

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2009**

**3818/7818/MS/R/09**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 2009

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> |
|---|-------------|
| Chief Examiner's Report                 | 1           |
| 2471-2480 Latin Literature 1            | 2           |
| 2481-2490 Latin Literature 3            | 4           |
| 2491 Latin Literature 2                 | 11          |
| 2492 Unprepared Translation 1           | 14          |
| 2493 Unprepared Translation 2           | 16          |
| 2494 Latin Composition or Comprehension | 21          |
| Grade Thresholds                        | 27          |

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

Examiners are delighted to report that in this, the final full year of the legacy GCE specification, all units performed well. Outcomes were very much in line with previous years. A slightly weaker performance on the two A2 language units was compensated for by a marginally better performance on the literature, particularly the Virgil, by far the most popular text. The language units provided evidence that vocabulary knowledge was not as strong as in some years, and more candidates struggled to make sense of common constructions. It is perhaps worth reminding centres of the need to immerse candidates thoroughly in the writings of the prescribed unseen authors, so that commonly used expressions and themes do not take candidates by surprise.

In the literature, a thorough knowledge of the text is the essential foundation stone for handling all types of question. Too many candidates are unable to give accurate meanings for the Latin they choose to analyse, or they cannot venture in detail beyond the limits of the passages in front of them when confronted by wide-ranging questions.

These criticisms aside, Examiners were once again impressed by the overall dedication to the subject shown by the overwhelming majority of candidates.

# 2471-2480 Latin Literature 1

## General Comments

This was the final sitting for this set of legacy units and the candidature was small. These circumstances may limit the extent to which this report is valuable for informing the future work of centres and candidates. Nevertheless, Examiners do wish to record their thanks to candidates and their centres for the quality of the work which they have assessed and the scholarship and preparation which have enabled that work to be done.

Examiners are confident that the units set candidates tasks of appropriate difficulty, yet of a difficulty comparable across all the texts examined, and that even within the small candidature, the units have produced an appropriate spread of marks.

Many candidates performed very well indeed and are to be congratulated. Those who did not achieve the highest marks showed similar weaknesses to those appearing in previous sessions: failure to refer to the Latin text, or to limited areas of text within the lines set for discussion in the question, concentration on content to the exclusion of style (occasionally the other way round), some confusion over stylistic and rhetorical technical terms.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Cicero

- 1 Generally all three parts of this question were soundly answered, though a number of candidates lowered their marks in part (a) by concentrating too much on too narrow a section of text, usually the first five lines to *donationes*.

Answers to Question (b) were marred at times by concentration only on Chrysogonus' connection with Sulla.

Question (c) was generally well and fully answered.

- 2 There were comparatively few candidates offering this question; those who did, did so well on the whole, particularly Question (a). Some answers to (b) concentrated too much/only on suspicion of involvement in the murder based on Glaucia's speed of travel. Question (c) did produce some good understanding of the effects of the rhetoric-rhetorical questions in particular.

### Virgil

- 1 Question (a) was often well answered, though some candidates again restricted themselves to too narrow a set of lines. The simile of the storm cloud was sometimes the only focus for attention, but it was usually very well discussed – including its stylistic aspects.

Question (b) was usually very well answered indeed.

Question (c) was also usually very well answered – clearly a well known and well covered passage.

- 2 In Question (a), less strong answers did not cover all the lines set, and some did not seem sure about swearing by the Styx or exactly what Juno was asking for the future of the Trojans to be.

Style discussion varied here between very perceptive and very patchy.

In Question (b) the few candidates unsure of what Juno was asking were also unsure of what Jupiter was granting, but otherwise this was well answered.

In answering Question (c) some candidates did not read the question fully and spent much of their time recounting what happened after the two men faced each other alone, rather than before.

### **Tacitus**

Some Candidates failed to appreciate Germanicus' resentment of the new emperor, Tiberius, in Question 1(a)(ii).

In Question 2(a)(i) the key word 'identify' required individuals' names, which not all candidates recalled.

Otherwise there was a lot of very good and worthwhile work, which was rewarding to read.

Discussion of Tacitus' style in Questions 1(b) and 2(c) often showed very good grasp of the way in which Tacitus makes the words, and the reader, work hard. Most of the points made in the mark scheme were covered in the answers assessed. In 2(c) however, some candidates did restrict their coverage of the text to the first few lines and were uncertain of the reference to Augustus.

The two questions worth 15 marks were often awarded the full marks, indicating very good grasp of the details of the storyline in the passages.

### **Ovid**

There was a tendency to omit reference to the central section (ll 14 - 18) of the passage in Q2(b), making answers less wide-ranging or lacking in scope, but with that proviso most candidates presenting answers on the Ovid text did so with sound recall of the detail and good discussion of both content and style issues.

Question 1(b) was often very well and thoroughly answered.

The 9 and 15 mark questions were often awarded full marks.

## 2481-2490 Latin Literature 3

### General Comments

#### Section A

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 demonstrated their understanding through precise reference to the Latin passage and well-judged analysis of the examples they chose. A number of candidates tried to cover every aspect of the passage, which tended to produce a disjointed answer which did not fit so easily into the higher bands. The Examiners do not expect candidates to cover every part of a passage in the limited time available. However, the very best candidates clearly organised their answers: in each paragraph there was clear reference to the Latin text, a reason given for choosing it as an answer to the question and a thorough discussion in the context of the passage. Many candidates were very precise in their reference to the passage, giving line numbers where appropriate; this was appreciated by Examiners.

A very few candidates made limited reference to the Latin in some or all responses. While the very best responses make clear and confident use of the text of the passage, there are still some candidates who make this more difficult for Examiners: there were fewer candidates this year who quoted long passages of Latin, assuming that it is immediately clear to Examiners why these words have been selected, but there were a not inconsiderable number who quoted the first and last word of a section of the passage and then made a reference to words they had not quoted. This makes it difficult for Examiners to give full credit. Less confident responses tended to rely over-heavily on paraphrase, with a few individual words dotted around to demonstrate an understanding of the text, though this approach was rarely convincing and, if there were a significant number of errors, rather counter-productive.

The majority of candidates were well schooled in the best ways to approach Latin texts, and many had a well-developed critical vocabulary; *lexis* proved popular this year, though it did not always contribute a great deal to the analysis. Some responses noted examples of alliteration or dactylic rhythm without expanding further to show what purpose these served in the context of the passage. Scansion, when given, was usually accurate, though it did not always support the analysis offered; very few candidates appeared to force lines to fit a predetermined pattern. There are still a very small number of candidates who use terms appropriate to the criticism of poetry when dealing with prose authors (e.g. enjambment). A number of candidates seemed determined to introduce into their answer a large number of abstruse, recondite and (in the opinion of Examiners) imaginary technical terms which were not always used appropriately and rendered what they were saying less clear rather more precise.

The main discriminator is still the quality of analysis. Clearly structured answers focused on the question were easier for Examiners to reward in the higher bands. As in previous years, 9 mark questions have a more limited scope and therefore answers need to make fuller use of the text; there are a number of approaches to an 18 mark question; the best answers make a range of points drawing on material from the beginning, middle and end of the passage.

There were a number of candidates whose understanding of the set passages was less than sound; there were a greater proportion of weaker answers on Sallust and Juvenal. However, the majority of candidates were able to deal confidently with the authors they had studied and were well able to apply themselves to the demands of the questions.

## Section B

There were many very good essays on all four set texts once again, where candidates responded to the challenge of the question and made excellent selections from the set text in presenting their argument. A small number of candidates produced very short or incomplete essays (less than a page and a half), and were obviously having difficulty recalling detail from the text they had studied. Many candidates planned their work extremely effectively, and produced essays that were well structured and clearly argued. As in previous years, some candidates wrote very long essays, often without a clear structure, which Examiners found hard to credit to the full. Handwriting was once again an issue for some candidates, particularly in the essay, as this was normally the last question to be tackled.

### Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates achieved a high score for this as in previous years, as they wrote very clearly with a high degree of literacy and an impressively wide vocabulary. A few struggled with the spelling of the names of key characters and works (e.g. Aeneas, Jupiter, *Aeneid*, Catiline). Examiners were on occasion challenged by miniscule script and, on occasion, excessive length. 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, and a lack of organisation was apparent in some candidates who included paragraphs in different locations within their answer, sometimes clearly linked, sometimes not so. Examiners also appreciate a little space being left between questions for annotations and marks.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Section A

#### Cicero

This set text proved reasonably popular with candidates this year.

#### Question 1

In their answers to (a), which was generally well answered, most candidates were able to select a good range of detail from the passage, such as the tricolon of names in line 1 (*Metellis, Serviliis, Scipionibus*); most candidates commented on the importance of these families for the defence, and noted the emphasis given by *non modo hospitium, verum etiam domesticus usus et consuetudo* (lines 1-2). Many went on to note the contrast *ex suis omnibus commodis hoc solum* (line 3). Stronger candidates analysed the effectiveness of *patrimonium domestici praedones vi ereptum possident* (line 4), and the strong *fama et vita innocentis* (line 4-5) together with the emphasis on Roscius' *hospitibus amicisque* (line 5).

The answers to (b) were generally thorough; weaker responses focused mainly on the content of the passage while stronger candidates were well able to use the language employed by Cicero to good effect. Many noted *nobilitatis fautor fuisset* (line 6) and the portentous *omnium nobilium dignitas et salus in discrimen veniret* (lines 6-7). Many commented on the way Roscius is singled out by Cicero (eg *praeter ceteros* (line 7), though a good number missed the restrictions implied in *in ea vicinitate* (line 7) and overstated his importance in the wider scheme of things. Many commented on *partem causamque* (line 7) and most noted the tricolon *opera, studio, auctoritate* (line 8), though few presented an analysis of it, and some gave unconvincing translations. The emphasis given by Cicero's use of *honestate* (line 8) and *honestissimus* (line 9) was usually picked out, though again the qualification *inter suos* (line 10) was passed over. Most candidates have a clear understanding of the situation obtaining in Rome at the time, and understood why Cicero emphasised Roscius' actions at this time (*Romae frequens atque in foro et in ore omnium cotidie versabatur* (line 11-12).



Most candidates were able to find relevant examples in (c). They noted that *veteres inimicitiae* (line 14) was picked up by *inimicitias* (line 16), and how Cicero hammered away at the two T. Roscii in these lines. Many commented on the contrast in use of *video* and *audio* (line 15), and on Cicero's reference to the *accusatorum subsellis* (line 15), together with the alliteration of *praedia possidere* (line 15). A number commented, not always very clearly, on the use of the subjunctives *potuisset* and *viveret* (line 16). Most candidates picked out the strong language used to characterise these men at the end of this passage (*plurimarum palmarum vetus ac nobilis gladiator, lanistam* (line 19), *tiro* (line 20)) and the effectiveness of the final phrase (*facile ipsum magistrum scelere audaciaque superavit* (line 20-21)).

## Question 2

In (a) most candidates identified Cicero's skilful use of two opposing voices, and his exploitation of the dramatic possibilities of this approach both to make his client seem an implausible murderer and to focus the attention of the jury more firmly on Magnus. Many noted the repeated use of *at ego* (lines 2, 3) and the way Cicero used the prosecution's characterisation of his client (*agricola et rusticus* (line 3)) as an argument in favour of his innocence. The majority of responses included Cicero's repetition (*in gregem sicariorum ... sum sicarius* (line 4)), and his emphatic use of *permulta* (line 5), together with the strong *summam tibi facultatem fuisse maleficii suscipiendi* (line 6). Rather fewer candidates picked up on the relevance of *ad plures* (line 9).

The majority of candidates dealt reasonably well with (b), and were able to demonstrate a good understanding of the content. Cicero's continued apostrophe of Titus Roscius was commented on by many, together with the emphatic repetition (*aperta et manifesta* (line 12)) and his strong language (*dus Fidius* (line 12)) as he addresses the jurors. A number remarked on his apparent reluctance (*invitus ea dicam* (lines 12-13)) to turn the tables on a prosecution witness and become prosecutor himself. Not all candidates seemed entirely clear about what was meant by *venit enim mihi in mentem oris tui* (lines 15-16), though most were able to deal with the end of the passage effectively, as Cicero increasingly focused his attention on Magnus (*in iudicio versarere et sederes cum accusatore* (line 18)) and brought the passage to a conclusion with the emphatic *ab omnibus mortalibus audacia tua cognoscatur et impudentia* (lines 19-20).

## Virgil

This section was, as always, very popular.

## Question 1

The majority of candidates responded well to the passage in (a), though a number concentrated on the first part of the passage and said relatively little about the incident involving Murranus. There were some extremely effective discussions of the similes, though there were also a few responses that betrayed a lack of certainty about the text; a very few suggested there was one fire and one river, for example. The best responses selected a variety of detail from the similes to show energy and destructiveness, and then related them to Aeneas and Turnus (e.g. *immissi diversis partibus ignes* (line 1), *decursu rapido* (line 3), *dant sonitum spumosi amnes* (line 4), *quisque suum populatus iter* (line 5)). The close coupling of the heroes' names (*Aeneas Turnusque* (line 6)) placed emphatically at the beginning of the line was noted by many, as was the strong verb (*ruunt*, picking up *currunt* (line 4)) and the alliteration (*per proelia* (line 6)) before the unusual break before the final foot. Almost all candidates commented on *nunc, nunc* (line 6) and on the powerful language of lines 7 and 8 (*fluctuat ira, rumpuntur nescia vinci pectora, totis in vulnera viribus itur*). The best responses noted the emphatic position of *Murranum* (line 9) and the sound of *atavos et avorum antiqua sonantem / nomina* (lines 9-10), together with the strongly positioned and delayed *praecipitem* (line 11). Many also commented upon *excudit effunditque solo* (line 12) with a strong break after *solo*; not all candidates disentangled the last few lines, though many mentioned *nec domini memorum* (line 14). Some were not sure who *hic* (line 9) referred to.

Responses to (b) were more mixed; not all candidates were able to separate confidently the various victims and show how Virgil treated each of them in different ways. In line 15, a number of candidates took *Hyllo* as a nominative, and made *ruenti* describe Turnus, though stronger responses commented on the effectiveness of the two present participles and the enjambment which threw emphasis on *occurrit* (line 16). Some commented on *aurata ad tempora* (line 16), but the majority were struck by the vivid description in line 17. There were some confusions about the next two victims, though many commented on the strong positioning of *dextera ... tua* (line 18) and the pathetic effect of addressing Cretheus. Many responses noted the use of *di ... sui* (lines 19-20) as a way of individualising Cupencus. The final example of Aeolus proved more straightforward for most candidates, who noted the use of apostrophe and the Iliadic references. Many commented on the abrupt *occidis* in line 24, and there were some excellent comments on the final two lines, though many ignored *metae* (line 26) and a few mistranslated *solo* (line 27).

## Question 2

Some candidates in (a) did not immediately pick up the reference of *harum unam* (line 1), though there were some good comments on the way that *luppiter* and *iussit* framed line 2. The majority of candidates picked up on the repetition of *celerem* (line 1) and *celeri* (line 3) (and *celeres* later (line 7)); a few seem to treat *celeri* as an adverb modifying *volat* (line 3). There were some excellent discussions of the simile (lines 4-7), which focus on some of the important aspects emphasised by Virgil; relatively few candidates collected all the different strands of the simile together to show how terrifying it suggested the *dira* was (e.g. *per nubem* (line 4), *saevi ... felle veneni* (line 5), *immedicabile* (line 6), *stridens, incognita* (line 7)). Many candidates were able to select a range of points about the *dira* as it made its way to earth; some concentrated mainly on content (e.g. *in bustis aut culminibus desertis* (line 11)), while others made range of points about the language in addition to this. Most candidates picked out *fertque refertque stridens* (line 14) and the description of Turnus's reaction (lines 15-16).

