GCSE

Latin

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J281**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J081**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Latin (J281)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Latin (J081)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

There were many commendable scripts this year, with the comprehension questions generally handled more confidently than the translation question. There were very few instances of 'No Response', which is a good indication of not only the accessibility of the questions, but also the candidates' efforts to do their best. The majority of candidates seemed to have been entered for the most appropriate tier, though a few scored very high marks, and might have been more suited to Higher Tier.

Candidates appeared to have had sufficient time to complete the paper. Many were able to produce a rough draft, followed by a neat copy, of the translation question. The number of corrections elsewhere in scripts suggested that candidates had plenty of time to check their work. Examiners noted, however, that often correct answers were changed to incorrect responses. Any alterations need to be clear and unambiguous, and the rough version of the translation should be crossed out. It is no longer necessary to write the translation on alternate lines.

Some candidates showed a tendency to provide alternative answers, using either brackets or an oblique stroke. Teachers should discourage their students from doing this, since an incorrect alternative response negates the mark they would have been awarded.

Many candidates were well-acquainted with the Defined Vocabulary List, though there were some errors with the meaning of some common words, such as *silva*, *filia* and *iratus*. The usual 'little' words (*statim, sed, itaque, nam, semper* etc.) were often not known. This year Examiners also noted that some candidates struggled with the meaning of question words, such as *quid* and *cur*.

Noun number caused few problems this year, but noun case was an issue for some candidates, particularly in the translation question: in the first section, for instance, *Atalantam* was sometimes translated as the subject of *amaverunt*. Candidates are advised to look very closely also at verb endings when deciding on the tense. In Q.10(i), for example, the tense of *ambulaverunt* was not always recognised.

The amended mark scheme for the translation question (introduced in January 2012), which broadens the three-mark band to include translations with up to one major *and* one minor error (or three minor errors), was once again welcomed by Examiners. Valuable marks, however, were lost through the omission of words such as *statim*, *itaque*, *nam* and *semper.* Candidates should therefore be advised to check that they have translated every Latin word in the passage. With the passage printed above the space for the answer, it is an easy matter to look at the answer and tick each of the Latin words translated.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q.1: most candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though some lost the first mark by translating *filia* as 'the son'.

Q.2(a): most candidates achieved at least one mark for *mediis*, but *silvis* was not always known.

Q.2(b): this was a good discriminator: some candidates lost a mark by failing to recognise the superlative form of the adverb *celerrime*, and others were led astray by *poterat* (despite the phrasing of the question), confusing it with a form of *portare*.

Q.3: a straightforward tick-box question, which was almost always answered correctly.

Q.4: another good discriminator, as many candidates were not familiar with *facere*. Teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the present tense (e.g. *facere* rather than *facio*) is good practice. *quid* was a problem for some (see General Comments).

Q.5: this tick-box question was answered correctly by the majority of candidates, and, as in Q.3, Examiners were pleased to note that very few candidates ticked more than one box.

Q.6(a): this was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Q.6(b): this was a very good discriminator: only the strongest candidates were familiar with *manere*, and, perhaps as a consequence, there was often no reference to *sola*. Candidates are reminded to look carefully at the number of marks available, as this is often an indication of how many elements are required in an answer.

Q.7: most candidates referred to both *multi* and *iuvenes*, and thus scored full marks.

Q.8: this was usually answered correctly, though some candidates failed to recognise the superlative form.

Q.9: success in this question depended largely on recognising the pronoun *eam*, as *in matrimonium ducere* was glossed. Many candidates gained one mark for 'to marry', but struggled with the number and meaning of *eam*.

Q.10: the translation question proved, as expected, a very good discriminator. Candidates are reminded that a thorough knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List is crucial to successful translation. Good responses also demonstrated attention to noun and verb endings, and rarely omitted words in the Latin (see General Comments).

'The young men walked to the woods and fell in love with Atalanta at once.'
Many candidates made a good start to the first section, and scored at least two marks. The first clause was usually handled well, though the tense of *ambulaverunt* was not always translated correctly. Some candidates failed to recognise the accusative *Atalantam*, making Atalanta the subject of the verb (see General Comments). Teachers are reminded that the testing of nouns in cases other than the nominative (e.g. *puellam* rather than *puella*) is good practice. Other common errors included the number of *silvas* and the omission of *statim*.

'But Atalanta did not want to have a husband. And so the girl ordered all the young men'
Most candidates scored at least two marks in this section. The main issue was vocabulary, with *sed* and *itaque* often wrongly translated or omitted. Some candidates struggled with the meaning and tense of *iussit*, while *nolebat* caused problems for others.

