'not' into the dependent clause. The phrase *poenas darent* proved difficult to handle and discriminated well among the candidates: in the best answers this was rendered as 'pay the penalty' or, even better here, 'be punished'; both versions received a bonus mark, while the literal 'give punishments', though nonsensical, was accepted for full marks. A wide range of tenses and moods was acceptable for *rediissent*. In the main clause, only the meaning of *imperatorem* proved problematic.

itaque ... favebant: there was a widely held view that *itaque* can mean 'in this way', which is nonsensical here. Once again the neuter plural ending of *nomina* was often not recognised. This clause was very often turned into the passive, doubtless because *nomina* appeared at the beginning with no subject, but 'by them' (essential to complete the sense of the active) was never added. The meaning of *legatorum* was often inappropriate. Most candidates could not translate the ablative absolute *ceteris spretis*: not only were they unsure of the meaning of at least one of these two words, but often the construction was not recognised, or at least not handled correctly. Many did not know *ob*. Most avoided the common pitfalls associated with *solii*.

omnes ... inscripserunt: *ac* was often converted into *ut*. Once again *nomen*, coming first and without a subject expressed, led many to turn this sentence into the passive, again without the 'by them'. Many treated *omnibus* as a simple repetition of the opening *omnes*.

aliae ... subveniret: most coped well with the indirect statement with the future infinitive after *promiserunt*, the exception being the handling of *se* (see above). Many confused *legere* with *scribere*. The indirect commands were handled well by all but the weakest candidates, who translated *ut* as 'in order to'. Few candidates knew the term *res publica*; most treated it as two distinct words. Some, ignoring the *-que*, treated the second *ut* clause as expressing purpose.

suscepto ... oppugnarent: most misread *suscepto* as *suspecto*. Many, not recognising the ablative absolute, made *bello* a nominative. Most saw the purpose clause introduced by *quae*. Many did not know the difference between *oppugnare* and *pugnare*.

dum ... occisusque est: many chose 'died' for *moratur*, despite the final sentence indicating that Vespasian was still alive; even more made *moratur* passive.

iam ... erat: only a handful of candidates failed to translate this concluding sentence correctly.

2481-2490 - Latin Literature 3

General Comments

There were very many excellent responses to these papers which demonstrated a high level of understanding of what had been studied. Most candidates were able to organise their answers effectively within the time constraints, though there were perhaps a few more than last year who failed to complete their answers. For most of those who found this a problem, it was the essay that suffered. There were also a number of candidates who were unable to deal with the questions on one of the half texts, as their understanding of the passages set was limited.

The best answers were well structured and were clearly focused on answering the question set. In both passages for comment and in the essay, there are still too many candidates who, while knowing a considerable amount about the author, make it more difficult for examiners to give them full credit through the way they present the material. Proper paragraphing can help make what is written much clearer. Where a candidate's handwriting proved problematic, double spacing was used by some as a useful device to aid clarity. Some candidates could be advised to write less, spending the time gained on focusing their answers on the demands of the question.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates conveyed their meaning clearly throughout their answers, though a small number of scripts were hard to read. Almost all candidates achieved very high marks.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Commentary

Candidates are expected to demonstrate both a good grasp of the text and an intelligent and thorough knowledge of the author studied. There has always been an expectation in these papers that candidates will demonstrate their understanding by close reference to the Latin text, quoting words and phrases to illustrate the points they are making. There were a few candidates who did not refer to the Latin text at all, including some candidates who clearly had a good knowledge of what was before them.

There are several methods of referencing the Latin text that examiners do not find helpful. Quoting a long passage in Latin (in some cases 3-4 lines in length) is not, in itself, very useful, especially if there is little or no commentary to show what was important. Adding a translation of the same 3-4 lines does not help a great deal. In the same way, quoting a longer passage by abbreviating it (e.g. *Arcades ... hospitia* to refer to the speech of Turnus in Virgil Question 1) is not helpful unless the particular Latin words quoted are the focus of discussion (e.g. *convocabat ... interponebat ... conscribebat* in Cicero Question 1, where the candidate is discussing the verbs). The best answers made close reference to the Latin text in a focused way, picking out individual words or phrases for comment, with or without translation. The examiners are pleased to see translation where it makes a point clearer and it can also make a candidate's understanding of the passage more obvious. Candidates should aim to quote complete phrases: a good example from Cicero Question 1 was *ad omne facinus paratissimus*, which many candidates used to good effect to show how Cicero contrasted Clodius and Milo, though this was often quoted as *facinus paratissimus*. This was a momentary oversight in most cases but a good instance where some candidates would be advised to slow down a little. This was demonstrated in the same section by a large number of candidates who confused Cicero, Clodius and Milo at some point; a single instance of such an error was accepted as arising from the pressure of exams, but a small number of candidates confused the names so often at some points in their papers that it was not easy to be certain what they meant.

