

# **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2008**

**3818/7818/MS/R/08**

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.

This report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE Latin (7818)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin (3818)**

### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
2471-2480 Latin Literature 1	1
2491 Latin Literature 2	6
2492 Unprepared Translation 1	10
2481-2490 Latin Literature 3	12
2493 Unprepared Translation 2	19
2494 Latin Composition or Comprehension	23
Grade Thresholds	28

# 2471-2480 Latin Literature 1

## General Comments

The examiners are confident that these papers set candidates tasks of appropriate difficulty balanced across the range of texts prescribed and questions asked, and that they produced an appropriate range of marks. As ever, a rewarding number of candidates achieved high marks, not least on the 9 and 15 mark questions where impressive levels of detailed recall were very frequently found.

The examiners have also noted, however, that there were more candidates in this session who seemed less sure about the content and 'storyline' of the texts and passages set in the papers. This significantly affected the performance of a number of candidates in the 9 and 15 mark questions, which are primarily based upon recall of the storyline and content detail. This also affected the 30 mark questions, where style was not uncommonly discussed *in vacuo*, detached from the information or narrative which the author was trying to convey. That relationship between style and content was the clear issue holding back a number of candidates whose work might be characterised as not quite in the highest echelons of the 'premier league' of scripts. There were, as ever, candidates who did not support their discussion by sufficient reference to the Latin in the 30 mark questions, sometimes indeed with no Latin reference at all, and whose work can therefore really only achieve the top of 'Band 3' of the marking grid. On the other hand there seemed to be fewer candidates whose reference to the text concentrated on a very narrow scope of lines or sentences, and so were restricted to Band 2 marks as their answers were 'less wide ranging than is needed for Band 1'.

Though many candidates do use the technical terms of style and rhetoric confidently and accurately, there are still those who will confuse alliteration and assonance, and even spondees with dactyls; perhaps Centres would go on encouraging candidates not to show off knowledge of stylistic or rhetorical technical terms but think of the effect. 'The slow rhythm of this line especially in ..... clearly reflects the sadness and solemnity of the moment' is preferable to 'this line is full of long spondees' (especially if it is really either full of dactyls or rhythmically undistinguished.) There are also still candidates who love discussing punctuation, which is not a genuine feature of Latin literature. 'This line has several commas and an exclamation mark, so it is dramatic' is not as effective an answer as 'Ovid has chosen to speak directly to ..... by saying in the vocative ..... and has also included the exclamatory word ....., which gives emotional impetus and directness to his words.'

More positively, as is now common, where there were two trigger words in a 30 mark question, most candidates tackled both. But there were in some cases clear examples of candidates not having read the question fully, particularly in setting the boundaries for discussion in 9 and 15 mark questions. This may have been connected with less sound recall of the content of the passages and texts.

Most candidates deserved their full marks for the Quality of Written Communication, with the best producing, as ever, well thought out and constructed answers presented in mature and fluent continuous English prose.

The examiners compliment most of the candidates on the legibility of their handwriting, and on the appropriate length of their answers. There are some, though, who would benefit from writing on alternate lines and it would be really useful if those who produce word-processed scripts could be encouraged to use double-spacing. The examiners would also like candidates to help them annotate clearly by leaving some space at the end of each of their answers, in order to accommodate the examiners' comments.

There was no sign of rubric errors, and most candidates completed their work within the time available.

The examiners, as ever, genuinely wish to thank Centres and candidates for the impressive and committed scholarship which underpins so much of the fine work they have assessed in this session, and indicates a promising future both for candidates and the subject.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Cicero

- 1
- (a) This was generally well and fully answered, though a surprising number of candidates omitted the murder of Sextus Roscius the elder, and some confused the moment in the case where the council of America became involved.
  - (b) Again there were many impressive answers, with some very good understanding of the way the rhetorical devices worked. Some candidates' work suggested that they were not clear why Sulla was mentioned and what the point of this paragraph actually was, some even thinking that the lines referred to Chrysogonus rather than Sulla. This was one of those questions where some candidates confined their answers to only a small part of the lines set and so restricted themselves to Band 2 marks for being 'less wide ranging than Band 1'. The best candidates commented on the *range* of stylistic and rhetorical devices Cicero employs here: anaphora, chiasmus, alliteration, hyperbole, word choice and word play were all there. Many were able to show that they knew why these stylistic devices worked for Cicero, some merely gave a list of technical terms, some with, some without the Latin.
  - (c) Generally well answered, though there were candidates who did not notice the requirement to discuss hostility to the accusers as well as sympathy for the client.
- 2
- Noticeably fewer candidates answered this question than question 1.
- (a) This was generally well answered, though not all candidates mentioned the idea that Roscius murdered his father.
  - (b) Generally this was also well answered by those who tackled it, with good discussion of the rhetorical questions, anaphoras and tricolon crescendos and the best candidates clearly understanding the tone of voice in which Cicero is addressing Erucius. Some candidates would have done better in this question if they had made clear their understanding of the 'content' point Cicero was making, and which the style points supported; the notions of sarcasm and hypocrisy in the attack on Erucius and through him the Roscii, were not always made clear. Again there were candidates who restricted their marks to Band 2 by not covering the whole passage set for the question.
  - (c) Again generally well and fully answered.

## Virgil

- 1
- (a) This was one of the questions where the examiners commented that some candidates' recall of the storyline was not always firm. 'A lion' is not really enough in the answer to a (i), reference to his still facing the hunters was thought important. Candidates did not always recall in a (ii) that Turnus has realised the Latins have lost heart and need him to be their champion, and the reference to making a truce rather than just having a duel with Aeneas, was also sometimes omitted.
  - (b) This was often well and fully answered, but some candidates did not really cover the second half of the set lines, and Latinus' agonies about his own responsibility for the current situation. Some candidates even thought that Latinus was accusing Turnus of bad faith in the phrase *vincla omnia rupi*. Virgil did not in fact write *rupisti* there. Quite a number of candidates failed to discuss why Latinus spoke thus to Turnus, to save him from death in the possible duel.
  - (c) The most assured candidates produced fine and full discussion supported by excellent and wide ranging reference to the Latin. But there were less assured candidates whose recall of the storyline was less sound and who consequently produced some rather mechanical regurgitation of notes on style points *in vacuo*. This may well have been connected with the lack of detailed narrative recall that appeared in the other questions on this passage. This also led to candidates' offering of Latin examples from quite a narrow scope in the lines set; this is rather disappointing in view of the number of available references that could have been discussed. Less assured candidates gave up on Latin reference beyond the blood flowing Tiber and the bone white fields. It would have been better for candidates in this situation to have made clear that they knew what Latinus was saying, then they could have used the style points sensibly as the means of making those points powerfully. An example of this was the often stated but rarely fully discussed enjambement of *spes Italas*. In this question some candidates confused spondees and dactyls when referring to the wonderfully spondaic line 14 and line 26, though there were candidates who wrote out and scanned one or both of these and receive the examiners' special commendation for this.
- 2
- (a) This question was quite often misread by candidates, who included more detail about the moment when Juturna abandons Turnus than was needed. Candidates often omitted the point that Aeneas pursues and challenges Turnus.
  - (b) Generally well answered, though candidates tended to omit Turnus' acknowledgement that he has brought this moment on himself and asks for nothing for himself, that his men have seen his defeat and humiliation, and/or that he asks Aeneas not to carry his hatred any further.

- (c) There was a spread of quality in the response to this question. The most assured candidates knew the passage well and offered several more than the required four examples to support their often very mature and sophisticated discussion. Less confident candidates, however, did not show clear recall of what Aeneas' feelings actually were, and this inevitably rather stymied their success. They were not always sure why Aeneas should be rolling his eyes, they did not grasp the significance of *iam iamque cunctantem* (which they took only as chance for rather mechanically discussed example of repetition or anaphora) and *flectere sermo coeperat*, so they only saw Aeneas as angry at seeing the baldric of Pallas and had little idea of the turmoil of his emotions before that moment. At best this lack of recall restricted them to Band 2 marks only. Some candidates discussed the last line and a half, which were outside the lines set. In many cases where this happened, it was to the detriment of discussion of valid points within the required lines.