'to run in a race. "Why?" the young men asked. Atalanta replied,'
Examiners were pleased to see many correct responses to this question, though *cur* was not known by a number (see General Comments).

'"I will choose the man who is able to run faster than I."'
It was pleasing to see that so many candidates recognised the future tense *optabo*. *virum* was sometimes not known, but often translated sensibly as 'the person', which was treated as a minor error. Most candidates handled the relative clause (including a modal verb) well, but the comparative adverb *celerius* followed by *quam ego* was challenging for many.

'For Atalanta used to run so well that she always used to arrive first at the winning post.'
This was a challenging section for some, with failure to recognise the result clause being the main issue. Other common errors included the omission of *nam* and *semper*.

Q.11: most candidates gained at least one mark, though some failed to offer two details about Hippomenes. Candidates are reminded to look carefully at the emboldened words in a question, as well as the number of marks available.

Q.12: another straightforward tick-box question.

Q.13: most candidates gained a mark for the glossed verb *iuvaret*, though some struggled to work out to whom the pronoun *se* refers.

Q.14: another good discriminator: the majority of candidates scored at least one mark, but only the strongest candidates recognised both *ingentia* and *tria*.

Q.15: this was usually well answered, with the glossed noun *victoriam* and the phrasing of the question guiding candidates towards the answer.

Q.16: most candidates selected the correct word *mox*, though a few struggled with its meaning.

Q.17(a): as in other questions, the superlative form was not always recognised, but this time a superlative rendering is not required by the Mark Scheme, as only one mark is available. A few candidates translated *iratissima* as 'very irritated', which was not accepted.

Q.17(b): most candidates understood what Venus did, but detailed answers were required to achieve full marks. 'She changed (1) them (0) into (omission of *feroces* = 0) lions (1)', for instance, would achieve only two marks. Once again, candidates are reminded to look at the number of marks and answer lines available.

Q18: this question is designed to be accessible to candidates of all abilities, and it was pleasing to see that plenty of candidates achieved full marks. Examiners noted that this year very few candidates translated the Latin word instead of giving a word derived from it, which has sometimes been a cause for concern in the past. Some, however, are still giving English words, which begin with the same letters as the Latin word, but which are not derivatives (e.g. *prima*: price). Finally, as there are usually several possible derivatives, candidates are advised to choose words, which they are able to define.

Most candidates managed to follow the storyline fairly well, and there were many good scripts, which reflected the hard work done by both the candidates and their teachers.

A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and Domestic life (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

Examiners considered this paper to be of an appropriate standard, though perhaps slightly more accessible in one or two questions than last year's, which contained, for instance, a quite demanding question involving pronouns and another with a first declension singular ablative of comparison. The standard of candidates' performance was generally very good, resulting in a substantial number of scores above 50. The more taxing questions, however, ensured differentiation at the higher end of the mark range. There were very few marks below 30. Only a handful of candidates would seem to have been entered for the wrong tier, and may have achieved a better mark on the Foundation Tier equivalent.

Examiners felt that the paper was accessible to the full range of candidates, whilst differentiating very well, particularly in certain questions. Both the translation question and the comprehension questions revealed a sound understanding of the storyline, in most cases. There were very few examples of 'No Response', suggesting that candidates of all abilities were able to engage with the questions.

One of the benefits of sitting all four GCSE units at the end of the two-year course is that candidates have the opportunity to look at plenty of practice papers, and Examiners were pleased to note that errors of exam technique were relatively few. This was particularly apparent in the derivatives question, where many candidates achieved full marks. However, as has been noted in previous reports, some candidates showed a tendency to provide alternative answers, using either brackets or an oblique stroke. In Q.4, for instance, a number of candidates offered the response: 'To ask for/get the help of the gods'. Teachers should discourage their students from doing this, since an incorrect alternative response negates the mark they would have been awarded.

Most candidates were well-acquainted with the Defined Vocabulary List, though there were some surprising errors with the meaning of some common words, such as *facere* and *filia*. In addition, there were relatively frequent errors in understanding the gender of some of the characters: Venus, for instance, was commonly referred to as 'he'. Candidates should therefore be reminded to make use of the glossary provided, noting in particular the gender of proper nouns. Easily confused words were a challenge for some: prime examples are *tamen/tandem*, *descendere/discedere*. If a word is given several meanings in the DVL, candidates should be advised to choose the most appropriate for the context. In Q.12(b), for instance, the apples were sometimes described as 'serious', which was not accepted.

Candidates' knowledge of syntax was judged to be generally sound, though one or two areas caused particular issues: different types of *ut* clauses; passive tenses; pronouns.