There were some excellent stylistic analyses of the Latin passages, particularly of the Virgil, and candidates for the most part used common technical terms sensibly and appropriately. A small number of candidates referred to the punctuation of the Latin text when they might have better referred to the clause length or to the phrasing. There were many convincing discussions of alliteration in prose and verse, with clear use of the Latin text to back up the points made; the dramatic nature of Cicero's rhetorical use of language was well understood, and candidates also responded to the vivid description of battle in Livy.

In the best answers, candidates drew on the full range of the passage, using the beginning, the middle and the end, and organised the answer effectively. Too many candidates try to put down everything they know about the passage, with little attempt to organise what they are saying or direct their knowledge to answering the question. There is no expectation that candidates should cover every detail: for example, in line 17 (*o dolor ... parenti*), many candidates made reference to this line for its use of apostrophe, emphatic wording/phrasing, use of alliteration, poignancy: few candidates discussed more than one aspect, but here the quality of the discussion is more important than the quantity of points.

In Virgil Questions 1 & 2, the question specified which lines the candidate should use. This was done to help make the question clearer. Where a candidate used a part that had been omitted, examiners gave credit where a sensible point was made (e.g. some candidates said that lines 14-5 in Question 2 showed Aeneas' effectiveness as a warrior as the siege was lifted). However in Question 1b, some candidates did not read the lines specified carefully enough and a very few tried to answer an 18 mark question on 5 lines of Latin.

Cicero

Question 1

The best answers to (a) referred to the trigger words and used the text sensibly to illustrate them. Many candidates were able to point to effective vocabulary that reflected Clodius' character and actions (e.g. *mancam ac debilem* (line 1), *ipse solus ... gubernaret* (line 3), *suis, ut dictitabat, umeris sustinebat* (line 4), *perditissimorum* (line 5), *ad omne facinus paratissimus* (lines 6-7). There were some good discussions of Cicero's emphatic language (e.g. *totam ut petitionem ... tota ut comitia...* (lines 3-4), *occidendum Milonem* (line 9). A number of candidates pointed to the use of the tricolon (e.g. *convocabat ... interponebat ... conscribebat* (lines 4-5) and were alert to the significance of phrases, e.g. *invitis illis* (line 3). Some candidates had difficulty with the superlatives in line 7 as their answers too often implied that *inimicissimum* described Clodius rather than Milo. In (b) there were some excellent responses that picked up elements through the passage: e.g. *servos agrestes et barbaros* (line 10) showed the company Clodius kept; *quos videbatis* (line 11) involved the jurors by drawing on their own knowledge; *significavit ... contione* (lines 12-13) to show the openness of Clodius' actions; the use of witnesses and the reference to Cato; finally the contrast between Milo's journey & Clodius' (lines 16-22). Many candidates were alert to the impact of particular words e.g. *palam dictitabat* (line 12), *sollemne, legitimum, necessarium* (lines 16-7), *furor* (line 20).

Question 2

In their answers to (a) many candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of the way Cicero builds up a contrast by choice of vocabulary and parallel phrasing, though some appeared to think that Clodius was accompanied on this occasion by *comites Graeculi*. Not all candidates commented on *virum a viro lectum* (line 6) but most pointed to the impact of *semper secum scorta ... lupas* (line 5), and many were able to explain *tamen mulier inciderat in viros* (line 8) to good effect. There was also good discussion of the parallel phrasing in *quia non semper viator ... occiditur* (line 7), although not all candidates explained the difficulty that Cicero faced at this point. In their answers to (b) not all candidates were able to explain Cicero's point in lines 9-13 that Milo was always prepared for Clodius' violence. Many however were able to discuss the tricolon *adde ... adde ... adde* (lines 13-15) and the description of Clodius in line 15 *pransi, poti, oscitantis*; a few also focused on Cicero's switch to the *servi fideles* (line 18).

Virgil

Some candidates, though fewer than last year, scanned every line they quoted, though they did not always use this to make a point. There were some sensible references to dactylic or spondaic lines, and occasional excellent points about the effectiveness of the caesura.