## Tacitus

- 1 (a) There were numerous examples of very sound to very good answers to this question, showing good, detailed recall of the content and well founded discussion of the several examples of Tacitean style. Some of the slightly less successful candidates might have been a bit more assertive in their discussion of the style features, particularly the neat, memorable brevity achieved in some phrases, and the use of *variatio* and the historic infinitive, but the visual almost cinematographic nature of Tacitus' description of the scene was generally well conveyed in answers.
- (b) This was mostly well answered. The examiners particularly rewarded candidates who specified the nature of Tiberius' *luctus*, the death of Augustus.
- (c) Again mostly well and fully answered. Some omitted the point that not only did those who came to them from Rome have to refer to their fathers, but that emperors decided quickly on bad things, but had to ask the senate about good ones.
- 2 (a) This was often very well answered indeed, with broad use of Latin references. But a surprising number of candidates seriously misunderstood the first few lines set, so that their answers suggested that the *amici* mentioned by Germanicus were the soldiers there in front of him, rather than the friends who had prevented him from killing himself in an earlier melodramatic moment. Inevitably, this misapprehension was a serious detriment to their response to the question, as was the perhaps connected misunderstanding of Germanicus' references to the Varian disaster and the role of the Belgae in the current crisis. Some candidates also ended their discussion a little early on in the lines set, leading again to the 'less wide ranging than a Band 1 answer' comment from the examiners.
- (b) This was usually very well done and fully answered. A number of candidates seemed to give the examiners an interesting view of Germanicus' plans for later by suggesting concern for Agrippina's 'impending pregnancy' rather than 'confinement'!
- (c) Though some candidates gave the incorrect name for the commander of the first legion, this was well answered.

**Ovid**

- 1
- (a) With some omissions of detail, particularly in Nape's not being reckoned as an ordinary serving girl or her being 'useful in the services of the stealthy night', this was generally well answered.
  - (b) There were many really full and detailed answers to this question, often with more than four Latin examples on offer in support of discussion, though some candidates found so much to say about the style points that they came close to losing sight of the need to link their points to Ovid's 'anxious longing for a positive reply'. The content of these lines was often well recalled with useful detail and in the most assured answers the role of the style points in conveying the content forcefully was well understood. Perhaps this message had itself been conveyed effectively from last year's Report.
  - (c) This was almost universally fully and accurately answered, often with much well recalled detail of Ovid's complaints about Nape and the provenance of the tablets, sometimes with that at the expense of actually pointing out that Ovid's *puella* cannot come to him.
- 2
- (a) This was almost universally well and fully answered, though in the second part candidates sometimes omitted either the abundant length of the hair or its fine texture.
  - (b) This was usually well answered, though some candidates thought that Corinna's hair did not break the comb or pin, rather than the other way round. Some candidates did not seem to understand the point about the hair's quality when undressed and a few went out of their way to suggest more spirituality and holiness in the look of a Bacchant than Ovid might have intended.
  - (c) This question was also usually well answered, with candidates showing good knowledge and recall of the content and understanding of the style points which might have been discussed. The most assured candidates suggested a range of emotions Ovid is trying to convey, not just simple sadness at the treatment of the hair but possible mock seriousness/exaggeration in the whole situation and some eroticism in the final description of Dione. Most of the stylistic points and devices Ovid employs were well discussed, though in some answers this discussion felt mechanical if the content of the lines seemed not to be fully understood.

## 2491 Latin Literature 2

### General Comments

The examiners again feel confident that this paper set the candidates appropriate tasks to invite response at the appropriate level.

The quality of performance on this unit's translation questions, though with the usual breadth of variation, was generally sound to excellent. The examiners' previous advice on 'policing' the quality of translation within Centres continues to be followed. The examiners were especially pleased to note that now there are very few examples indeed of whole Centres offering shared inaccurate dictated or printed translations.

The errors encountered in translation, perhaps inevitably, 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. But there were very few candidates indeed who saw the passages as 'unseen' translation.

Again the examiners would want to emphasise how important it is in this paper that **candidates should write translations on alternate lines**. It is absolutely vital for the useful annotation of scripts that candidates would expect from the examiners, that they are given sufficient space to make the annotation clear. It would be particularly useful if candidates who are permitted to use word processing could be strongly urged to use double spacing.

While there were very many examples of good and well thought-out essays which exhibited a detailed recall of the text (including both 'halves' where two authors had been studied), there were, perhaps inevitably, still a number of essays which were essentially narrative in nature, with at best a randomly placed 'nod' to the question set, and some where significant features of the narrative of the text were not in fact fully recalled. The highest marks in the essay section were awarded to those candidates who in their analysis exhibited the sensible approach of finding a good range of points to make.

There were no signs of rubric errors, most candidates except those who exhibited weakness of recall in the translations completed all the questions attempted, and many candidates achieved a well deserved full mark for the quality of their written communication in the essay, though some who did not express themselves clearly, or legibly, or whose essay structure was weak, did lose a mark here.

As ever, the examiners wish to express their real thanks to Centres and candidates for the hard work of which they saw evidence in the scripts assessed, and their hope that candidates have achieved the results they wish or require.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Section A: Translation

#### Cicero

- (i) This was generally accurately translated though *nam* and *itaque* were not infrequently omitted and some candidates linked *domestici* with *patrimonium* rather than *praedones*.
- (ii) Relatively few candidates offered this passage; those who did so generally performed well, though the structure of the periodic sentences did floor a few.

#### Virgil

- (i) There were many very accurate translations offered for this passage. Weaknesses included:
  - the taking of *ignavi* with *dicta*
  - not seeing *recusent* as subjunctive
  - taking *hac* with *Dardanidum* rather than with *dextra*
  - misunderstanding *crimen* as 'shame' rather than 'accusation'
  - not seeing the subjunctive force of *habeat* and the case and number of *victos*
  - misunderstanding *cedat* or at least seeing it as indicative
  - not seeing the case of *Lavinia*
- (ii) Common errors in this otherwise generally very accurate translation included the following:
  - taking *superant* as *superaverunt*
  - not seeing the mood of *sequamur*
  - taking *morte* as *mortem*
  - omitting *neque*
  - translating *amplius* as 'again' rather than 'any more'
  - seeing *hunc* as *hoc*
  - omitting *ocius*
  - omitting *arvis*

#### Tacitus

- (i) There were some very accurate translations here, despite the following mistakes:
  - tristissima*: 'bad news' was not thought a close enough translation
  - satis* was quite often omitted
  - ex re* was not always fully translated 'on the matter' was a frequent not quite right attempt
  - aderant* was often taken as simply *erant*

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- (ii) This translation was almost always well done, the weak points being:  
*facies* was quite often omitted  
the pluperfect in *habuerat* was not noticed  
*vescentes* was sometimes taken with *dies* as 'days of feeding'  
ditto *quietos nox* as 'quiet night(s)'  
*simul* was taken as if the soldiers were feeding and quiet at the same time  
*discedunt* and *ingerunt* were sometimes taken as verbs in a different sentence from  
*non ... habuerat*  
the sentence structure of the last sentence, particularly the fact that the ablative  
absolute fits inside the postquam clause rather than constituting that clause's verb, was  
sometimes not grasped.

## Ovid

- (i) Thanks to Professor Barsby, there were a good number of very accurate translations  
here; those who tripped up did so at the following places:  
  
the tense of *sumet* was not always accurately rendered  
'eyes' appeared in places as translations of *oscula*  
*verum* was omitted  
*valent*; 'are answered' was not thought accurate enough  
*opto* was quite often missed out  
*certe* was sometimes omitted  
as was *tamen*
- (ii) Again there were many really accurate translations of this, except for the following:  
some candidates thought that this poem was set in the summer rather than in heat  
*exegerat*; the pluperfect was not always noticed  
some candidates thought that Ovid had light limbs in line 2  
*ferre* was often omitted  
*tamen* was often omitted  
*timidus* was sometimes taken with *latebras* or even *puellis*, a reminder of the constant  
battle to have students check noun and adjective endings in verse very carefully.