In (b) weaker answers tended to focus on the number of rhetorical questions with limited discussion of the detail at various points through the passage. On the other hand, there were some excellent analyses by candidates who were entirely confident about the meaning of the passage and Virgil's use of language. Most candidates picked up on the language of the family which stressed the relationship between Juturna and Turnus, and the frequent use of personal pronouns: e.g. *soror* (line 19), *germana* (line 20), *fratri* (line 29), *frater* (line 31), *te tua* (line 20), *te sine* (line 31). Many commented on *infelix* (line 18), emphasised by its position at the start of the line, and on the emotional self-mutilation of Juturna (lines 18-19). The repetition of *iam iam* (line 23) was commented on to good effect, as was the alliteration of *terrete timentem* (line 23). There were some excellent discussions of the tone of *iussa superba / magnanimi lovis* (lines 25-26) and also of the anguish and despair in the final lines of the passage, where Juturna seeks to accompany her brother down to hell (*immortalis ego?* (line 30), *mihi dulce meorum / te sine, frater* (lines 30-31)).

## Sallust

Sallust was the least popular author this year.

## Question 1

There were a number of responses to (a) which betrayed a less than confident understanding of the Latin passage. However the majority of candidates were able to make relevant selections to show how Sallust makes this a powerful and dramatic speech. There were some excellent discussions of the contrasts in the questions in the first part of this passage (e.g. *divitias superare* (line 1)/*ad necessaria deesse* (line 3), and many commented on the exaggeration and word order in *extruendo mari et montibus coaequandis* (line 2). Specific vocabulary was noted to good effect: *larem familiarem* (lines 3-4), *tabulas signa toreumata* (line 4), *trahunt vexant* (line 5) etc. Most candidates noted the strong contrast at *at nobis* (line 6) and the following tricolon: *domi inopia, foris aes alienum, mala res spes multo asperior* (line 6-7). The best responses dealt well

with *en illa illa ... libertas* (line 8) and the lists that followed (*divitiae decus gloria* (line 9), *res tempus pericula egestas, belli spolia magnifica* (line 10)). Many commented on *vel imperatore vel milite me utimini* (line 11), though the last two lines of the passage were not always understood.

In (b) candidates generally commented sensibly on the demands made by the conspirators in three focused questions and (*quae condicio ... quae praemia ... quid ...* (lines 16-17)) in response to the speech in the earlier part of the passage. There were some very good discussions of Catiline's reply and the different elements within it (*tabulas novas, proscriptionem locupletium, magistratus, sacerdotia, rapinas* (lines 17-18)). Most candidates were able to show good understanding of the background in the later part of the passage and the relevance of the names. Many made effective use of the contrast in the final sentence (*maledictis increpabat omnes bonos, suorum unum quemquam nominans laudare* (lines 23-24)).

## Question 2

In (a) there were some excellent responses, though a number of candidates clearly found the description of the battle challenging. The best answers focused on the language used to make the fighting come vividly to life and focus the reader's attention on first one side, then the other: e.g. *cum infestis signis cocurrunt; pila omittunt, gladiis res geritur* (line 2). Many commented on the use of the effective use of the historic infinitive in this passage (e.g. *vorsari ... succurrere ... etc.* (lines 4-5)), and in particular on the role played by Catiline in the fighting. There were some very well considered discussions of the final few lines and Catiline's role at the end of the battle; most commented on *memor generis atque pristinae suae dignitatis in confertissimos hostes incurrit* (lines 11-12) and on the striking *pugnans confoditur* (line 12). A few concentrated mainly on archaisms (e.g. *maxumo* (line 1) etc.) and rather lost sight of what was being described.

In (b) there were again some very well judged discussions. Most commented on *quanta audacia quantaque animi vis* (line 13) and understood the significance of *quem quisque vivos pugnando locum ceperat, eum amissa anima corpora tegebat* (lines 14-15); many also commented on *advorsis vulneribus* (line 16) and on the description of Catiline (*paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivos, in voltu retinens* (lines 17-18)). Some of the better answers commented on the reference to a *civis ingenuus* (line 19) and were able to show how Sallust brought out the impact of the battle (*neque ... laetam aut incruentam victoriam* (lines 20-21) on the victorious forces (*strenuissimus quisque aut occiderat ... aut graviter vulneratus* (lines 21-22)). There were some effective analyses of the final part of the passage, focusing on the aftermath of the battle (*amicum alii pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiebant* (lines 23-24)) and the majority of candidates noted the final sentence (*per omnem exercitum laetitia maeror luctus atque gaudia agitabantur* (lines 24-25)).

## Juvenal

This proved a challenging section for some candidates. The episodic nature of the poems caused confusion for some, who clearly were uncertain as to exactly which part of the text they were dealing with.

## Question 1

There were some very good discussions of (a); most candidates seemed aware that they were dealing with some Greek words at the start (*trechedipna* (line 1), *ceromatico, niceteria* (line 2)) and many commented on the vocative *Quirine* (line 1). However a number read this as *Quirites*, and very few commented on the strongly positioned *rusticus ille tuus* (line 1). The majority of candidates were able to identify this section as part of Juvenal's attack on Greek influences in Rome, though not all were able to identify what was meant by *Esquilias dictumque petunt a vimine collem* (line 5); the best answers had plenty to say about *viscera magnarum domuum dominique future* (line 6). Many candidates identified the tricolon *ingenium ... audacia ... sermo ...* (line 7), though a number misinterpreted *Isaao torrentior* (line 8). There were some

interesting discussions of the various roles the Greeks fulfilled in Rome, though some candidates seemed a little uncertain about the meaning of individual words: many commented on *schoenobates* (line 11) and on *omnia novit / Graeculus esuriens* (lines 11-12), and understood the humour in *in caelum, iusseris, ibit* (line 12). Not all candidates were able to link this to the final two lines of this section.

In (b) most candidates picked out *conchylia* (line 15), though by no means all explained why it was significant. There were some good discussions of *me prior ille* at the end of line 15, though relatively few candidates discussed the activities identified in line 16. Many candidates commented on the contrast between Greeks *adventus Romam quo pruna et cottana vento* (line 17) and Romans such as Umbricius brought up in the centre of Rome. The majority of candidates noted the superlative in *adulandi gens prudentissima* (line 20), though not all commented on its tone. There were some excellent analyses of the examples of typical Greek insincerity in lines 21-25; most were aware of the significance of the myth in line 23, but rather fewer explain the significance of the *gallina* (line 25). Relatively few commented on the implications of *sed illis / creditur* (lines 26-27), and the ending of the passage was misunderstood by some candidates.

## Question 2

In (a) the beginning of the passage proved problematic for some candidates, either because they identified the context and then continue as if Alexander was the subject, or because they were unclear at what point in the poem this passage occurred. There were some excellent responses that identified very clearly the references to the Greek background and Xerxes. Weaker responses often picked up individual words without identifying the context, so any comment was less focused. For some individual words (e.g. the diminutive *corpuscula* (line 2)) this did not matter. However, the relative difficulty of the Latin and the range of mythological and historical references certainly presented a challenge, to which the best candidates made an excellent response: they were able to explain what was meant by *velificatus Athos et ... Graecia mendax* in line 3, and could discuss the details based on the text of Herodotus; fewer were confident about *Ennosigaeum* (line 11). Most candidates were able to deal with *Salamine relicta* (line 8) and there were some interesting discussions of Xerxes' return (*una nave, cruentis / fluctibus ac tarda per densa cadavera prora* (lines 14-15)). Some candidates misinterpreted the final line.