Question 1

In their answers to (a) some candidates wrote that Turnus' speech (lines 1-5) could be interpreted in a positive way, but others detected only sarcasm, though there was a grudging admission that Turnus did return the body to Evander. Most were able to say sensible things about the seizing of the baldric, though relatively few commented on the scene depicted on it. The majority of candidates commented on the emphasis of *ovat ... gaudetque* (line 10). There were some excellent answers to (b), though a number did misread the line references. Most candidates commented on *multo gemitu lacrimisque* (line 15), and many discussed the image of Pallas being carried *impositum scuto* (line 16). There were a variety of responses to the next 3 lines (17-19), many very articulate. There were some excellent discussions of the vocabulary in the second section (e.g. *metit* (line 23), *ardens* (line 24), *superbum caede nova* (lines 24-5) and of the disjointed phrasing at the end of the passage (lines 25-7)

Question 2

In their answers to (a) a number of candidates were unclear about the switch to Liger in line 5. Many candidates commented on *pius* in line 1, with a variety of interpretations; some were struck by the contrast with *dictis ... amaris* (line 1). Many candidates noted *arripuit biugos* (line 5) and some commented on the caesura, so too *pluribus oranti Aeneas* (line 9). There was discussion of the abruptness of Aeneas' reply in lines 9-10, and the graphic content of line 11. The comparisons (lines 13-14) were discussed, though relatively few commented on *furens* (line 14). Most candidates were clear about the change of scene in (b), though there was a range of views about the relationship depicted. Most candidates pointed to the way Jupiter and Juno addressed each other and assessed the tone of the remarks, e.g. *gratissima coniunx* (line 17), *pulcherrime coniunx* (line 21), *omnipotens* (line 25). Juno's attitude to Turnus was discussed well with some good points made, e.g. *nunc pereat* (line 27) *pio ... sanguine* (line 27).

Livy

Question 1

Most candidates used the content of the passage well in (a), though some did not use lines 1-2 or were uncertain of their significance. There was some discussion of literary techniques (e.g. alliteration in line 3 and the use of short clauses in lines 9-11). In their answers to be (b) not all candidates disentangled the meaning of lines 11-14. There were, however, some good discussions of Livy's choice of vocabulary & phrasing (e.g. *satis* line 12; *Romani Africa, Poeni Italia* (lines 13-4). Most candidates traced Scipio's change of plan and showed what features of the Carthaginian camp were highlighted by Livy at the end of the passage.

Question 2

Although this was a difficult passage, candidates in general responded well to the vivid description. Most candidates were able to show how well the *velites* responded to the challenge in lines 1-5, and many commented on the effectiveness of the final phrase (*addiit percussis terrorem* (line 5). Most candidates conveyed the distinction made by Livy in lines 6-10 and chose appropriate references to the Latin text. Although most candidates were clear about the overall picture in (b), the difficulty of the Latin proved a stumbling block for some. There were some good discussions of word order (e.g. *igitur primo impetu ... Romani* (lines 10-11) and phrasing (e.g. *velut nullo resistente* (line 12).

Horace

Question 1

In their answers to (a) some candidates did not focus on the middle of the poem, and struggled to find points to make, especially about lines 5-8 and, to a lesser extent, lines 9-12. Specific historical detail was not required, though knowledge of this was credited. Rather the emphasis was on the way Horace picked out details, e.g. *quietum ... regnum* (lines 1-2), *nobile letum* (line 4), to emphasize the figures he chose from Roman history: the best answers were clear about how this section fitted into the poem as a whole. There were some common errors: *animaeque magnae* was associated by some with *Scauros* (line 5), and some thought that *superante Poeno* pointed to a Roman victory. Many candidates made points about word order and alliteration. Most pointed to the similes in lines 13-16, though a few conflated the two together, and were not entirely clear about the reference of either *Marcelli* (line 14) or *Iulium* (line 15). In their answers to (b) most candidates focused on the impact of the words. There were some who failed to identify line 17 as referring to Jupiter, and some identified *Caesaris* (line 19) as Julius Caesar. However most made some good points about the relationship between Jupiter and Augustus. In commenting on lines 21-24 not all took into account the tense of *egerit* (line 22) or were sure what Horace was saying here. The final stanza was generally well interpreted. Many candidates commented on the repeated *te ... tu ... tu...* and the use of the hymn form, with the specific references to aspects of Jupiter. There were some who thought *tu* referred to Caesar/Augustus.