## Section B: Essays

### Cicero

A number of very good answers were seen. Those candidates who achieved the highest marks were those who did more than recall the text and drop in repeatedly (and in places almost randomly) 'and this shows his skills as a defence lawyer'. There was a lot of very well recalled detail from some of Cicero's arguments and it was often clear that candidates had really enjoyed reading this text, with the sense of it covering a 'real life' crime rather than something more political. There were, however, some points which were not made but which might have been, such as discussion of the speed of the news of Roscius' death being known and to whom the news was sent, the '*cui bono*' discussion of motive and the parallel case of Caelius, and not every candidate who said that Cicero had separated Sulla from Chrysothonus explained why this separation was important. There were perhaps not many candidates who had studied just Cicero; references to the second half of the text were less frequent and in some cases this stymied chances of the really highest marks.

## **Virgil**

This question produced quite a spread of quality. There were quite a number of examples of essays which bordered on the simple recall of the story, with 'and this is emotional' dropped in in places sometimes almost haphazardly. A not insubstantial number of candidates did not read the question fully and so covered the emotions they considered were felt by the characters in the book rather than those evoked in the reader, as asked. At times they did this well, but sadly could not be awarded the highest banding. Less good Candidates also tended to have a limited breadth of recall of the narrative, limiting themselves to a few key moments only. This was a little surprising. The best candidates covered a range of emotions felt by the reader, particularly when focussing on the characters of Turnus and Aeneas and the discussion of the final duel, but also on Latinus, Amata, Juturna and the Trojans and Latins. There was often very sound discussion of the emotional effect of similes and the use of metre and sound effects too. Some candidates showed some very detailed and well expressed knowledge in this area.

## **Tacitus**

There were some very good answers to this essay question, with a detailed and broad recall of the narrative and very sound points of analysis, though weaker candidates again tended to a narrow scope of incidents and moments discussed from the narrative. A small number of candidates did not help their cause by confusing incidents from the two mutinies discussed in Annals 1.

The highest marks were awarded to those who covered a range of analysis points about the features of the characters, collective and individual, that Tacitus had seen and wanted his readers to see. Candidates found balance in the accounts, that, for instance, the soldiers had a case for their resentment and were not just low class, violent, superstitious and easily led astray, and that their officers included both brave and cowardly men. There were some very intelligent discussions of Drusus and Germanicus and also Agrippina, and the role of Tiberius and Tacitus' attitude to him and the principate generally were also sensibly included in the best answers.

## **Ovid**

This question produced some examples of extremely accurate and detailed recall of the texts, taken in the best cases from the whole series of poems set. Weaker candidates, though, tended to repeat the narratives of the poems (not always with wide ranging recall, in some cases limiting themselves only to the poems mentioned in the translation question and the commentary paper they had just sat), and drop in 'so this shows his sense of fun' at regular or even irregular intervals. The most impressive answers showed very sound analysis of the nature of Ovid's sense of fun and lightheartedness and the range of forms it took; self deprecation, sharp observation of character and situation and use of witty language being the best examples of this. These answers were often also well supported with text allusions, but the quality of this analysis was a significant differentiator of the quality of the essays.

## 2492 Unprepared Translation 1

### General comments

Examiners judged this unseen passage to be of appropriate difficulty, but challenging. There seemed to be enough pitfalls of accident and syntax to prevent all but a tiny number from gaining full marks, and to bring the overall performance of candidates down from that of last year.

Many candidates seemed ill-prepared for this paper, showing little evidence of familiarity with basic constructions. Also a high percentage of candidates made no apparent effort to earn 'bonus' marks for good or natural English. They need to be aware that simply reproducing meanings listed in the Defined Vocabulary List is not always sufficient to gain bonus marks.

Many candidates seemed unable to cope with any deviation from the basic subject-object-verb word order that language course books regularly maintain. They need to be aware that, at this level, they are likely to encounter a more varied word order.

Legibility was often a problem, added to the apparent reluctance of candidates to set their work out neatly; tracing a path through tortuous deletions and additions above, below and alongside the line was frequently difficult.

### Comments on Individual Questions

*dum ... gerunt*: most scored well here, with very few 'kingdoms'.

*Chalcidenses ... dederunt*: this caused problems. Many took *Romanis exceptis* as ablative absolute and did not put in 'to them' (but good candidates earned a bonus mark for recognising the dative). *in urbem* was often 'in the city' and *libenter* 'freely'.

*Lucretius ... spoliavit*: this was correctly translated by almost all candidates.

*omnia ... vexit*: this was generally well done but ignorance of *vexit* caused many to lose the mark for *ornamenta* because they failed to make it the object. *in* with the accusative was again ignored by most.

*homines ... abduxit. liberos* was sometimes 'freedmen' and very often 'children'; 'from freedom into slavery' was a popular guess. Many ignored the prefix in *abduxit*.

*res ... auferbat*: this proved a very tricky section with few scoring all the marks. The two genitives were rarely correctly rendered and the meaning of *sociorum* was generally unfamiliar.

*quamquam ... accipere*: most coped well with this and arrived at some fairly close approximation to the sense. *portas* was often 'ports'.

*tamen ... decedere*: the indirect statement was more difficult to recognise here and the gerundive was often not known; the meaning of *patienda* eluded many but *quia ... decedere* was usually correctly rendered, even if candidates rarely understood what the underlying sense was; few earned a bonus mark by giving 'break their word' *vel sim*.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

*legatos ... accusarent*: many gained full or almost full marks here. A very small number had *miserunt* as 'unhappy' and weaker candidates failed to see the purpose.

*legati ... obliviscerentur*: this was a challenging section; the two deponent verbs were often rendered as passives and the indirect command was frequently not recognised. *civitatis* was rarely known.

*arcessere ... defenderet*: *placuit* was recognised by better candidates who sometimes improved on the impersonal and so gained a bonus mark. The weaker often preferred 'it pleased Lucretius' even if this destroyed the sense. The distinction between *in senatum* here and in *senatu* previously was often not noticed. For *se ipse*, the simple 'himself' as object of *defenderet* was all that was needed; very few earned a bonus mark by trying to render both words sensibly (e.g. 'to defend himself in person').

*simulatque ... sit*: *simulatque* as usual was often 'at the same time'. Few recognised *adfuit* and *inlata sunt* defeated all but the most able. A surprising number failed to see the result clause following *tot*. However, most knew *sine mora* and were able to guess that he was condemned.

*senatores ... facta esse*: this posed problems for many, although some otherwise weak performers scored full marks here. Many were confused by *quae ille fecisset* and *facta esse* and tended to abbreviate or invert the actions.

*praeterea ... imperaturos esse*: this was probably the section with the most pitfalls and very few indeed scored full marks. *praeterea* was sometimes 'a praetor'; *litteras* not infrequently was the 'shore' and a singular letter was highly unusual. Although many realised that the *promiserunt* led to an indirect statement, they failed to see *imperaturos esse* as an infinitive. There was a substantial number of Roman emperors and very few recognised the dative as going with this verb; even the better candidate had 'letters to the governor' (often at Rome).

*ut, si qui ... liberaret*: most gained a reasonable score here and worked out what was going on.

*legati ... redierunt*: most were accurate here, but it was surprising to note how many did not recognise *aequo animo* as a common expression and made no attempt to think of a more natural English version. They can hardly have thought that 'with equal minds' made any sense.

## 2481-2490 Latin Literature 3

### General Comments

There were some excellent responses to the questions set this year, though, in the opinion of the examiners, there were perhaps fewer outstanding answers than last year. Most candidates showed a good knowledge of the texts they had studied and were able to make a range of points in response to the passages set in Section A. The essays varied rather more. Some candidates do not apportion their time effectively and this can lead to a very long answer to one or other passage, with a subsequent reduction in time for the remaining questions; for a few candidates this made a significant difference and affected the essay as a rule, as the majority of candidates tackled this last. The most effective answers in both sections were structured clearly so that what the candidate wrote was immediately understandable to the examiner. Hand-writing did prove an issue with a very few candidates. There also seemed to be a slightly larger number of candidates this year who found the set texts studied very challenging.