The (b) question produced a range of responses. The very best recognised the significance of the prayer in line 17 and commented on the effectiveness of the switch to the 2nd person (*optas* (line 18)). Most candidates were able to discuss the details of Juvenal's account of old age to good purpose, with clear and precise references to the Latin text, together with some well judged remarks about word order and choice of vocabulary. It was clear that, for some candidates at least, Juvenal's comments about old age chimed pretty closely with their own thoughts. Many candidates commented on the exclamation *quam continuus et quantis ... / malis* (lines 19-20) and also on the repetition of *deformem* (lines 20, 21); some clearly relished the humour of the description of the *mater simia* (line 24). The contrast between young and old in lines 25-29 was often effectively handled. The meaning of *gravis uxori natisque sibi* (line 30) was well understood and well discussed, though there were a few candidates who were unclear what to make of *captatori ... Cosso* (line 31).

## Section B (essays)

### Cicero

This essay proved relatively straightforward for candidates. The best responses were well organised and drew together a range of material from the *pro Roscio* under a number of headings. A number of candidates made very effective use of the two passages quoted on the paper, but there were also those who were able to quote the Latin from memory. Candidates

who referred to what Cicero said only in English were not disadvantaged, though this made it harder to discuss his use of language. Most candidates dealt with the topic effectively and some demonstrated an impressive knowledge of the text and understanding of rhetorical technique.

### **Virgil**

The quotation in the title provided something of a challenge to students, and in most cases they rose to that challenge very effectively. The majority of candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of Book 12; a number ranged more widely over the *Aeneid* as a whole, but they kept the focus for the most part on the set text. There were some excellent discussions of Turnus's role in the book, and there were some very sympathetic treatments of Virgil's presentation of him. Some candidates were more critical of the way Aeneas was depicted, particularly at the end of the poem. The role of the gods was seen as very significant by many candidates, and there were some interesting treatments of the battle scenes in the middle of the book. Weaker answers were generally less focused on 'triumphant'.

### **Sallust**

Candidates in general were well-prepared for an essay on this topic, and showed a good understanding of their set text for the most part. There were a small number who struggled to recall sufficient detail to illustrate their general comments, but the majority drew on a wide range of examples from different parts of the text, and were able to discuss Sallust's presentation of Catiline's character at different points. Many made very effective use of the end of the book, and were able to show convincingly where Sallust highlights positive characteristics for Catiline. A very few candidates misinterpreted the question, though not in such a way as to entirely undermine what they wrote.

### **Juvenal**

There was a range of responses to this particular title. There were many excellent candidates whose knowledge of the text was most impressive; they were able to show knowledge of both satires in considerable detail and relate what they said to the title. Most candidates responded very well to the often difficult material contained in these two poems, and they were able to discuss Juvenal's use of exaggeration with some well chosen examples; some were less certain about unpersuasiveness. In many cases it was clear that candidates had found what Juvenal had to say challenging and stimulating. There were also some weaker responses, where candidates did not know the text of the satires in sufficient depth, and there were some who struggled to relate what they knew to the question.

## 2491 Latin Literature 2

### General Comments

This examination was the last sitting for this legacy unit and the candidature was small. However the Examiners wish to record their view that the unit set candidates tasks of suitable difficulty and complexity and while the circumstances may make it less useful for centres to draw conclusions from the candidates' performances, the Examiners would wish to record their thanks to candidates and their centres for the good work assessed and the hard work and preparation that will have supported it.

Translation and essay work alike showed much the same variety of strengths and weaknesses exhibited in earlier sittings of this unit. Much translation was accurately and thoroughly recalled, though perhaps inevitably a few candidates still gave the impression of meeting these passages for the first time. Omission of words and, more frequently, the failure to grasp clues to sentence structure given by endings were often to be found in the scripts of candidates who did not score the full marks.

In essay work, there were a number of very fine answers, recalling the text in some detail and applying that recalled knowledge to the question with thoroughness and intelligence. Those candidates who did not achieve the highest marks tended either to have a sketchy memory for text detail, or did not succeed in producing the essential range of analytical points needed to address the question fully. Some confined themselves to a simple retelling of the narrative of the text without analysis.

For most the quality of written communication was good enough to warrant the full 3 marks.

There were no signs of rubric errors and candidates who had studied part of the texts in translation were on the whole well able to use information from the translated section successfully in their essays.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Translations

##### Cicero (i)

Mostly well answered, but the common error here was to reverse the subject/object relationship of *ossa terra*: several candidates wrote that the bones did not touch the earth; *tanti maleficii crimen* posed problems for those who did not know that *crimen* is a charge, not a crime. In some cases tenses were inaccurately rendered, especially in the first few lines.

##### Cicero (ii)

There were few candidates offering this passage; those who did performed well.

##### Virgil (i)

The vocatives *Turne* were sometimes not translated; the hypothetical nature of *per si quis...* did not come out very clearly. Several students translated *Latini* as 'Latins' rather than as 'of Latinus'; and some did not correctly render the cases of *generum Aenean captive videbo*.

### Virgil (ii)

Quite often it was not seen that *durae* agrees with *mihi*; the force of the reduplication of *iam* was sometimes missed; and few candidates understood the nature of *mortis...condicio*.

### Tacitus (i)

A few carelessly translated *praefectum* as a plural; and the tendency of Lucilius to ask for a third stick was not noted by some: *rursus aliam* was omitted.

### Tacitus (ii)

*Gallias* was often taken as people, not place; Agrippina often had many children rather than several (*plures*); and *Augustae* was quite often translated as masculine. Sometimes the hatred was more bitter, rather than its causes (*causae*); and few correctly saw the acquisitive nature of *potitus*: 'was in power' was a common version.

### Ovid (i)

Some did not see that *tantum* qualifies *conviva*; as this is a set text, detail of this kind is expected. Often not all the parts of *alterius sinus apte subiecta fovebis* were acknowledged in the translation.

### Ovid (ii)

Quite a few candidates did not get the right sense of *passa*, or fully render the sense of *imum qua patet usque latus*; the pluperfect of *contigerant* was often missed.

For the Ovid there were, for good or ill, fewer verbatim copies of Barsby's translation than in previous sessions.

## Essays

### Cicero

Some candidates confined themselves too much to the first bullet point, some reached discussion of the second also, but there were few that mentioned Cicero's response to Erucius, and hardly anyone mentioned the *cui bono* argument. Nevertheless, candidates did quite often use the parts of the text which they did employ, to answer the question and think of emotions and feelings aroused in the jury.

### Virgil

Perhaps too many candidates restricted the range of 'pictures' given by Virgil to those associated with the first bullet point, and even these quite often tended to omit the final duel and the sense of the injustice or futility of warfare it conveys. Very few candidates included sound discussion of the role of the gods and fate, surely crucial in seeing some very significant aspects of warfare in the ancient world.

### **Tacitus**

Some very sound work was produced here, with a range of points made and supported by text recall, though at times that was a little narrow. Some interesting comparisons were made between Tacitean narrative and film, as candidates sensed the author's skill in producing narrative that is easy to visualise.

### **Ovid**

Some candidates rather fell into retelling the stories of the poems, or at least a selection of them, one hopes their favourites, rather than drawing some general conclusions about what makes Ovid worth reading, and there seemed to be a reluctance on the part of some candidates actually to respond to the poems. The Examiners would have accepted (and in a few cases did indeed accept) a well supported 'none at all' as the basis of an answer, if candidates had really not enjoyed reading the Amores.



## 2492 Unprepared Translation 1

This year's examination had a higher proportion of re-sits than usual, with a corresponding rise in the number of very good scripts and fall in the number of very weak ones. There were a gratifying number of very accurate translations and these candidates had clearly thought carefully about what they were doing. However, many seemed unwilling to take a risk and try something more stylish than the literal. Consequently, there were few scripts with a very high number of bonus marks. Candidates should be encouraged to improve on a literal translation of an ablative absolute or a gerundive of obligation, for example. Sometimes, even a more precise word than the basic meaning was enough for the candidate to be awarded a bonus mark.