Question 2

In their answers to (a) the majority of candidates commented on the poem effectively, making a range of points about love. Most discussed *mater saeva* (line 1), the repetition of *urit* (lines 5, 7) and the description of Glycera (lines 5-8); not all commented on *in me tota ruens Venus* (line 9) and many were puzzled by the references to Scythians and Parthians (lines 10-12); there were some good discussions of the last 4 lines. There were some excellent discussions of Horace's technique in (b): candidates generally found an excellent range of points to make across the poem and were able to make close reference to the Latin text to show Chloe's fearfulness and relate it to the end of the poem. Many candidates commented on Horace's comparison of himself to a *tigris* (line 9) or *leo* (line 10), and on the forcefulness of *frangere* (line 10).

Section B: Essays

There were some excellent responses to the essay questions and some candidates very effectively challenged the question to produce stimulating and interesting answers. The very best answers were well focused, using the texts studied to illustrate discussion. There were some very long answers, these tended to lose their focus on the question and become a retelling of the story. Some candidates were able to quote extensively from the texts in translation and sometimes in Latin; paraphrase was entirely acceptable, unless the points being made were about the use of language. Candidates should be reminded that there is no reason for them to avoid using the passages on the exam paper. Where the question focused on, for example, rhetorical technique, many candidates quite sensibly used the passages for examples to illustrate what they wanted to say.

Many candidates chose to answer the essay question last and a very few essays were unfinished. Many essays would have been improved by a clearer structure and a greater focus on the question, but most candidates conveyed a good understanding and considerable enthusiasm for their chosen subject.

Cicero

There were some perceptive essays written in response to this question. Many candidates were able to give examples of a wide range of techniques employed by Cicero in the *Pro Milone* and show how he used these to influence those listening. In many cases examples were drawn from the passages on the paper, a practice that is entirely acceptable, though many candidates drew on the wider text and could make sensible use of translation or paraphrase. Weaker answers tended not to be specific, referring for example to 'rhetorical questions' without giving examples of their use. Some candidates also related the *Pro Milone* to its historical context, though this was not required.

Virgil

There were some excellent answers to this question. Candidates clearly responded well to the text and were able to show the variety of material to be found in Book X: they discussed not only the scenes set elsewhere than on the battle field, but also showed how Virgil used the battle scenes in a variety of ways, both to bring out the horror of warfare and to allow his readers to empathise with the victims and to gain a greater understanding of the principal characters such as Aeneas, Turnus and Mezentius. There were some effective discussions of the role of the scenes involving the gods and the nymph Cymodocea; there were also some interesting interpretations of the phantom Aeneas. Many candidates commented well on the Iliadic background of this section of the Aeneid. The essays in general reflected some excellent classroom discussion and showed that candidates had responded very well to the set material.

Livy

There were some excellent balanced answers to this question, where candidates showed a thorough grasp of the text and applied it well to the question. Some candidates failed to deal with politics explicitly. Most candidates concentrated on Scipio, Hannibal and Masinissa, with some effective discussion of Sophoniba and, to a lesser extent, Syphax. Livy's portrait of Scipio as a paradigm of morality was generally picked up by candidates, but only the better answers dealt successfully with politics.

Horace

While there were many excellent answers to this question, a number of essays became little more than a list of poems with limited discussion of detail. The best responses engaged directly with the meaning of 'contemporary Roman themes': while most thought this referred to the Augustan regime and recent history, there were some who interpreted it very widely to include Roman philosophy, love and wine. A great deal of latitude was allowed in this area. However the question was interpreted, the best answers were able to focus on specific poems and provide interpretation. Candidates often showed their enjoyment of a difficult author very effectively.

2493 - Latin Unprepared Translation 2

General Comments

The two passages proved equal in level of demand. Overall the standard of difficulty was appropriate, and similar to that of last year's paper. However, there seemed to be fewer outstandingly good scripts this year; equally there were few really poor scripts.

Most candidates wrote on alternate lines. Candidates should not write in the right-hand margin. There were many instances of omission, sometimes in very good scripts, of whole clauses or lines of text. Centres are advised to encourage their students to double check that they have not omitted anything. As no candidate appears to have suffered from time pressures, all should be able to do a final check.