### 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. A few struggled with the spelling of the names of key characters and works (e.g. Aeneas, Jupiter, *Aeneid*). There seems to be a slight decline in the standard of handwriting, which, candidates should realise, makes the work of the examiner much more difficult, especially if they seem to be intent on cramming as many words as possible onto each line. Writing on alternate lines proved helpful in a number of cases. No scripts were referred to the Principal Examiner for illegibility this year. A few candidates struggled with the time constraints of the paper and either did not finish individual questions or resorted to bullet points or notes. Examiners also appreciate a little space being left between questions for annotations and marks.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Commentary

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the Latin text and to offer an intelligent response to the question. The majority of candidates were well able to do this, and demonstrated their understanding through precise reference to the Latin passage and judicious analysis of their selections. Some candidates tried to run through the whole passage, with the result that they often concentrated too much on content rather than literary analysis. There is no need to cover every aspect of a passage, indeed this would be impossible in most cases. However the very best answers were clearly organised: for each selection there was precise reference to the Latin, a reason for its selection as an answer to the question and a discussion of the salient points in the context of the passage. Many candidates helpfully included line references for the detail they selected; this was appreciated by examiners.

A few candidates made little or no reference to the Latin in some or all responses. While the best answers point specifically to the phrases they wish to analyse, there remain a number of candidates who choose to make this less clear: there are relatively few candidates who quote long passages of Latin, assuming that it is obvious to the examiners why the passage has been quoted, but there are still too many who quote the first and last word of a selection and then refer to something not quoted. It is hard to reward this approach. Weaker responses tend to overuse paraphrase, with occasional words thrown in to link what is said to the text, though these are often unhelpful.

Most candidates were well aware of appropriate ways to approach Latin texts, and some had a well-developed critical vocabulary. Some candidates pointed to examples of alliteration or dactylic rhythm without expanding their comment further to show what purpose these served. Scansion, when given, was on the whole accurate. There were also a small number of candidates who used terms appropriate to verse criticism when dealing with prose (e.g. enjambment) or who discussed the author's use of punctuation. Some candidates littered their discussion with a large number of technical terms which did not seem to be fully understood, or which they perhaps assumed to be so obvious as to need no further explanation.

The main discriminator remains the quality of discussion. Well-organised answers that were directed at the question were easier for examiners to credit in the higher bands. In general, 9 mark questions have a more limited scope and therefore answers need to make fuller use of the text; there are many routes through an 18 mark question, though the best answers draw from the beginning, the middle and the end of the passage.

There were a very few candidates who seemed unprepared for some or all of the set text passages they attempted. The purpose of this paper is not to test the translation skills of candidates, but it is a requirement that they understand what is written and can then apply their knowledge to the question. The majority of candidates were able to deal with the texts confidently and showed a high level of understanding of the literary qualities of what they had studied.

## Cicero

This set text proved less popular with candidates this year.

### Question 1

In their answers to (a), which was generally well answered, most candidates were able to select a range of detail from the passage, such as the repetition in *fletus gemitusque* (line 1) and the repeated use of the superlative (*florentissimi, crudelissima, indignissima* (lines 2-3)). Many also commented on the impact of *nefarius* (line 4), the significance for Romans of *ne iter quidem ad sepulcrum patrium reliquisset* (line 4), and the effect of the list of offences (*bonorum ... donationes* (lines 4-5)). The emphasis on the repugnance felt at T. Roscius' actions (*nemo ... T. Roscium* (lines 5-7)) was not so often noted, but those that did drew attention to the powerful language (*iactantem se et dominantem* (lines 6-7)) in contrast to the positive superlatives used to describe Sextus Roscius. Most candidates picked out *scelere et iniuriis* (line 9), and the patterns formed by the tricolon of verbs (*doceant ... conquerantur ... orent* (lines 8-9)).

The answers to (b) were in many cases less assured, and there was some confusion over the meaning of the Latin, as many made Chrysogonus the subject of *pollicerentur* (line 14) and few noted the significance of the *homines nobiles* (line 13). However most were able to put the references to Sulla in context and discuss the contrast between Chrysogonus and Capito on the one hand and the *homines antiqui, qui ex sua natura ceteros fingerent* (line 15-16) on the other. There were some good discussions of the end of the passage also, with a few candidates discussing the effectiveness of *domino incolumi* (line 22).

### Question 2

In (a) some candidates gave very detailed responses which were not well directed at the question. However most were able to select a range of detail from the passage to show how Glaucia was portrayed in a negative way, beginning with his reporting the news of the murder first to Capito rather than to more obvious individuals, particularly as the speed (*hic incredibilis cursus ... tanta celeritas festinatioque* (lines 4-5)) was emphasised by Cicero. Many candidates

commented on the way Cicero almost toys with Glaucia in these lines (*nihil est, Glaucia, quod metuas; non excutio te* (lines 5-6)) and the effectiveness of his almost dismissive attitude to the act itself (*quoniam, cuius consilio occisus sit, invenio* (line 7)). Many also commented on the use of questions (e.g. *ubi aut unde audivit Glaucia?* (line 9)) and the persistence of Cicero's focus on Glaucia's role as an accessory.

In (b) most candidates commented effectively on the way Cicero asked the jurors to visualise the murder as it happened (*cernere oculis videmini, iudices* (line 14)), and the impact of the repeated questions. Many candidates discussed the way Cicero tried to link both Glaucia and T. Roscius with the murder itself and with each other. Most picked up on the reference to Automedon (line 17), though this was not always clearly explained, and only the best answers commented on the language here (e.g. *sui sceleris acerbissimi nefariaeque victoriae nuntium* (lines 17-18)). A few commented on the tricolon *non orat ut ... nuntiet* (line 18-19). As Cicero turns his focus on Capito, many candidates pointed to the vivid present tense verbs (*video ... audio* (line 21)) and the details that Cicero chose to emphasise, including the references to *palmas* and *lemniscatam* (line 23). Relatively few commented on the effectiveness of *multos ferro, multos veneno* (line 25).

## Virgil

### Question 1

In (a) the majority of candidates were able to deal very well with the first half of the passage, but surprisingly were able to make little use of the simile in lines 9-14. In some cases candidates spent too long on lines 1-4. There were some good discussions of the effect of enjambment (e.g. *Aeneas* in line 2), repetition (*iterum ... bis ... altera* (lines 3-4)) and powerful vocabulary (*cogi, rumpi* (lines 3-4)). The word order in line 5 was well analysed, together with the amplification of *discordia* in the following lines. Relatively few candidates drew on the detail of the simile to respond to the question, but paraphrase showed that most understood what the lines meant: *pastor* (line 9) was not often discussed, but a good number pointed to the repetition of *trepidae* and the *cerea castra* (line 11). There were some notable exceptions to this, who examined the simile in detail and commented effectively on its significance.

Responses to (b) generally showed a good understanding of the meaning of the passage. Some commented on the word order of *totam luctu concussit funditus urbem* (line 16); most picked up on the queen's reaction to what she saw of the battle and noted the emphatic repeated negatives in *nusquam acies contra Rutulos, nulla agmina Turni* (line 19). Virgil's choice of words to describe the queen (*infelix, subito mentem turbata dolore, per maestum demens ... furorem* (lines 20-23)) was noted by a good number of candidates, as was his use here of enjambment and alliteration. Some weaker responses did not use the end of the passage which showed the impact of the death of the queen on the Latins and, in particular, her family.

### Question 2

Some candidates in (a) were uncertain who the speaker was in this passage, thinking it must be Juturna (variously spelled) or in some cases leaving this unclear in their response. The majority of candidates found points to make at the start of the passage: the direct address to Turnus, the use of elision in line 1, alliteration and the repeated personal pronouns. They also noted the strong verbs applied to Aeneas which showed his domination in the battle for the city, and the vivid use of the present tense (*iamque faces ... Volant* (line 4)). Weaker responses tended to offer more paraphrase of content and to some extent lost sight of the question: for example, a number of candidates picked out lines 9-10 (*solis ... acies*) without offering any discussion of the impact of Virgil's language. Another phrase which was picked out was *strictisque seges mucronibus horret / ferrea* (lines 11-12) (often with *ferrea* left out, but correctly translated),

though many identified it as a simile. The stark contrast of the closing line (*tu currum ... versas*) was highlighted to good effect by some candidates.