### Section 1

*interea...mente*: Most candidates made sense of this, even if they missed the agreement of *melior* with *iuvenis* rather than with *forma*. Some tried more interesting words than *mind* for *mente* (brains, intelligence). A rare few gained a bonus here for such renderings as *better physically than mentally*.

*consilium...interficeret*: There were some awkward attempts at fitting the *ut* and *simulac* clauses together but the vast majority did this section well. The pluperfect tense of *ceperat* was frequently missed, even by very good candidates, but good use of suitable English, such as *had devised*, *had hatched*, *had come up with* were worth a bonus. Candidates should be aware that if they choose to make an active very passive, they must include the agent. In this section, *he would be killed* would not be deemed correct for *eum interficeret* without *by him*.

*eo...ortus*: *eo tempore* was occasionally translated as *at the same time* but most difficulty was encountered with the phrase *clarissimo genere ortus*. Candidates could see the superlative force of *clarissimo* but not always the agreement with *genere* which was sometimes incorrectly identified as infinitive. Such offerings as *descended from a very distinguished family* outnumbered those who did not recognise *ortus* at all and any sensible attempt at a suitable English word for *genere* (*family*, *background* rather than *race*) gained a bonus.

*Urbis...praeerat*: Sadly, easy marks were lost here if candidates did not use the information in the glossary, where *praesum* + *dative* was given. *He was in command of the city with guards* was all too common and this imperfect tense was frequently mistaken as pluperfect. Candidates need to be careful over redundant pronouns e.g. *C Maecenas... he was in command*.

### Section 2

*hic...poscebat*: As long as candidates avoided the redundant pronoun and realised that *res* was the subject of *poscebat*, all was well.

*Multos...poterat*: *poterat* taken as a pluperfect was the only real issue here.

*in...esset*: The main problem here was caused by the straightforward word *in*. If candidates chose to ignore it and made *officiis ac perculis* the direct object of *intellegebat*, *quid* inevitably became *which* rather than *what*. There were many stylish and accurate renderings of *faciendum esset*, even if this introductory *quid* was mishandled as a relative pronoun.

*cum...placebat*: *cum vero otium haberet* proved surprisingly difficult, mainly due to the lack of vocabulary knowledge, *otium* being confused with *odium* or even *omnium* and *haberat* being taken as if from *habitare*. Almost all candidates could translate *in vino...placebat* accurately, but it produced a clumsy English sentence – *it pleased him to live in wine and luxury*. A simple tweak to *he enjoyed living...* would gain a bonus and if the candidate were brave enough to try

he enjoyed drinking wine and living a life of luxury they could gain another one. However, only a very few were indeed brave enough, the safe option being far more common.

### Section 3

*quamquam...cupiebat*: This was generally done very well, the only pitfalls being *maiores* taken as *great* or *better*, *honores* not seen as plural, *neque* not given its full force of *neither* and *sibi* omitted or not treated as a reflexive.

### Section 4

*is...speculatus est*: The level of difficulty increased in this section. *summa* was often correctly identified as *greatest* or *utmost*, but then incorrectly taken as agreeing with *consilia* to produce a meaningless translation. As long as *cum* was not translated as a conjunction, there was a bonus for a good choice of word for *cum quiete*, such as *discretion*, *subtlety* or *secrecy*. *consilia* as a plural was often missed.

*tum...necato*: *rerum* and *hominum* had to be identified as plurals to gain the mark, but the majority of candidates were able to handle this section without too many problems. Congratulations should be given to those candidates who fitted the ablative absolute *iuvene...necato* smoothly into their translation rather than using *with the young man having been killed*. Those candidates who did not attempt to maintain a connection eg *the young man was killed, he surprised...* lost a mark, where the simple addition of *and* would indeed have achieved a bonus. There was often confusion as to whom *ipso* was referring to and the superlative force of *celerrime* was frequently missed.

*novi...suppressit*: Apart from *civilis* being treated as *by the citizens*, this sentence proved straightforward for most candidates.

### Section 5

*Lepidi...consumpsit*: This was the most challenging section of all. Candidates had to see that *occisi* referred to Lepidus and was not an Ablative Absolute. *Dead* was not sufficient as a translation but *of the murdered Lepidus* or such like was awarded a bonus. A further complication was that *uxor* had to be taken as the subject of *adepta est*, but by far the most difficult to handle was *vivum ignem consumpsit*. Very few scored a bonus here (by rendering *vivum* as *burning*, for example) and credit should go to them. Many missed the mark completely, taking *vivum* as *wine* or *life* and *ignem* as *huge* or *cowardly*.

*praematura...adepta est*: The meaning of *adepta est* was not known by a number of candidates and hence their translations went awry here, with little regard paid to agreement of nouns and adjectives or the case endings. However, there were several flawless translations and it was pleasing to see many realising that *sui* referred to Lepidus' wife rather than to Lepidus.

*Caesar... exceptus est*: In this final sentence, the major errors occurred in dealing with *tutus* (often mistaken for *totus*) and *ab* (given the meaning *from* rather the correct *by*). There was a bonus mark available for a less literal translation of *tutus... exceptus est* than *he was received safe*, achieved simply by using *safely* or *unharmd* to give a more natural English expression. Many candidates did indeed do this and thus gained the bonus.

## 2493 Unprepared Translation 2

### General Comments.

Examiners judged this year's paper to be of a fair standard, if slightly on the difficult side. They were also of the opinion that candidates performed slightly less well than last year, showing weaker vocabulary knowledge and a greater tendency to be overwhelmed by syntactical complexity. While fewer candidates scored full marks than last year, rather more gained very low marks. A noticeable tendency was to begin well on both passages and then, after the first few lines, progressively to lose the thread; a significant number failed to finish one or other or both passages.

At the highest level, performance was equal on prose and verse; in the middle range, the more familiar subject matter and word order caused candidates to do better on the prose; the weakest candidates tended to fare equally poorly.

An unexpected tendency was apparent this year for certain candidates, including some entire centres, to miss out unknown words and leave gaps in every sentence throughout the passage. This is clearly unacceptable practice at this level and results in the loss of marks even for words which are known as the mark for a word is often tied to its relationship with the omitted word.

There were many opportunities in both passages to earn bonus marks for quality of English. It was disappointing to find that most of these were earned more by luck than by judgement; few candidates seem to have been prepared to venture beyond the bounds of the literal. Only a handful earned the maximum of 20 bonus marks.

Time did not seem to be a problem; many had time to write a rough version first. A small proportion of candidates did not adhere to the instruction to write on alternate lines.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Question 1

Underlined words show the most obvious opportunities for bonus marks.

simul castra oppugnabantur,

Most gained marks here, some neglecting the continuous verb; most saw the implications of the repeated *simul*, though few saw an opportunity to improve on the literal repetition. Half the candidates turned the clause unnecessarily into the active; on this occasion this was not penalised, despite the introduction of a subject not present in the Latin.

*simul pars exercitus ad populandum agrum Romanum missa urbemque ipsam temptandam.*

Most scored well in this section and recognised the perfect passive indicative (translating it as a participle was not accepted here or below), but common errors were the rendering of 'field' or 'fields' for *agrum* (at this level it is expected that candidates should be more selective and choose 'land' or 'territory'. Weaker scripts showed a misunderstanding of the gerundive of purpose, giving 'to the city'. A bonus mark was awarded for 'attack' or 'make an attempt upon', as opposed to the simple 'attempt', for *temptandam*; 'tempt' received no credit.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2009

L. Valerius ad praesidium urbis relictus,

Some rendered *relictus* as 'having been' and some misunderstood and made him leave the city, confusing *relinquere* with *discedere*. An attempt to show purpose in *ad praesidium* gained a bonus mark.

*consul Postumius ad arcendas populationes finium missus.*

Most gained the marks here but some failed to recognise *finium* and referred to 'ending'.

nihil remissum curae aut laboris:

Most could translate this but only a minority made any attempt to express it in normal English ('no effort or toil was spared' earned two bonus marks).