There were several errors so common that they represent serious flaws in the preparation of most candidates. The following are the most prevalent:

- inability to distinguish active and passive verb endings: wherever the subject is within the ending of an active verb, most candidates automatically start their translation by making its object the subject of a passive verb, generally losing a mark for the omission of the agent;
- inability to handle the conjunctions *–que*, *ac* and *atque* afflicts at least half the candidature;
- few candidates can confidently distinguish between the following pairs of words:
 - *reliqui / relinquere*
 - *hic / ille*
 - *se / ipse*
 - *post / postquam*
 - *vir / vires*
 - *cunctor / cunctus*
 - *vitare / vivere*
 - *male / malle*
 - *aestus / aestas*;
- few candidates have an eye for phrasing and word order; for example, in the first line of the Ovid, more took *diu* with *relinquit* than with *cunctata*; in the Caesar, many took *uno* with *anno* instead of with *loco*;
- very few candidates can handle embedded participial phrases: in the Caesar, *assuefacti* was almost always made the finite verb dependent on *quod*, leaving *faciunt* to play the role of main verb;
- few make any consistent or conscious effort to improve on a literal rendering, even when this sounds nonsensical: for example, in the Ovid, *laeta* was crying out for something better than 'happy' to describe the grass, and 'she seized herself' for *se rapuit* was feeble but common. Improvements in these and similar cases are rewarded with bonus marks.

Comments on Individual Questions

Caesar

Sueborum ... educunt: most candidates began well on this relatively straightforward section. The only pitfalls were *longe* (widely unknown) and *ex finibus* (often omitted). Some candidates decided that the present tenses here and throughout the piece must be historic, and turned them all into the past; they were penalised once or twice only.

reliqui ... licet: *reliqui*, *se* and *atque* have already been mentioned. Those few who used the English present perfect for *manserunt* gained a bonus mark. For a further bonus mark, candidates needed to distinguish clearly between *hi* and *illi*. Many gave 'after a year' for *anno post*. *In armis sunt* called for improvement, such as 'went to war' or 'took up arms'. Few candidates linked *agri cultura* to give 'agriculture'. While 'the use of war' was accepted for *usus belli*, 'the practice of war' *vel sim.* gained a bonus mark. Few worked out the function of the partitive genitive *agri*; most took it as nominative plural, for which they could earn a bonus mark if they handled *nihil* sensibly to give 'there were no private fields'. The comparative *longius* was recognised by most.

neque ... efficit: most saw the function of the ablatives; only a few had the men living with the cattle. *Multum sunt* was a difficult phrase, for which candidates needed to grasp fully the argument; most simply changed *multum* to *multi* to give 'many were on hunting trips', which was not quite acceptable; those who translated *multum* as 'often' gained a bonus mark. Another difficult phrase was *quae res*, which differentiated effectively: a few not only saw the reference to the sources of food, but also correctly made the phrase the subject of *alit*; most lost at least one of these links. The handful who gave 'the fact that' for *quod* gained a bonus mark, as did the rather greater number who saw that *a pueris* meant 'from boyhood' rather than 'from boys'. *Omnino* was often unknown or taken with *contra voluntatem* instead of with *nihil*. Candidates found *Vires alit* very difficult, with very few correct versions ('men' outnumbered 'strength' by four to one). Few could sort out *immani corporum magnitudine homines efficit*.

atque ... in fluminibus: few recognised the accusative following *in*. Most gave a literal 'they lead themselves' for *se adduxerunt*, without demonstrating understanding of the underlying significance of the phrase; candidates who wrote 'lead' rather than 'led' lost a mark. None linked *eam* to *ut*. A few candidates took *locis frigidissimis* as dative with *se adduxerunt*, ignoring the *ut* altogether. Very few linked *neque* to *quicquam*, or *quicquam* to *vestitus*. Many thought that *praeter pelles* meant 'except their own skins'. Fewer than half the candidates linked *quarum* to *exiguitatem*. Those who treated *lavantur* as equivalent to a deponent verb gained a bonus mark.

Ovid

Lines 1-4: the first line discriminated well. A few candidates made *illa* agree with *locum*. Very few candidates translated *cunctata* correctly; many settled on 'white' (cow), a guess which has some logic to it, even though completely wrong. Line 2 was translated correctly by almost all, though there was an extra mark for those who translated *erat* as 'there was'. *Utque* was regularly mistaken for *atque*; in other respects lines 3 and 4 caused few problems.

Lines 5-7: candidates needed to be careful to distinguish *illuc* from *illic*. Many did not translate *gregibus* correctly. Many made *herbae* the object of *petiit*, after which they had to treat *humum* as a local ablative. The few candidates who improved on the genitive *herbae* by writing 'ground with ... grass' gained a bonus mark, as did those who gave 'lush' (*vel sim.*) instead of 'fertile' for *fertioris*. 'Thus I' was not adequate for *sic ego*, and so a bonus mark was available for the many candidates who added 'said'. Most candidates made the genitive *imaginis* dependent on *dixit* ('spoke of') instead of *augur*.