In (b), candidates generally made good use of lines 13-19, though many did not explore the way Virgil used language to create an impression of Turnus' state of mind (e.g. *obstipuit, confusus, obtutu tacito* (lines 13-14)). Relatively few commented on the force of *aestuatur* (line 14), though there were some good discussions of lines 14-16. Many picked up on *ardentes oculorum*, though some omitted *orbis* (line 18). There were some good comments on the significance of the tower, and the final lines provided the basis for some good analysis. The best answers pointed to effects such as anaphora or alliteration and discussed how they related to the impact of Turnus' words; weaker responses lost sight of the question.

## Tacitus

### Question 1

There were a number of responses that revealed some uncertainties over what Tacitus was saying in this passage, but in general, most candidates were able to pick relevant examples from the Latin. Relatively few commented on *mente ambigua* (line 1), but many picked up on *miles in rabiem prolapsus est* (line 2), together with the ablative absolutes which showed the extent of the problem. The majority of candidates commented on *per otium aut levia munia* (line 4) and also picked out *vernacula multitudo* (line 5), though there was some confusion about what this meant. Another phrase that was highlighted was *lasciviae sueta, laborum intolerans* (lines 5-6), and most candidates were able to discuss the demands made by the soldiers in the tricolon (*veterani ... iuvenes ... cuncti* (line 7)). The contrast between the two mutinies was also discussed, though some weaker responses were rather confused at this point. The final tricolon (*sua in manu ... suis victoriis ... in suum cognomentum* (lines 10-11)) was not handled as effectively as the examiners expected.

In (b), many candidates picked out the effect of the *plurium vaecordia* (line 12) on the *legatus*, and significance of *lymphatic* (line 13). The attack on the centurions (lines 13-16) was generally well covered, though *sexagenis singulos* (line 14) was not understood by all. Most candidates were able to select good examples to illustrate the impact on the centurions (*prostratos verberibus ... convulsos laniatosque et partim exanimos* (lines 14-16)). However only the better responses showed how Tacitus' switch from the general to the particular (lines 16-20) in the later part of the passage worked very effectively with the two contrasting examples of Septimius and Cassius Chaerea. The best answers brought out the chilling change in the camp at the end of the passage, where the regular authorities had lost control, but had been replaced by the ordinary soldiers acting together *tanta aequalitate et constantia regi crederes* (line 24); weaker responses were confused as to who was in charge at this point.

### Question 2

In (a), better answers used the detail of the passage to good effect. Some candidates assumed that darkness would help the Romans more, so ignoring *sideribus inlustris* (line 1). Most could show how Tacitus emphasised the unpreparedness of the Marsi, though not all were clear about the meaning of *ne pax quidem nisi languida et soluta inter temulentos* (lines 3-4).

In (b) candidates were for the most part able to draw out some of the detail to support their answer. Many commented on *ferro flammisque pervastat* (line 6), though fewer commented on *populatio* or the organisation of the army. Not all were clear about the significance of *Tanfanae* (line 8) or how it related to the adjectives *sacra* and *profana*, but many picked up on *sine vulnere milites*, in contrast to *semisomnos, inermos aut palantes* (lines 8-9).

Candidates found (c) more demanding. The best candidates found little difficulty in showing how the description of the preparations for the march and the march itself involved the reader and led

to the final confrontation; there were some particularly good explanations of the significance of the detailed description of the Roman army in lines 11-13. The contrast between *immoti* and *tota vi* (line 14) was also commented upon. Relatively few picked out Germanicus' appreciation of the situation he was leading his men into (*quod gnarum duci incessitque itineri et proelio* (lines 10-11), though more were able to point to his role in rallying his troops during the battle (*Caesar ... voce magna ... clamitabat* (lines 16-17)), highlighting the alliteration (*peregerent, properarent* (line 17) and the effective *culpam in decus vertere* (line 16).

## Ovid

### Question 1

There were some excellent discussions of (a). Most candidates could make sensible comments about the tone, though not all made effective use of the Latin. There were some good discussions of alliteration. Most candidates saw that Ovid makes negative remarks about three careers traditionally pursued by members of the elite, and could point to his choice of vocabulary (*pulverulenta ... verbosas ... ingrato ... prostituisset* (lines 4-6)). There were also sensible comments about the contrast between *mortale* and *fama perennis* (lines 7-8). Some answers became rather lengthy for a response to a 9 mark question, perhaps because this was the first question attempted.

In (b) the responses from candidates were a little below expectation. As last year, a list question seemed to cause problems, when all that was required was for the candidate to note how the poet introduced *variatio* to his references in these lines. There were many good responses: some candidates were able to show how Ovid varied the way he referred to the individual poets, and were aware of the allusion to Lucretius (lines 11-12). Some however seemed very unclear about the content of these lines: some identified *Tityrus* (line 13) as a poet, even though they did recognise the reference to the *Aeneid*. Very few candidates commented on the ending of the list with love poets, though rather more noted the contrast between the apostrophe of Tibullus and the repetition of Gallus' name, coupled with the reference to his mistress Lycoris.

Responses to (c) were better. Most candidates found a range of points to make, though weaker answers tended to use the content of the lines rather than developing an analysis in response to the question. Many candidates noted *carmina morte carent* (line 20), though not all mentioned Ovid's use of alliteration here or explained the contrast with the earlier part of the couplet. The anaphora of *cedant ... cedat* (lines 21-22) and the emphatic *reges regumque triumphi* were also commented on. Not all candidates noted the apparently subservient role of Apollo in lines 23-24, though they did pick up the alliteration in *vilia miretur vulgus*. There were some very good analyses of the end of the poem (though line 28 was largely ignored), with its link back to the start of the poem (*Livor* (line 27)); the confident *ergo* was noted by many, as were the emphatic *vivam* and *erit*, which frame the final line.

### Question 2

In (a) most candidates were well aware of the context of the poem, and were able to select a range of details to illustrate Ovid's complaint. They were generally less successful in addressing the issue of Ovid 'as a lover', making little, or, in some case, no reference to lines 5-8. The majority commented on the repetition of *quo properas* (lines 3 and 9), and the best answers analysed the virtues of the early morning (e.g. *somni pingues, frigidus aer* etc (lines 7-8)). There were some interesting discussions of the anaphora of *ingrata viris, ingrata puellis*, and the patterning of line 10. However the list like qualities of the last 6 lines proved less fruitful for some candidates as Ovid illustrates a range of professions who might resent the dawn.

In (b) many candidates noted the repetition of *quo properas* which linked back to the beginning of the poem, and they were able to appreciate the humour of Ovid's reference to Memnon, and

also the way he developed his attack on Aurora's relationship with her husband and with Cephalus. The use of direct speech (line 24) and his amusing question (*num me nupsisti conciliante seni?* (line 26) were also well discussed in the better answers; few however fully understood the humour in lines 23-24. Ovid's references to Luna and to Jupiter were not always understood by candidates, but most could explain the final couplet and its effectiveness in context.

## **Section B: Essay**

There were many very good essays on all four authors this year, where candidates attacked the question and showed good judgment in the range of detail they selected to analyse. There were also a number of very short essays (less than a page and a half), some of which were concise and to the point, but in a number of cases candidates were clearly struggling either with time or with the recall of detail. One significant issue for a number of candidates was maintaining focus on the question set; while many candidates made a plan before they started, some of those who did not do so allowed themselves to be diverted into more extended discussion of issues that interested them than was warranted by the title. There were also a number of relatively long essays (five/six pages or more) which would have benefited from a tighter structure and a better selection of examples from the text. In some cases, the quality of the handwriting declined markedly towards the end of the exam and made the job of the examiners harder.