*vigiliae in urbe, stationes ante portas, praesidiaque in muris disposita.*

This was a high scoring section though *vigiliae* was often guessed at (occasionally 'vigils') and *in muris* curiously was often 'in the walls'; *disposita* was sometimes 'displaced' even though it made no sense.

*interim in castris Furius consul cum primo quietus obsidionem passus esset,*

Few gained all the marks here; in fact this was where performance very frequently tailed off quite noticeably. *Quietus* was often a noun and *Furius* was frequently not the subject of *passus est*; a common error was to take *cum primo* as 'as soon as' even though it was difficult to make sense of it. A bonus mark rewarded *quietly*.

*in incautum hostem porta erupit et, cum \_\_\_ persequi posset,*

Although many could translate this accurately, *persequi* was sometimes unknown. Many lost marks for *Furius consul* because they then made *porta* the subject of *erupit*: 'the gate broke'. Bonus marks were available for 'against' rather than 'into' for *in*; 'although' for *cum* (rarely gained); and supplying an object (e.g. 'them') for *persequi* (also rarely found). The most frequent version ('since he could follow through') revealed a total lack of awareness of the context.

*metu substitit, ne qua ex parte altera in castra vis fieret.*

This was a very difficult section with almost no-one gaining all the marks and the majority scoring 3 or 4 out of the 11. The 'fear' tended to be recognised but not *substitit* and often not *vis* (for which 'attack' qualified for a bonus mark); *in castra* was nearly always 'in the camp' or 'in the other camp'. Scarcely anyone grasped the function of *qua*. It was clear that few could envisage what was actually happening here. Since *parte* clearly called for 'direction' here (a common enough usage in Livy), no credit was given for the nonsensical 'part'. Only a small minority of candidates could distinguish between *alter* and *alius*; a bonus mark was available for *opposite* (rarely if ever achieved).

*Furium legatum – frater consulis erat – longius extulit cursus;*

A minority did recognise the accusative and made *Furius* the object but most did not. They often failed to recognise *longius* as an adverb but saw the comparative; 'a longer charge' was a common rendering, as too was the weaker 'a long charge'; very few had 'further' and only a handful gained the bonus for 'too far'.

*nec suos redeuntes ille persequendi studio neque hostium ab tergo incursum vidit.*

This proved to be another difficult section where only the good candidate realised what was happening; *nec* was often omitted or rendered as if *non*; they usually had *ille* as the subject, but of another, invented verb, because *vidit* was too far away for all but the best candidates. They were unsure what to do with *persequendi studio* (rarely seen as a phrase) and could not handle the *incursum* or *a tergo*. 'Retreating' gained a bonus mark for *redeuntes*.

*ita exclusus multis frustra conatibus captis*

Most could work out *ita* (although some had 'therefore' or 'and so') and *exclusus* was obvious as 'excluded' but less so as 'cut off', which gained a bonus for many good candidates. The ablative absolute was often misunderstood as 'many made an attempt'; an improved and accurate rendering of this gained a bonus mark.

*ut viam sibi ad castra faceret, acriter dimicans cecidit;*

Most recognised the sense of purpose and scored well here, even though *dimicans* was frequently unknown and had to be guessed at; *acriter* was often placed with *cecidit* even though it made little sense. A bonus was awarded to those who could find something better than 'make his way' for *viam sibi faceret*.

*et consul, nuntio circumventi fratris conversus ad pugnam,*

This was another difficult section with only the best arriving at the complete sense here. Most had some idea of news and recognised the surrounding but were unable to work out the structure and failed to put *conversus* with *consul*. The bonuses were for 'that his brother had been surrounded' (vel sim.) and for something better than 'having turned/been turned' for *conversus*.

*dum se temere in mediam dimicationem infert,*

Most scored few marks here even if they knew *dum*; *temere* was frequently an infinitive and the accusative was not recognised in *dimicationem*. The exact meaning of *se infert* ('rushed' or 'charged' gained a bonus) could only be guessed at by most. Few grasped the import of the present tense following *dum*.

*vulnere accepto aegre ab circumstantibus ereptus*

This section defeated even the most able very often and few arrived at the sense. Even if the ablative absolute was correctly rendered (the commonest error was to make it plural), many took *aegre* with it to mean 'a serious wound' and *ab* was frequently 'from' and *ereptus* 'burst though'.

*et suorum animos turbavit et ferociores hostes fecit.*

Most scored reasonably well here; a common error was a misunderstanding of *turbavit* as 'roused'. Many missed the comparative or made the adjective attributive, usually after taking *fecit* as if *impetum fecit*. The few who gave 'morale' for *animos* gained a bonus.

## Question 2(a)

*accessit positoque genu Titania terram pressit,*

The potential for numerous errors existed here but many arrived at a correct version and the majority earned a bonus by making *Titania*, as opposed to an unidentified 'she', the subject of

## Report on the Units taken in June 2009

*accessit*; *genu* was strangely quite often 'family'. The bonus mark for 'she knelt down' was earned by a small minority of candidates; the one for an improvement on 'pressed' by even fewer.

*ut hauriret gelidos potura liquores.*

Most scored well here except for *potura* which was generally either 'in a jug/cup' or 'from the lake' (scansion notwithstanding); only a handful recognised the future participle and even fewer identified the correct verb.

*rustica turba \_\_\_\_ vetat; dea sic adfata vetantes:*

Most got the sense here, even if *adfata* was sometimes confused with 'fates'; this was generally the best-scoring section. Most gained a bonus mark for supplying 'her' as the object of *vetat*. Most coped with the present participle as nominal object.

*'quid prohibetis \_ aquis? usus communis aquarum est.*

Most could understand the purpose of the question and the comment on the water. Good candidates put in 'me' (for a bonus) to aid the sense of *quid prohibetis*; weaker ones gave 'why do you prohibit the waters', which carries limited sense and ignores the ablative. *usus ... est* was usually successfully paraphrased. 'For everyone' was considered enough of an improvement on 'communal' to earn a bonus.

*nec solem proprium natura nec aera fecit*

Many arrived at the sense though 'neither' was very often omitted and the perfect of *fecit* not widely recognised. Very many weaker candidates had 'not only' or 'I am not accustomed' for *solem* and some made *natura* ablative. This was the sentence where so many candidates began to lose contact with the Latin.

*nec tenues undas: ad publica munera veni;*

A common error was to see *tenues* as a verb and make *undas* the object of it ('you do not hold the waves' was by far the commonest rendering); most had *veni* as first person but had to guess, often strangely, at *munera*. The bonus mark earmarked for *tenues* was for something imaginative to improve on 'thin'; scarcely anyone earned this one.

*quae tamen ut detis, supplex peto.*

Even good candidates came to grief here; they recognised the *quae* and the *tamen* but a number had 'as a goddess' for *ut detis* and some made *supplex* the object of *peto*. Few recognised the indirect command.

*non ego nostros abluere hic artus lassataque membra parabam,*

Most found this very difficult but there was an occasional correct version (even in a script with many other errors). Candidates tended to start with *non ego* and then invent a verb to go with it and come to *parabam* later, by which time they had already disposed of the infinitive; *hic artus* was very often 'this skill' and there were some interesting renderings of *membra lassata* (including 'worn out body parts!').

*sed relevare sitim. caret os umore loquentis,*

Few produced a completely correct version. with *sitim* rarely recognised and *os* often unknown or mistaken for 'bone'; *loquentis* usually produced some mention of speaking.

*et fauces arent, vixque est via vocis in illis.*

While the verb was given, it was generally necessary to guess the subject and varied were the meanings of *fauces* (even though it appeared last year); 'lips' were the most popular body part, which made reasonable sense of the rest and accounted for the plural. A few even attempted an actual explanation of what was happening in better English, sometimes qualifying for the bonus mark for an improvement on 'a way of the voice'. *Illis* needed to be linked to *fauces* to gain its mark. There was much confusion of *vix*, *via*, *vita* and *vis*.