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

- Lines 8-10:** half the candidates correctly linked *suo* to *animo*. *Singula dicta* caused many problems, partly because of a desire among many to force *singula* to mean 'singular', and partly because many insisted on turning *dicta* into a finite verb form. *Quem* defeated most candidates, with only a few able to link it both to *aestus* and *vitare*. There were few acceptable versions of *mobilibus foliis*, though most knew or guessed one or the other of these words.
- Lines 11-14:** most handled line 11 successfully, though many did not think to add an *erat/est* in the second half (for which there was a bonus mark). The most common error in fact was the handling of *ille*, too often made to agree with *puellae*. A literal translation of *in vacca conpare* made no sense at all (but gained full marks because of the difficulty of the phrase); many candidates treated *conpare* as nominative; 'with the cow as your mate' was the sense called for, and this gained a bonus mark. In line 13, *sua* was the main problem, since *cunctata*, having occurred previously, was not penalised again for meaning. Very few candidates translated *destituere* correctly or identified its ending.
- Scansion:** candidates often created diphthongs where they did not exist (*diu, sua, viduo, destituere*). Also, many candidates made the last syllable of the hexameter long (here it is short), instead of using the perfectly acceptable anceps.

2494 - Latin Composition or Comprehension

General Comments

There was a slight decrease this year in the number of candidates answering Section A (prose composition), with approximately 38% opting for this, as opposed to nearly 40% last year. All candidates followed the rubric and there was no evidence of candidates running out of time in which to finish the exam. There was evidence of good practice amongst individual centres and candidates. Some candidates answering Section B omitted some of the grammatical questions. The paper was of comparable difficulty with last year's and the two options were of a similar difficulty.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Prose Composition

This section was usually well done. The overall quality of candidates' answers was impressive, with many demonstrating a pleasing understanding of Latin accidence and syntax. Most candidates secured at least several style marks and many scored the maximum possible. Hardly any candidates left blanks and there were pleasing attempts at creativity when candidates' vocabulary failed them. There was a tendency for candidates not to provide appropriate connections and thereby to lose opportunities for style.

"As Alexander was ... from a friendly satrap": in terms of vocabulary here the problems were the words "neighbouring" and "friendly". Whilst many candidates knew the adjectives *vicinus*, or *finitimus*, some were forced to use such words as *prope* (often treated as an adjective) or *proximus* (which didn't quite get the sense). "Friendly" cause problems: comparatively few simply used *amicus*. More candidates preferred to attempt to use the noun *amicitia* or made up an adjective *amicitius*. "As" was often translated by a temporal cause introduced by *ubi* or *cum*, and this caused candidates no problems; when it was translated by *dum*, both the tense and the mood of the verb were regularly incorrect. The English idiom "was on his way" was occasionally translated by the rather literal *in via erat*. Other errors included incorrect use of ablative absolutes, hanging nominatives, passive verbs taking a direct object and a failure to work out the accusative of the word "Bactra", despite the vocabulary gloss.

"from which ... with his army": generally quite well-managed, with candidates usually handling the indirect statement correctly. Errors included putting the relative pronoun into the wrong gender, using the verb *disco* instead of the required *cognosco* (but where used, the principal parts were not always known), omission of the word for "with" (resulting in an ablative of instrument), incorrect use of pronouns within indirect statement and incorrect formation of the present infinitive of *progredior*.

"and also that ... revolted against him": the majority of candidates realised that the indirect statement continued here, but a few did not. The key phrase in this part was "whom he himself had put in charge of", and it was pleasing to see that many candidates knew *praeficio* (and most knew the case required) or a suitable circumlocution usually involving some variation of "made leader of". Many candidates thought that the verb inside this relative clause should be in the subjunctive. The use of pronouns within indirect statement continued to cause problems here. Again it was pleasing to observe that most candidates could form the perfect infinitive of *commoveo* correctly, although a small group of candidates believed that the infinitive should have been a passive. Both the spelling and the declension of *Satibarzanes* proved challenging despite the gloss.

“Although he was eager ... in battle”: most candidates had no problems at all with the concessive clause. “He was eager” was most often dealt with using *volo* or *cupio* and the subsequent prolative infinitive was naturally adopted by most. Those candidates who chose an adjective (*cupidus*, *avidus* or *acer* seemed the popular choices) plus the verb “to be” were often confused by the dependent construction. Many candidates translated “in battle” without the use of a preposition.