### **Cicero**

This essay did not seem to surprise many candidates and there were some well-organised answers that used a good range of material to answer the question. A few candidates who struggled with this title might have been advised to use the material in the passages, which is entirely acceptable. Most of those who attempted this had some sensible ideas about how Cicero organised his speech and used a variety of approaches to argue his case, and could illustrate this with some sensible paraphrase, and, in many cases, specific examples in Latin.

### **Virgil**

The majority of candidates were well prepared for this essay, though in some cases this led to a summary of the book rather than an argument. Most were able to point to a number of ways Virgil raised the expectations of his audience, yet also managed to delay gratification of those expectations. Candidates pointed to the role of the gods through the book, particularly as a contrast to what was happening at the mortal level; Virgil's choice of the similes used to describe the protagonists; the fighting between the two sides, and in particular the roles of Turnus and Aeneas; and the final confrontation between the two heroes. There were some very effective answers that focused on the characterisation of the two leaders and the manner in which Virgil directed the reader's reaction to them. Most, but by no means all, commented effectively on the final scene itself as a 'climax' for the duel, the Book and the *Aeneid* as a whole.

### **Tacitus**

While there were some effective responses to this title, examiners felt that some candidates struggled to tie together the different strands in the title. Most were able to show how Tacitus was skilful at conveying an exciting narrative; most, again, were able to point to the more dramatic parts of the set text, though there were a number of candidates who failed to address this. Very few attempted to attack the term 'storyteller', though those that did often did very well. Some essays seemed to be incomplete reworkings of essays written previously. However the

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

majority of candidates showed a good recall of detail and were able to make some well-directed comments on Tacitus' approach to writing history.

### **Ovid**

This essay proved quite challenging, though the majority of candidates made a real attempt to contrast the 'light-hearted' Ovid with demands of his genre. Very few attempted an explicit discussion of what a 'real' love-poet was, but many had a good understanding of the history of the genre in Rome, and made some effective comparisons between Ovid and the other significant figures, such as Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius. There were also some interesting discussions of his impact on the future of the genre. Most could illustrate their arguments with a range of good examples from *Amores* 1, and there were some excellent analyses of individual poems, even if there was little unanimity over the answer to the question. The best answers challenged the key terms in the question and drew on the evidence of the poems to support their argument.

## 2493 Unprepared Translation 2

### General Comments

The overall standard of the two passages appeared to be about the same as last year's, generating almost identical results. Once again there was a wide range of marks, from the small but impressive group achieving full marks to a larger number of candidates at the other end of the scale, who seemed ill-prepared for translation at this level.

The best candidates made full use of the availability of bonus marks to compensate for errors in linguistic accuracy. Both passages were replete with phrases and words calling for treatment beyond the literal. The great majority of candidates, however, made little or no attempt to improve on the literal, even where that offered little sense; the poetic plural *guttura* was a good example. Even ablatives absolute were rendered literally into highly awkward English by many otherwise good candidates.

The two passages appear to have offered equal challenges overall, and it was a matter of personal or centre preference - or focus of preparation - that determined which generated the higher mark for each candidate.

Even at this level there is a worrying reluctance among candidates to embrace the possibility that a direct object may precede the subject in a sentence; a high percentage of candidates would rather trust their expectation of standard patterns of word order than the evidence of case endings; *quae has vires habet herba* is a good example. Similarly *coepit mea praeda moveri* led to a widespread assumption that 'he' must be the subject of *coepit*, with *mea praeda* as the object of *moveri*.

As in previous years, any parenthetical word or phrase instantly renders a sentence impenetrable for most candidates. Another recurrent problem is the handling of *-que*, many instances of which word appeared in both passages; few were the candidates who could locate the 'and's in their correct places.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Ceaser

*est autem oppidum ... servosque omnes liberaverunt*

Many candidates omitted the first *et* ('both'). Most ignored the endings of *loci natura* to give 'the natural location'. In the second sentence the most frequent error, in a large majority of scripts, was the mishandling of *his*: a few omitted it, while most treated it as an attributive adjective with *turribus*, making the latter an instrumental ablative rather than an ablative absolute. *Infirmi ad resistendum* caused many problems for those who could or would not extract the underlying meaning; 'too weak to resist' gained a bonus mark. 'They descended to extreme help' earned full marks for a literal rendering, but gave little sense; a bonus mark was awarded for 'they resorted to extreme measures'.

*quorum cognita sententia ... a re frumentaria laborabant*

Only about five percent of candidates handled the connecting relative properly; most ignored the case and gave 'these opinions' or omitted it altogether. About half the candidates identified the ablative absolute and translated the two words correctly. *Uno tempore* defeated half the candidates. Clearly there were very many candidates who knew the English word 'besiege', but

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

had no idea whether it was a verb or a noun: 'with a besiege' was common. A bonus mark was available for an improvement on the literal 'press' for *premere*. *Illi* caused the usual confusion over its case. *A re frumentaria* cried out for an improvement on the literal 'from the corn matter'; a pleasing number of candidates saw that this meant a 'shortage of corn'.

*reliqua incommoda ... in proxima castra irruerunt*

This section proved beyond the capacity of most candidates, with only a handful gaining full marks. Able candidates managed the first sentence well enough, though weaker ones thought *reliqua* was part of the verb *relinquo* (an extraordinarily common error), and many thought *ut poterant* was a purpose clause. Few saw that *longo interposito spatio* referred to time rather than space (a bonus mark was available for doing so), and the ablative absolute defeated many. *Cum* was frequently 'with', despite the gloss giving *diuturnitas* as nominative. Few indeed realised that *diuturnitas* was the subject of *effecisset*, with *Octavianos* as its object; most tried to make *neglegentiores* attributive rather than predicative. Very few recognised *nacti* ('born' was common), and most took *discessu* to be dative ('for the departure'), with *eorum* detached from it. *In muro* was usually 'in the wall', showing no understanding of the tactic being used; many tried to turn the ablative absolute into a main clause, but with no connection. Few candidates knew the meaning of *ne quid*. The majority of candidates wrongly thought that 'they' was sufficient for *ipsi*. Weaker candidates could make no sense of *cum eis quos*.

*his expugnatis ... in naves confugere coegerunt*

Few knew the meaning of *expugnatis*, and even fewer perceived that this referred to the *castra* in the previous sentence, and so had to be translated as a singular. Many did not recognise *eodem*. A bonus mark was available for translating *altera* as 'a second' or 'the next'. About half the candidates knew or guessed *inde*, but only a tiny percentage gave anything acceptable for *deinceps* (many thought it was a noun). Translations had to show that *tertia et quarta et reliqua* referred to the camps; few did so convincingly. *Reliqua* and *reliquos* further on wreaked havoc again, being taken as verbs; those who took them as nouns usually gave simply 'the remaining', which is nonsense. Most candidates took *omnibus* to be the object of *expulerunt*, rather than agreeing with *castris*. *Reliquos* was usually made part of the ablative absolute ('with a large number of the remaining killed' was the norm). Very many candidates turned the last clause into the passive, generally omitting the agent. *In naves* was usually 'in their ships'.

## Ovid

*res similis fictae ... ut in aequore niti*

A minority of candidates earned a bonus mark for improving on 'thing' for the opening *res* (e.g. 'story' or 'event'). The best candidates guessed intelligently the import of *similis fictae* ('like fiction' or, better, 'like a fantasy'); weaker ones made *similis* agree with *fictae* rather than *res*. Most had to guess the meaning of *ingere* (little credit was available for the not infrequent 'what is the use of fingers to me?'); if they came up with a verb cognate with *fictae*, they gained a bonus mark. The ablative absolute *gramine contacto* proved problematic: a common guess that ignored the syntax was 'sitting on the grass'; also common was 'when it contacted the grass', which at least had the virtue of correct syntax, but ignored the fact that remote communication was as yet uninvented; 'on contact with the grass', however, was good enough to earn a bonus. *Coepit mea praed moveri* was regularly 'he began to move my prize', paying no attention to case endings; those who did see that *mea praeda* was the subject generally gave 'to be moved' for *moveri*, which was unacceptable. Very few candidates identified *latus*; partly in consequence, many made it the subject of *mutare*. (Handling of *moveri* and *mutare* demonstrated that very few candidates had any understanding of the way Latin distinguishes between transitive and intransitive uses of verbs.) Line 3 was chosen as a line for scanning to help candidates to see that *terra* was ablative; unfortunately even many of those who scanned correctly failed to

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

transfer this detail to their translations. Many failed to translate *-que* in a correct position. Most failed to identify *niti* as an infinitive and treated *ut ... niti* as a purpose clause.