Noun number and case caused problems for a few candidates: *iuvenes* and *deorum* were occasionally translated as singular, while *condicionem* was often rendered as the plural 'conditions'.

Irregular principal parts (e.g. *velle*, *dedisse*) caused considerable difficulty for some, and teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the present tense (e.g. *velle* rather than *volo*) is good practice.

The amended mark scheme for the translation question (introduced in January 2012), which broadens the three-mark band to include translations with up to one major *and* one minor error (or three minor errors), was once again welcomed by examiners. Valuable marks, however, were lost through the omission of words such as *iam*, *tandem*, *tamen* and *semper*. Candidates should therefore be advised to check they have translated every Latin word in the passage. With the passage printed above the space for the answer, it is an easy matter to look at the answer and tick each of the Latin words translated.

Candidates appeared to have had sufficient time to complete the paper. Many were able to produce a rough draft, followed by a neat copy, of the translation question. The number of corrections elsewhere in scripts suggested that candidates had plenty of time to check their work. Examiners noted, however, that often correct answers were changed to incorrect responses. Any alterations need to be clear and unambiguous, and the rough version of the translation should be crossed out. It is no longer necessary to write the translation on alternate lines.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q.1: most candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though a few lost the first mark by translating *filia* as 'the son', and *regis* was occasionally rendered as 'of the queen'.

Q.2(a): a good early discriminator: most candidates achieved at least one mark for *currere*, but the superlative adverb *celerrime* was often not recognised (and translated simply as 'quickly') or confused (perhaps as a result of misreading *quae* as *quam*) with the phrase *quam celerrime*.

Q.2(b): this was answered correctly by most candidates.

Q.3: a straightforward question for the majority of candidates. Those who did not score the one mark available tended to offer answers such as 'to get married', probably as a result of not knowing the meaning of *inveniret*.

Q.4: another good discriminator, as many candidates failed to choose the most appropriate meaning of *peteret* (see General Comments). Some lost the mark for *auxilium* by confusing it with *consilium*, and, as the Mark Scheme insists on the correct use of the apostrophe for *deorum*, others lost the third mark by writing 'the god's/the gods help'. Candidates are advised to translate nouns in the genitive case literally, unless they are confident about the use of apostrophes.

Q.5: a surprisingly effective discriminator considering the relatively straightforward structure of the Latin: some candidates mistranslated *necabit* as 'will die'; there was also some confusion between the subject and the object, resulting in a few candidates writing that Atalanta would kill her husband.

Q.6(a): almost always answered correctly.

Q.6(b): the main issues here were confusing *discedere* with *descendere*, and omission or mistranslation of *diu* (often confused with *dies*). Candidates are advised to include all relevant details (including adverbs) in their responses.

Q.7: most candidates gained at least one mark, though some failed to offer two details about the young men. Candidates are reminded to look carefully at the emboldened words in a question, as well as the number of marks and answer lines available. The most common error was not recognising the superlative *plurimi*.

Q.8: this tick-box question was answered correctly by the majority of candidates, and Examiners were pleased to note that very few candidates ticked more than one box.

Q.9: the translation question proved, as expected, a very good discriminator, though the overall standard was high. Candidates are reminded that a thorough knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List is crucial to successful translation. Good responses also demonstrated attention to noun and verb endings, and rarely omitted words in the Latin (see General Comments).

'Atalanta did not know what she should do now. At last she prepared a cruel plan.'
This first section was generally done well, with most candidates scoring at least two marks. The indirect question was handled well, and vocabulary was usually secure. The most common errors included the misplacement or omission of *iam* and *crudele* rendered as an adverb. As ever, one or two candidates confused *tandem* with *tamen*.

'"If anyone is able to run faster than I, I will marry him," she announced.'
The majority of candidates coped well with this section, scoring at least three out of the four marks available. The main errors were *celerius quam* mistranslated as 'as quickly as possible'; *illi* mistranslated as 'them'; *nuntiavit* omitted or mistranslated (usually as 'said' and sometimes with 'the messenger' added as the subject).

'"The rest of the young men, however, overcome by me, will be killed." Having heard these words,'
The Mark Scheme accepted a range of responses for the phrase *a me superati*, which allowed candidates the opportunity to score three marks in the rest of the section. As a result, most were able to score at least two marks overall. Common mistakes included the following: *ceteri* translated as 'others'; the tense and meaning of *necabuntur*; handling of the ablative absolute; vocabulary issues with *his* (sometimes rendered as 'his' or 'her') and *auditis* (surprisingly translated as 'Having said' by a few candidates).