“he thought he ought ... first”: a large number of variations for ‘thinking’ was employed by candidates. Again the use of the indirect statement after a verb of thinking was correctly handled by most. It was encouraging to see many candidates, usually successfully, employing a gerundive/gerund of obligation, although candidates opted for the safer *debeo* construction with equal success, but less style. It was the word “first” which caused most problems.

“He set off ... cavalry”: a verb which implied setting off was required, not simply one which suggested motion. Many candidates took the opportunity to use the perfect participle of a deponent verb to subordinate this clause. Many candidates either omitted the Latin for “all” or could not decline it. Some candidates could not decline the word for cavalry. When *equitatus* was known, it was often put in the plural, which would be unusual. A smaller number of candidates could not give the ablative plural of *expeditus* despite the gloss. The opportunity to gain a style mark for the promotion of *omnibus* was not taken by most candidates.

“and marched through ... enemy unawares”: the overwhelming majority of candidates identified and successfully translated the result clause. “Through the night” required the preposition *per*, although many candidates omitted it. A small number of candidates did not know the word for “night”. A common error was *tam celerrime* instead of *tam celeriter*. Many candidates had difficulty in translating the word “unawares”, but many made sensible attempts to overcome this. The most obvious included derivatives of *scio* and the use of the adjective *ignarus*. Candidates often forgot that compound verbs, for example *advenio*, require the repetition of the preposition. A few candidates seized the chance to use a perfect subjunctive in the result clause.

“On learning of his arrival, Satibarzanes”: a large proportion of the candidature chose to use an ablative absolute here, occasionally also involving a connecting relative. Others chose to subordinate using a temporal cause. Some candidates could not decline the word for arrival and did not realise that the preposition *de* was required with the word for arrival given the construction they had chosen.

“fled to Bactra ... in some hills”: most candidates omitted the preposition *ad* here, thinking perhaps that Bactra was a city (despite the description as a province earlier in the prose). “Abandoning” often became a present participle, showing a lack of appreciation for the usage of that verbal form. “Most of his army” proved a very challenging phrase indeed to translate; many simply opted for *plurimi milites*, *multum exercitum* or a similar phrase. Where something better was attempted, the partitive genitive was sometimes not used. “Some” caused a few problems as well with both its position and its declension. A few candidates were unable to translate the word “hills”.

“Alexander sent ... to pursue him”: some very good attempts at subordination were made here, particularly using ablative absolutes. Almost all candidates spotted the purpose clause, with some even using *ad* and a gerund/gerundive construction. There were even instances of a supine of purpose.

“and ordered ... into the hills”: this part of the sentence was usually well done with candidates correctly identifying and using the correct indirect command construction. “Rest” proved difficult, with some candidates using the perfect passive participle of *relinquo* as an ordinary adjective; *alii* and *ceteri* were often incorrectly chosen.

Good Practice

- Much evidence of participle usage, but not always correctly done.
- Frequent use of gerunds and gerundives
- Many candidates had clearly produced a rough version with notes, from which they transcribed their neat version towards the end of the exam. The marking was made easier since the presentation was clearer. Such candidates also tended to make fewer, careless errors since such were picked up in the process of transcription.

Areas of Weakness

- Usage of pronouns within indirect statement
- The meanings of participles in Latin, especially the present participle, which is seldom directly equivalent to the English present participle.
- Interpretation of information given in vocabulary glosses (so many candidates took the word Bactra as a 1st declension feminine noun or could not handle the declension of Satibarzanes).
- Prepositions – this year seemed to give rise to a mantra “if in doubt, leave it out”. Unfortunately, such a mantra was nearly always wrong.

Section B: Comprehension

For the second year running greater flexibility within the mark scheme gave candidates more opportunities to score highly. This, coupled with a general improvement in the way in which candidates performed in the grammatical questions, led to a better overall performance by the candidature.