*dumque moror mirorque simul ... num sucus fecerit herbae*

Many candidates did not know the rule for tenses after *dum*. 'While I died' was depressingly common among weaker candidates; 'delayed' gained the mark, while 'hesitated' gained a bonus. Few construed *omnis* correctly, giving 'everyone fled' or 'into all the waves'. Because *turba* follows *fugit*, many could not see it as the subject of this verb, taking it instead as the subject of *relinquunt*. Many translated *dominumque novum litusque relinquunt* correctly, though equally many were ensnared by the two conjunctions, often making *novum* agree with *litus*. The occasional 'I was gobsmacked' for *obstipui* was not acceptable. The unusual juxtaposition of a perfect and historic present (*obstipui dubitoque*) was handled variously; those who maintained the two tenses were given full credit, as were those who turned the historic present into a past. 'I require' was not acceptable for *requiro*. *Num deus hoc aliquis, num sucus fecerit herbae* defeated most candidates: few saw the need to take *fecerit* with *deus*, and so most inserted 'was' to give 'surely this was some god'; the meaning of *num* in an indirect question was rarely known; since *hoc* had nothing else to agree with, it had (so the usually reasoning went) to agree with *deus*; *aliquis* was routinely neuter; few could make any sense of *fecerit*; equally few realised that *herbae* referred to the *gramine* of line 2 rather than being some undefined plural 'herbs'.

*quae tamen has ... ignotos guttura sucos*

The first clause, '*quae tamen has, inquam, vires habet herba*', defeated all but the very best candidates, despite its simple structure; firstly the interrupting *inquam* obscured the links between the rest of the words for many; secondly very few candidates were able to identify perfectly straightforward endings in order to work out subject and object; thirdly most were under the impression that *vires* meant 'men'. The compound result of these errors was usually along the lines of 'But what are these,' I asked, 'do men have herbs?' Even the better candidates could usually only manage 'But what strength does this grass have?' Most candidates, on the other hand, made good sense of the next line, usually earning a bonus for turning *dente* into the plural, and generally guessing the meaning of the unknown *momordi*. Weaker candidates failed to make *decerpta* the object of *momordi* ('and after being plucked I bit' was the imaginative choice of many), while the proximity of *decerpta* and *dente* led to the plucking of many teeth and a thriving dentist industry. The many candidates who retained the plural of *guttura* gained no credit: surely no one seriously thought the speaker had more than one throat? Many missed the pluperfect of *conbiberant*. Strangely, many candidates decided that *sucos* was the subject and gave 'the juices had slid down the throats'.

*cum subito trepidare ... corpusque sub aequore mersi.*

Many treated *trepidare* as a noun, 'fear' or 'trembling', and went on to render *intus praecordia* as 'in my heart'. The next line, *alteriusque rapi naturae pectus amore*, had a devastating effect: the vocabulary was generally known, but very few candidates could construe the clause; most translated the words in the order in which they appeared, being content to accept the resulting nonsense. By contrast the last two lines were translated well by most, apart from general ignorance of the meaning of *restare* and a failure to see that *terra* was vocative. A new verb has been coined by this year's candidature: 'I emersed' was the choice of about half the candidates for *mersi*.

## Scansion

The scansion was handled much less accurately this year.

In line 3, the elision defeated half the candidates, who were clearly not expecting to have to deal with an example in the examination. Equally disastrous, however, was the choice of an opening

*Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

dactyl (for *et mutare*) by three quarters of the candidates. Clearly few give any thought to the standard pronunciation of Latin words.

Line 9 caused fewer problems, but was still wrongly done by most candidates. An opening spondee was the norm for *pabula*. Few candidates threw marks away by marking the final syllables short instead of using an *anceps*.

## 2494 Latin Composition or Comprehension

### General Comments

Roughly the same number of candidates were entered for this paper as last year and the numbers taking each section remained the same (approximately 1/3 took Prose Composition and 2/3 Comprehension).

The examiners were once again pleased to note that nearly all candidates followed the rubric, although one or two candidates for Section A failed to write versions on alternate lines. There was much evidence of good practice amongst individual Centres and candidates (see below). Very few candidates appeared to be pushed for time. Only a few candidates (all doing Comprehension) apparently failed to finish, but all had omitted the grammatical questions, so it is possible that they did not attempt these. One or two Comprehension candidates inadvertently omitted questions.

The examiners felt that the paper was of comparable difficulty with last year's and that the two options were of a similar difficulty. Both prose and comprehension candidates generally were confident and competent within their chosen options.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Prose Composition

There were fewer instances of candidates falling back on stock vocabulary when attempting some of the more difficult parts and these were dealt with accordingly when they appeared. There was a very pleasing display of linguistic competence by the candidates, with most able to handle constructions with confidence. There were many attempts at style and hardly any omissions: any such omissions seemed to be the result of transcription errors from "rough" versions. There was an increase in the number of candidates who could not interpret the vocabulary glosses correctly. The declension of *munitor*, *-is* proved especially tough for some. Verb tenses were sometimes wayward, especially in the use of the imperfect.

"Although ... beneath the walls": there were some problems with the concessive clause, although, oddly, not with the construction itself. The case that "night" should be baffled more than 60% of the candidates – both *noctem* and *noctu* appeared, with a sprinkling of *nocti*, *nocte* and *noctis*. "Still" caused some candidates problems (which most solved by omission), as did "it was", much to the examiners' surprise. The construction for indirect command was generally sound (although there were some *iubeo ut* attempts). There were many creative attempts at "loudly". Whilst many candidates knew the word *moenia*, a significant proportion of them could not decline it. The negative purpose clause was generally correctly handled, but attempts to do this with a gerund/gerundive were, on the whole, not successful. "Enemy" oddly often became singular (usually with a plural verb), and the instances of *inimici* were too frequent. It is not often that one would besiege one's *inimicus*. "making a tunnel": there were many pleasing attempts to do this via a relative clause, but the declension of the relative pronoun gave cause for concern.

"While the soldiers ... near the gates": the *dum* clause was often well translated, but the tense of the verb inside the clause gave candidates difficulties. Where candidates incorrectly opted not to use the present indicative, incorrect use of the gloss was much in evidence. The noun *custos* was often mis-declined. "From the tunnel" was usually well done, although a large number of candidates had *de cuniculo*. The noun *turris* sometimes became masculine, despite the gloss.

“Exsuperius ... kill an enemy”: not all candidates seemed to be aware that two Latin adjectives describing the same noun are usually joined by a conjunction. The examiners felt that *magnus* did not quite capture the size of Exsuperius, although the superlative did the job well. *homo* in context was deemed the wrong word for “man”. The idiom “was the first to ...” was so rarely known that it was awarded a style mark. Where candidates did use *primus*, they tended to follow it with *ut* + subjunctive or the infinitive; the simple *primus interfecit* was only managed by a few. The principal parts of *interficio* caused a few problems, both here and later on.

“Having captured ... killed them”: most candidates spotted the ablative absolute opportunity here, but not all got it right. There was also a tendency to (not penalised) to have the noun and the participle together, with the other words elsewhere (not sandwiched as is traditional). The gender of *turris* again proved a problem. A few thought that *cipio* was a deponent verb. Many omitted the word for “this” altogether. “Without difficulty” was often translated literally. There were many pleasing and wide-ranging attempts to render the word “stealthily” – style marks were often in evidence here. Many candidates knew verbs of “approaching”, but were unfamiliar with the correct usage. Examiners were disappointed to see so few attempts to translate “sentries” with a Latin equivalent, although almost any such attempt earned style marks.