'the young men were very unhappy, but they loved Atalanta to such an extent that they accepted her condition.'
Most candidates handled the result clause well, with only a small percentage omitting *ita* and therefore mistranslating *ut.* Other common errors were failing to spot the superlative in *miserrimi*, mistranslating *eius* as 'this/these/the', and mistranslating *condicionem* as the plural 'condition' (though 'terms' was accepted, as it was glossed as such).

'Atalanta, however, used to run so well that she always arrived first at the winning post.'
This seemed to be the most accessible of the translation sections, with plenty of candidates gaining full marks. The main issues were the omission of *semper* and the mistranslation of *bene* as 'good'.

Q.10: this was a good discriminator, as only those who understood the meaning and structure of the Latin were able to score all three marks. The two main issues were omission of *quoque* and failure to recognise *velle* as a form of *volo* (see General Comments). In addition, a few candidates translated *cum* as 'for' or 'against'.

Q.11: a straightforward question, which was answered correctly by most candidates.

Q.12(a): many candidates handled the indirect statement well, but Examiners were surprised to see a number refer to Venus as 'he' (see General Comments). *sciret* caused problems for a few.

Q.12(b): as in Q.7, not all candidates gave two details about the apples. *gravia* was sometimes translated as 'serious', which was not accepted by the Mark Scheme (see General Comments), or simply not linked to the adjective *gravis* at all, and guessed as 'delicious' or 'golden' or 'poisonous'.

Q.13: another straightforward tick-box question.

Q.14: this proved to be an excellent discriminator, with only the strongest candidates able to deal with the indirect statement and know the meaning of all the vocabulary. Common errors included mistranslating *cognovisset*, giving an incorrect tense for *dedisse*, omitting *nulla* and misunderstanding the pronoun *sibi*. As a result, very few candidates scored full marks on this question.

Q.15: most candidates understood the nature of Venus' punishment, but detailed answers were required to achieve full marks. Omission of *saevos* resulted in only one mark being awarded. Once again, candidates are reminded to look at the number of marks and answer lines available. Some failed to recognise the passive tense and translated *mutati sunt* as 'They changed'*,* which cost them the first mark. One or two lost the mark by translating the verb as singular, despite the wording of the question.

Q16: this question is designed to be accessible to candidates of all abilities, and it was pleasing to see that plenty of candidates achieved full marks. Indeed, as in 2015, Examiners noted that the general standard of response to this question seems to improve every year. Most candidates were able to give two correct derivatives, often including an example to support their answer. A few candidates are still translating the Latin word instead of giving a word derived from it. Others are giving English words, which begin with the same letters as the Latin word, but which are not derivatives (e.g. *annos*: 'annul'). When defining the English word, many candidates attempt to include the meaning of the Latin word, which often works well. This year, however, 'trade' was frequently offered as a derivative of *tradidit*, but 'hand over' was not considered to be an acceptable definition – some notion of exchange had to be included in addition.

Most candidates performed well on this paper, and many scored high marks, which reflected the hard work done by both the candidates and their teachers.

A402/01 Latin Language 2 (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

Examiners were once again pleased with the performance of candidates. Very few failed to follow the gist of the story and well over a quarter scored more than 50 out of 60.

Standards of literacy and legibility, though variable, were generally acceptable or better, and few failed to complete the paper. On a testing piece of Latin, candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the large amount of sense they made of it.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1: What was intended to be an easy first question turned out otherwise: the inclusion of the verb *accidit* led many to answer 'a dreadful accident', which failed to score the mark. Comprehension of *res* was required (e.g. 'thing', 'event', 'incident').

Q2: This question was answered well by most candidates.

Q3: Mostly answered well.

Q4(a): This question was relatively straightforward, but a number of candidates lost a mark for failing to show the meaning of *duos* or *fideles* (or both).

Q4(b): The phrase *ut consilium peteret* caused similar difficulties to the Higher Tier paper, but the omission of the personal pronoun on the Foundation Tier paper was oddly helpful to candidates, who seemed to realise more easily that Nero was seeking/asking for <u>their</u> plan, not his own.

Q5(a): The meaning of *taceo* was not always well known. Many confused it with *timeo*, which was perhaps natural in the context.

Q5(b): The mark allocation should have alerted candidates to the fact that the meaning of *vir* was required for full marks. Some omitted it.

Q6: A straightforward question which was answered well.

Q7(a): This was well answered, though some surprisingly took *villa* as 'village'.

Q7(b): Not all knew *paucis,* which was required for full marks.