- (a) This question was generally answered well, although comparatively few candidates opted for something like “as soon as” for *ubi primum*.
- (b) Although most candidates answered this correctly, a few omitted the *non amplius*. A common error was 80 instead of 800. There were some amazing numbers (800,000 Germans; in one instance 5 million Romans vs 8 Germans).
- (c) Many candidates omitted or incorrectly handled the verb *erant profecti*, but managed to make enough points to score full marks.
- (d) *is dies indutiis* caused more than a few problems and some candidates in turning the main verb active lost track of who was doing what to whom. In context *legati* could not really mean “legates” or “commanders”, and the failure to realise this was penalised. Despite this most scored six or more marks on this question.
- (e) The mark scheme was sufficiently flexible that the omission of minor words (for example *tum*) did not unduly affect marks. *multis* was often taken with *equis* and *consuetudine sua* omitted or misunderstood. Free translations on the lines of “the rest turned to flee” were acceptable.
- (f) There was some confusion about the precise meaning of *agmen* here, but that was not really required by the mark scheme. There were sufficient marks available that most candidates scored highly on this question.
- (g) All candidates answered this question very well, although there was minor confusion about precisely who was called a friend and what the Latin meant by “had obtained a kingdom”.

- (h) Although many answers to this question were very good, it was clear that some candidates did not really understand how to tackle prose criticism. Many candidates wrote knowledgeably but irrelevantly about alliteration and assonance. A few also commented on scansion, elision and enjambment. For the first time a translation of the piece of Latin upon which they had to comment was provided on the paper. Candidates managed to identify interesting vocabulary, the use of emphatic pronouns and short, snappy clauses. It was absolutely vital that candidates quoted Latin – since translation had been provided it was more important than ever that candidates got to grips with the actual text.

Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations

- 0 mark:** ‘The alliteration of “c” in *acceptis cecidisset* makes the passage exciting and dramatic.’ [No, it doesn’t. Seldom, if ever, will alliteration form any part of the answer for a prose style question].
- 1 mark:** ‘Caesar’s use of short clauses makes the passage exciting and dramatic.’ [Yes, but there is no quotation of Latin and no discussion of how this drama and excitement is achieved].
- 2 marks:** ‘Caesar’s use of short clauses (*illum ex periculo eripuit, ipse eqo vulnerato deiectus, quoad potuit, fortissime restitit*) makes the passage exciting and dramatic.’ [Yes, and we have a quotation to support this; but no explanation of how this effect is achieved].
- 3 marks:** ‘Caesar’s use of short clauses (*illum ex periculo eripuit, ipse eqo vulnerato deiectus, quoad potuit, fortissime restitit*) helps to speed up the pace of the action by the rapid accumulation of ideas. This adds excitement and helps to make the Latin dramatic.’ [Yes – and we have a quotation and an explanation of how the effect is achieved.]

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

- (i) Most seem to miss the sense that Piso’s brother all but committed suicide – the problematic words being *se hosibus obtulit*. Rarely have so many horses been aroused in so many ways.
- (j) Most candidates answered this question well, although not many found a good meaning for *ultra*.
- (k) Few candidates realised that *dum* + subjunctive meant “until” – as a result minor misunderstandings were widespread.
- (l) There was evidence here of quite serious misunderstandings by some candidates, although the flexibility inherent in the mark scheme meant that such errors were not too heavily penalised. It was the Germans who had gained influence amongst the Gauls.
- (m) Despite the instruction to translate into idiomatic English, many candidates wrote literal translations and lost marks thereby.
- (n) There was a distinct improvement this year in the standard of answers produced by this year’s candidature. Most scored quite well on this question, but a few candidates seem to believe that gerundive or gerund is a case. The partitive genitive was particularly well handled.

- (o) While most candidates identified the result clause, very few realised that *animadvertisset* was a subjunctive dependent upon *cum* in the previous line.
- (p) Most candidates answered these competently, but a few were unable to identify the forms.

Areas of Weakness

- Candidates sometimes had problems with the identification of case.
- Tenses were sometimes not known.
- Longer sentence structure often caused candidates problems.
- Candidates need practice and encouragement so that they produce an idiomatic translation where this is required by the question.

Style Question – Tips

- Always write a separate paragraph on each of your three points (or however many points you wish to make). This helps you to keep your 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 you quote 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 layout of the exam paper.
- Do mention position of words inside **clauses** and **relative positions** of words (e.g. juxtaposition and chiasmus).

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin 3818 7818

June 2006 Assessment Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2471-80	Raw	120	94	82	70	59	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2491	Raw	90	69	61	53	45	38	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2492	Raw	90	78	70	63	56	49	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2481-90	Raw	120	86	76	66	57	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2493	Raw	90	71	63	55	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2494	Raw	90	69	62	55	49	43	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	240	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3818	66.1	84.5	92.9	96.9	98.9	100	1273
7818	68.6	89.9	97.5	99.2	99.8	100	920

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

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

OCR Information Bureau

(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 2006