“At last the city ... was stormed”: again, the ablative absolute opportunity of “its gates open” was welcomed by most candidates, with the usual sprinkling of errors noted previously. Other options included a relative clause (with numerous errors in the relative pronoun) and a temporal clause. The perfect passive participle of *aperio* often became *aperitus*. There were some wonderful attempts at “was stormed”, some of which had examiners reaching for the Latin dictionary; *cipio* was deemed a suitable, although not stylish, alternative.

“So fierce was ... were slaughtered”: many did the opening of this sentence literally, although a small number had the courage to personalise the sentence. “men and women” caused relatively few problems, but “young and old” proved difficult, especially the declension of *vetus*, if used. Numerous candidates put the entire subject of this consecutive clause in the accusative case. There were very many creative (and gruesome) words chosen for “slaughtered”.

“Only eighty citizens ... survived”: the word for “eighty” was tough for many – not all those who attempted to circumvent this knew their Roman numerals. The word for “this” again was omitted or, if included, regularly wrong. “Survived” was correctly handled by many; Examiners were pleased to note some creative attempts to translate this by candidates who did not know *supersum*.

#### Good Practice

- Sensible attempts to use participles (but not always correctly, especially within ablative absolutes)
- Indirect commands, purpose and result clauses well known by most.
- Creative attempts to work around gaps in vocabulary.
- Some good attempts at connection.

### Areas of Weakness

- Usage and declension of pronouns, especially the relative pronoun and the demonstrative *hic, haec, hoc*.
- Confusion over the difference between deponent and non-deponent verbs: some seemed to believe that any verb could be used as a deponent.
- Tenses were a slight cause for concern.
- Some weak attempts at connection (repeated *tum, deinde* and *itaque* won't work).
- Word order within an ablative absolute was often weak.

### Section B: Comprehension

Many candidates found the passage challenging, but made good attempts to come to terms with the questions and scored well. The flexibility of the mark scheme and candidates' willingness to give very full answers helped significantly in the accrual of marks. Grammatical questions were less successfully answered, although some candidates did score full marks here. There was a tendency amongst weaker candidates not to use the full line ranges quoted in the question, thereby often providing only partial answers. A few more candidates than in previous years adopted the tactic of giving multiple answers to the grammatical questions – where this happened, examiners simply marked the first answer given.

- (a) Generally well done, although weaker candidates took *ubi primum exercitus* to mean "when the first army ...".
- (b) Usually well answered, although most candidates did not take account of the superlative *plurimo* in their answers.
- (c) Again a well answered question, although a few candidates failed to deal with *exterritis* in their answers. An even smaller number thought that *exterritis* meant "from the land".
- (d) Good, although *avertendos* sometimes posed difficulties.
- (e) Most scored full marks here.
- (f) Most candidates scored well on this question, although there were difficulties in getting the full sense. The difficult phrases were *nec hominibus magis quam pecori* and *vis morbi*. In the former, the meaning of *magis quam* and case of the dependent datives proved challenging. In the latter, the meaning of *morbus* became a continuing source of misunderstanding (some confused it with *mors*). A few candidates did not know *pecori*. Candidates could still make a couple of errors in understanding and get full marks.
- (g) As usual, most candidates gave the "lit crit" question a go, but failed fully to get to grips with the question. The translation was included to assist the candidates in their understanding of the Latin, although some candidates seemed to ignore it. A few candidates did not obey the rubric and restricted their comments to the translation without referring to Latin. There was a tendency to pick only part of the Latin that supported the point candidates wished to make: thus *ea conludio* was often not quoted along with *omnis generis* and hardly any candidate included the *animantium* (surely an interesting and important word). These five words together made what examiners considered to be an excellent point. Candidates insist on discussing position of words within the line (instead of in clauses and relative to one another) and assonance / alliteration. The examiners found it difficult to believe that the assonance of "a" in *arta tecta* or the "o" in *insolito odore* actually mimicked the dying groans, the narrow houses or the whimpering of animals.

### Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations

- 0 mark:** “The repeated “t” and “a” sounds in *confertos in arta tecta* emphasise the harsh conditions and distress.” The Examiners could not understand this point; in addition there is no attempt to explain how this might be achieved (why does a “t” indicate harsh conditions and distress?).
- 1 mark:** “Livy ends the sentence with *morbum*, thereby emphasising it”. The candidate has identified a relevant Latin word, but does not really say anything about it. Why is *morbum* an important word?
- 2 marks:** “Livy ends the sentence with *morbum* (“disease”), showing that the disease is still in effect and causing problems. Thus the ongoing distress is emphasised”. This is much better, since it identifies not only a Latin word, but shows awareness of its meaning and the significance of its position. There is also some sense of what this word means.
- 3 marks:** “*aegros curabant temere vulgabant morbum*. There is a chiasmus hinged around the word *temere*. This enables Livy to draw attention to the contrasting meanings of *curabant* and *vulgabant* by bringing them into close proximity. The adverb *temere* provides some distress by making the reader more aware of the distressing consequences of the desire to help others. The object *morbum* (disease) is delayed to the end of the sentence, leaving the reader with a lasting impression of the source of so much (ongoing) distress.” A much better answer, since the candidate has picked on a whole clause rather than one word, understands what it means and adequately explains why this would be distressing. Examiners might not always agree with the answer, but the candidate is responding to the text in a sensible way.

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

- (h) There were problems here with the meanings of the words *clades* and *sustinentibus*.
- (i) Generally sound, although candidates were sometimes unclear about whose land was being devastated.
- (j) This was tricky for many candidates. Translation of individual words did not pose a problem *per se*, but piecing it together proved more difficult. Despite the gloss of *populari* many got the tense (and hence the sense) wrong. The clause *si qua eius mali quies veniat* proved exceptionally difficult, although full marks could still be obtained without it. The meaning of *opem* and the tense of *laturos esse* were seldom correct.
- (k) This proved very hard: *nuntium* often became a messenger; the meaning of *pro* was rarely known; the comparative was not spotted; the tense of *referentes* was often guessed and *domum* was translated as if it were *domi*.
- (l) Generally good, but comparatively few candidates got the actual fate of Servilius right.
- (m) Difficult for candidates: *non modo* regularly omitted; *tumultu* taken to mean “crowd”; *poscebat* not known; *quietas* omitted (since the noun to which it referred was glossed, examiners needed this to be included); *viribus* taken as “men”, although in context (and depending on what the candidate actually wrote) this was often allowed.
- (n) The tricky one here was *hominibus* where examiners insisted on a recognition of what case it was in context (“for men”, not “to men”). As usual, *res* did not mean “thing”.

- (o) The two ablatives were generally OK, but the accusative *Aequos* was often explained as the subject of the sentence and *sociis* was taken as a genitive.
- (p) Nearly all candidates got (ii) the result clause, but few spotted the indirect command of (i).

#### Areas of Weakness

- Candidates are still too reluctant to stray from the literal, even when an idiomatic translation is called for.
- Style questions generally need to be better addressed (see Tips section).
- Grammatical questions seem to be a question of pot luck for candidates – but they are an important part of the comprehension.
- Some candidates (a minority, but still quite a large number) limit themselves to only some of the Latin cited in a question.

#### 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 or position in a line, since where a word appears within the layout of a piece of prose will depend entirely upon the margins and the typeface used.
- Do mention position of words inside **clauses** and **relative positions** of words (e.g. juxtaposition and chiasmus).
- If discussing a single word (e.g. *conludio* or *confertos*), be sure to explain why the word is unusual or emphatic.
- It is generally easier to gain marks by quoting phrases and clauses rather than single words (see “Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations”).

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Latin 3818/7818  
June 2008 Examination 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	65	58	52	46	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2481-90	Raw	120	82	73	64	55	47	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2493	Raw	90	67	59	52	45	38	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2494	Raw	90	69	62	55	48	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

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

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
<b>3818</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>7818</b>	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
<b>3818</b>	65.0	84.9	93.4	97.2	98.5	100.0	1353
<b>7818</b>	67.7	86.9	95.5	98.4	99.7	100.0	1432

## 2785 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2008