*haustus aquae mihi nectar erit, vitamque fatebor accepisse simul:*

This proved very difficult for the majority, because they failed to recognise *haustus* as a noun and were determined to make it a verb. Many recognised *fatebor* as a first person verb (though few knew its meaning) and so made some sense of the latter part, even though there were few correct versions and very few bonus marks for the indirect statement.

*vitam dederitis in unda.*

Most gained some marks here, though 'surrender' was a popular rendering of *dederitis* and few attempted to put *in unda* into good English for a bonus mark.

*hi quoque vos moveant, qui nostro bracchia tendunt parva sinu,'*

There were few completely correct versions of this sentence, which proved too complex for most to sort out the agreements; 'my small bosom' was strangely quite popular and *hi* often 'these things' even though it made the agreement with *qui* difficult. Only a tiny handful of candidates made any improvement on 'move' for *moveant*, although most recognised the subjunctive, without understanding why it was subjunctive. 'Branches' was common for *bracchia*.

*et casu tendebant bracchia \_\_\_\_ nati.*

There were few marks gained here and the majority of attempts were nonsensical, especially for *nati* which often related to birth; 'holding out their arms to be born' was a popular choice, even though it made no sense.

## Question 2(b)

Most coped well with the scansion and scored at least 8 if they showed any understanding of the process at all; in fact, it was noticeable that often even those with very low scores for translation scored full marks for this. Only a very small number left it out, with a small but worrying percentage attempting the wrong lines. Very few this year wrote out a schema with no Latin attached (a growing trend in recent years). It was apparent that many candidates were totally unprepared for the scansion question and had no idea how to tackle it. The common errors were getting adjacent spondees and dactyls the wrong way round, even though quantities were usually clear.

## 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 approximately the same (just under a third took Prose Composition, and just over two-thirds took Comprehension).

Examiners were once again pleased to note that all candidates followed the rubric. There was much evidence of good practice amongst individual centres and candidates (see below). Very few candidates appeared to be pressed for time. A significant number of candidates for Section B (perhaps as many as 5% of the candidature) failed to turn over the page and answer Questions (p) and (q); the paper followed standard OCR layout, with a prominent "Turn over" in bold typeface at the foot of page 5.

Examiners felt that the paper was of comparable difficulty with last year's, although Section A was perhaps slightly more challenging, if only by virtue of its length. The spread and distribution of the marks across the two options was comparable. Both prose and comprehension candidates generally were confident and competent within their chosen options.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Prose Composition

General Comments: some instances of standard, stock vocabulary emerged this year, and these were dealt with in a suitable fashion when encountered. Most candidates were able to handle a range of constructions effectively, but there was a marked increase in errors within indirect statement (far too many candidates used *ut*) and the voice of the perfect participle, both within ablative absolutes and elsewhere, caused some difficulty. There were few omissions, and such that there were occurred mostly as an unhappy conflation of the second and third sentences. Hardly any candidate could decline *virgo Vestalis*, despite (or because of) the gloss.

"Having crossed ... promptly besieged": many pleasingly promoted *Galli* to the first word in the sentence, although knowing the word for "Gauls" was the exception rather than the rule. There were good attempts at subordinating the opening clause using the perfect participle of *transgredior*; attempts using ablative absolutes and other verbs were less successful. "The town of Clusium" caused problems: many simply omitted "town"; some used *urbs*; comparatively few realised that "Clusium" should be in apposition (and hence not genitive). The spelling of "Clusium" was inconsistent, with some candidates spelling it differently (and incorrectly) each time it appeared. "Promptly" often became *mox* or *celeriter*. The principal parts of *obsideo*, even where the verb was known, were often got wrong by candidates.

"When news of this ... what they should do": it was encouraging to see connecting relatives and ablative absolutes in large numbers, although the majority of candidates found the order of words within an ablative absolute beyond them. "Of this" was the difficult part of the opening clause. "Senators" proved a surprisingly tricky word for some, although a few came up with *patres conscripti*. "Discussed" proved to be a hugely difficult verb for candidates, giving rise to a wide range of answers, with widely varying suitability. The indirect question following it was usually spotted and tackled successfully, although the interrogative pronoun proved a poser.

"It was decided ... driven back": this was one of the key passages in the prose. There were varied, usually successful, attempts to translate "it was decided", although the construction that should follow it proved a mystery to many. The purpose clause "to negotiate" was almost always spotted and translated accurately in numerous ways, although the verb "to negotiate" itself was a stumbling block. "In the hope that" got the candidates' creative juices flowing, with many opting



for a causal clause (“because they hoped ...”) or a present participle (*sperantes*, but many failed to make it agree). The construction following the verb of hoping was not widely known. “Abandon the siege” caused difficulties, but candidates often rose to the challenge; “of their own accord” was often correctly translated, but some made it plural – a few attempted (usually incorrectly) a present participle of *volo*. “Roughly treated” was again responded to by most candidates with an attempt to subordinate this with a perfect participle, and there were encouraging circumlocutions (*vitupero* and *verbero* being prominent). “Driven back” was often correct; some candidates came up with “and were forced to return” as an acceptable alternative.

“The Gauls ... to Rome itself”: whilst most candidates knew (or could work out) *averto*, not many realised that it is a transitive verb and therefore omitted the reflexive pronoun; prepositions with both “Clusium” and “Rome” were much in evidence. A large number of candidates failed to make *ipse* agree with “Rome”.

“At the river Alia ... short, fierce battle”: Examiners were surprised to see that “at” caused problems; many candidates attempted the locative of “Alia” (which could not be found in the dictionary); at least an equal number omitted the word “river”. “Roman army” often became *exercitus Romanorum*, or even *exercitus Romae*. “Under the leadership” was too often attempted in a purely literal way, although many did one of the two expected ablatives absolute. Many left out the word “consul”. “Short, fierce battle” – the gender of candidates’ chosen word for “battle” was often wrong, as was the declension of both *brevis* and *ferox* (some attempted to get round this by putting both adjectives into the superlative); two adjectives describing the same noun are usually joined with a conjunction, which not many candidates knew. If they did, they often used *–que*, usually incorrectly.

“The Romans were .... of holding the city”: this was generally quite successful done, until the phrase “of holding the city”. The passive was well handled and the result clause spotted and correctly attempted by most. “In all directions” stimulated a wide response with varying degrees of success. “No longer” was sometimes mistranslated by *nondum*. “Of holding” regularly became the present participle in the genitive; the correct choice of Latin for “holding” in context was often a challenge. Many attempted a periphrasis of the final part of this sentence, normally involving something along the lines of “and they could no longer hold the city”. This, Examiners believed, failed to address a major part of the sense.

“The Gauls discovered ... and left the city”: the principal parts of *cognosco* have yet to be discovered by some candidates, although many sensibly deferred the verb until the end of the sentence. The vast majority of candidates spotted the accusative and infinitive construction, but there were some *ut + subjunctive* answers. “Ungarrisoned” provided candidates with many options, which Examiners assessed carefully on their relative merits. Fewer candidates than usual, but still too many, believed that *civites* is part of *civis*. “Vestal Virgins” could not be declined by most candidates, despite the gloss. “Remove” was sometimes done by *removeo*, rather than the much better *tollo* or *aufero*. “Sacred objects” was rarely done by the simple neuter of the adjective; often the noun *res* appeared, but its gender was apparently a secret. There were once again pleasing attempts here at an ablative absolute. The verb “leave” was usually well done (except by those candidates who did not know the principal parts of *relinquo*), although there was considerable confusion about whether or not to use a preposition (and if so, which) with their chosen verb.

Good Practice

- Sensible attempts to use participles (but not always correctly, especially within ablative absolutes)
- Purpose and result clauses well known by most
- Creative attempts to work around gaps in vocabulary
- Some good attempts at connection
- Some excellent working of gerunds and gerundives.

Areas of Weakness

- Usage and declension of pronouns, especially the relative pronoun and determinative pronoun and the demonstrative *hic, haec, hoc*
- Confusion over the difference between deponent and non-deponent verbs: this was especially pronounced in ablative absolutes
- Tenses were a slight cause for concern
- Some weak attempts at connection (repeated *tum, deinde* and *itaque* will not work)
- Word order within an ablative absolute was often poor (although not penalised)
- Indirect statement was poorly handled by a large proportion of the candidature.

## Section B: Comprehension

General Comments: the flexibility of the mark scheme and the candidates' willingness generally to rise to the challenges posed by the passage ensured that most coped with the questions quite well and often scored highly. The grammatical questions were an Achilles' heel for certain candidates. Some candidates (fewer than last year) gave multiple answers to grammatical questions; as always, Examiners simply marked the first answer in such cases.

Q(a) (i) Responses to this question were good.

(ii) Responses to this question were mostly very good.

Q(b) Some candidates had the consul abandoned by his bodyguard and often the bodyguard became a single person. *vires* was often mistaken for *viri*, causing a few problems on the way.

Q(c) Responses were generally very good, with most getting 6 or more marks out of the 8. The biggest problem was translating *mori* which was mistaken for *morari*, closely followed by mishandling the *eos quos* clause (which clearly became a nominative, apparently referring to the defeated Romans earlier in the sentence). A few struggled with *trucidarent*.

Q(d) There were very good answers from most candidates.

Q(e) Most scored full marks here, with a few helpfully clarifying that their answer meant that it was the consul, not the rock, that was drenched in blood. Most simply put "sitting on a rock drenched in blood", which, arguably, is not quite right, but Examiners permitted it.

Q(f) The style question posed its usual problems. Many candidates treated prose as verse, right down to discussing couplets, enjambment and sound effects. As always, Examiners were generally sceptical of assonance and alliteration points unless they were extremely well made. The provision of the translation is to help candidates make

sense of the Latin – some candidates did not seem to use it at all. Candidates should pick short phrases (single words are possible, but more difficult) and concentrate upon the choice of vocabulary (not its sound) and the arrangement of words. See the “Style Question – Sample Answers with Explanations” box for more detail.

Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations

**0 mark**

“The use of *–que* is emphatic”; how? why? is it?

**1 mark**

“*lacrimarum satis luctusque* makes the speech emotional and effective since it tells us that there has been enough misery already.” The candidate has identified a relevant Latin phrase, but does not really say anything about it. There is much more that could be written about this.

**2 marks**

“*lacrimarum satis luctusque* makes the speech emotional and effective since it tells us that there has been enough misery already. Furthermore, since *lacrimarum* and *luctus* mean similar things, the sense of grief is emphasised.” This is much better, since it identifies not only a Latin phrase, but shows awareness of its meaning and the significance of the pleonasm Livy has employed.

**3 marks**

“*lacrimarum satis luctusque* makes the speech emotional and effective since it tells us that there has been enough misery already. Furthermore, since *lacrimarum* and *luctus* mean similar things, the sense of grief is emphasised, and since – unusually – they are separated by the word *satis*, the word order makes us focus on the phrase, and on *satis* in particular, thus stressing that there has been enough grief already.” A fine answer which picks a relevant phrase, demonstrates a good understanding of the meaning and can also say something interesting about both the words and the order in which they appear. 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 the section on “Tips” at the end of this report.

- Q. g. *cave ne* often taken as though it were *noli cavere*; *miserando* not known; *manibus hostium* often assumed to be “bands of enemies”. The flexibility of the mark scheme helped to ensure that most scored reasonably well on this.
- Q(h) (i) Most scored quite well, although many took *victor hostis* as “the victor of the enemy” and some conflated *muniant* and *praesidiis firment*.
- (ii) Examiners insisted that there was some recognition of the distinction in tenses between *vixisse* and *mori*; this eluded most candidates, as did the meanings of the two infinitives. Many took *mandatorium eius memorem* as an indirect command.
- Q(i) Most scored reasonably well on this, although *patere* was often misunderstood; *exspirare* as “to breathe out (one’s last breath)” was not always known; *collegae* was usually taken as a plural.
- Q(j) The two key words, *alieno* and *crimine* were not well known; the precise form of *protegam* was a mystery to many. As a result, high marks were unusual here.
- Q(k) Responses to this question were generally very good.
- Q(l) *telis* was often taken as a singular and *obruerunt* not worked out. Many candidates had Lentulus seizing a horse; *tumultu* taken as *turba*.
- Q(m) Responses to this question were generally sound, although a few candidates were very weak on their numbers (both “seven million” and merely “seven” appeared in answers).

The comparatives *minora* and *maiora* not spotted by some; others took *castra* as a plural.

Q(n) (i) Despite often getting a good translation of this in Question (a)(ii) (where a good translation was not needed), many candidates simply fled to the literal translation at this point.

(ii) *agentes* was not well tackled, with some candidates even confusing it for the Greek ἀγόντες.

Q(o) (i) good, although some thought *Hannibali* was genitive.

(ii) those who knew it got its case right and also the reason.

(iii) a much wider range of answers here, with some stating that it was a particular case because the verb *firment* took that case.

Please note that there is no requirement for candidates to know technical terminology. If they can demonstrate that they know why the case is used, they will get the marks (e.g. "*virium* is genitive, because it is *virium aliquid* – something of strength" is a perfectly acceptable answer).

Q(p) (i) Not many candidates got this question right.

(ii) Even fewer knew the answer to this question.

Q(q) (i) Many candidates answered this question correctly.

(ii) A pleasing number of candidates answered this question correctly as well.

Further discussions and tips for Section B are given on the next page.

#### 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); candidates should be discouraged from making **any** points involving sound effects.
- Grammatical questions seem to be a question of pot luck for some candidates – but they are an important part of the comprehension.
- On occasions candidates could not distinguish singulars from plurals – which proved costly.
- Candidates also ignored important word forms (e.g. *minora* is comparative).
- Similar words were confused (e.g. *eques* with *equus*; also *morior* with *moror* and *vivo* with *vinco*).

#### Style Question – Tips

- Always write a separate, short paragraph on each of the three points (or however many points it may be). It helps to keep thoughts clear and focused and also helps the Examiner determine where one point stops and another begins.
- Style questions are not essays. Points can be made in a matter of two or three lines.
- 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 probably get no marks.
- Examiners are unlikely fully to reward discussions of sound effects.
- 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 (eg juxtaposition and chiasmus),
- If discussing a single word (eg *funestam*), be sure to explain why the word is unusual or emphatic.
- It is generally easier to gain marks by quoting phrases and short clauses rather than single words (see “Style Questions – Sample Answers with Explanations”).

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Latin 3818, 7818  
June 2009 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

| Unit           |     | Maximum Mark | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | U |
|----------------|-----|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| <b>2471-80</b> | Raw | 120          | 89 | 78 | 68 | 58 | 48 | 0 |
|                | UMS | 120          | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 | 0 |
| <b>2491</b>    | Raw | 90           | 69 | 60 | 51 | 43 | 35 | 0 |
|                | UMS | 90           | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 0 |
| <b>2492</b>    | Raw | 90           | 69 | 62 | 56 | 50 | 44 | 0 |
|                | UMS | 90           | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 0 |
| <b>2481-90</b> | Raw | 120          | 82 | 73 | 64 | 55 | 47 | 0 |
|                | UMS | 120          | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 | 0 |
| <b>2493</b>    | Raw | 90           | 65 | 58 | 51 | 44 | 37 | 0 |
|                | UMS | 90           | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 0 |
| <b>2494</b>    | Raw | 90           | 63 | 56 | 49 | 43 | 37 | 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> | 69.2 | 89   | 95.1 | 97.6 | 99.4 | 100 | 494                        |
| <b>7818</b> | 67.9 | 89.7 | 97.6 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 100 | 1478                       |

## 1972 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**