Q8(i): As on the Higher Tier paper, *posuit* was often confused with *potuit,* which forced candidates to take *circum* as 'to surround'. Most, however, got the gist and scored at least two of the four marks.

Q8(ii): *ipse* was sometimes omitted or mistranslated but this sentence was otherwise handled well.

Q8(iii): *facile* was not well known and *dominam* was sometimes confused with *dominum* or *domum*, but many handled this long sentence well.

Q8(iv): *sedentem* caused difficulties. Some confused it with *sed* and others who took *invenit* as 'went into' sometimes took *sedentem* as a part of Agrippina's house.

Q8(v): The straight question *tu me relinquis?* was handled much better than the equivalent *num* clause on the Higher Tier paper.

Q8(vi): *postquam* was predictably often taken as *postea* but most dealt confidently with the participle *tenentem.*

Q8(vii): This was often translated correctly.

Q8(viii): *quamquam* was well known and the imperative form *neca* was taken correctly by many.

Q8(ix): *graviter vulnerata* was generally handled well but a surprising number seemed not to recognise *periit.*

Q8(x): A difficult last sentence was handled well. Some did not know *discessit* and/or *celeriter*, but the purpose clause was usually recognised correctly. Examiners allowed some leeway in the translation of the *ut* clause, in order to reward sensible alternatives (e.g. '... to tell Nero that Agrippina was dead').

A402/02 Latin Language 2 (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

Examiners felt that the paper was marginally more testing than the previous year, but the performance of candidates was as impressive as usual – the mean mark was over 48 out of 60.

Standards of literacy and legibility, though variable, were generally acceptable or better, and few failed to complete the paper. The comments below inevitably concentrate on what went wrong but, on a testing piece of Latin, candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the high number of strong scores.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1: However much a comprehension exercise is designed to be a test of understanding rather than mere translation, examiners are still looking in this section for the precise understanding of grammatical forms and vocabulary. Thus, as in a similar question on the 2015 paper, there was a mark for recognising the superlative form of *dirissima.* The weakest candidates mistook *res* for *rex* and wrote something like 'the king had a terrible accident' and lost 2 marks.

Q2: This question was generally successfully answered.

Q3: The testing of irregular forms of verbs often finds out even the very best candidates. In this case, many failed to relate *ausurum esse* to *audeo*, but still picked up three marks of the available four if they said that no one believed that Nero would kill his mother.

Q4(a): Some were misled by the presence of *scelus* in the sentence and answered that Nero was 'criminal', which did not gain the mark. Most realised that the question was merely testing the meaning of *crudelis.*

Q4(b): Those who identified *de quo diu cogitaverat* as the Latin containing the answer tended to answer the question well.

Q5: To the surprise of examiners, *ut consilium eorum peteret* caused widespread problems. The most common error was not the meaning of *peteret* (though there was a fair amount of 'attacking' in evidence), nor the meaning of *consilium* (for which 'advice' made more sense in the context than 'plan'), but the form *eorum,* which was often taken as singular ('his'). The mark scheme penalised candidates who though that Nero had summoned his companions to discuss his own plan.

Q6(a): Ignorance of *tacebant* was quite common. Some, perhaps misled by the question ('what suggests ...') quoted the Latin word *tacebant* with no discussion of its meaning.

Q6(b) The inclusion of *libertum* and *libenter* in the same sentence certainly sorted out the best from the rest.

Q7: This was very well answered and it was unusual for candidates to score fewer than three marks.

Q8(i): The hurdles to be surmounted here were the precise meaning of *eadem nocte* ('that night' was not enough) and the meaning of *posuit*. Very many took the latter as *potuit*, and were then forced to take *circum* as a verb (e.g. '... was able to surround'). It was common for even the best candidates to score only two of the four marks available.

Q8(ii): The omission of *ipse* was treated as a major error. It was pleasing to see that most handled the compound verb *inrupit* successfully.

Q8(iii): This sentence was a stern test, but most were successfully in handling the result clause containing a relative clause with a gerundive of purpose tacked on at the end. The most common difficulties were the meaning of *tam* (often confused with *tum* or *nam*) and the form of *relicti erant.* Teachers using the passage as a classroom exercise might wish to make a point of referring to the case of *paucos servos* – it was depressingly common for candidates to take them as nominatives and ignore the voice of the verb *opprimerent* (e.g. 'many slaves ... were easily overcome'). Most did quite well with the gerundive of purpose.

Q8(iv): A straightforward section which was answered well by those who knew the difference between *antequam* and *antea.* The most common error was the failure to take *effugerant* as pluperfect.

Q8(v): The test here was to recognise that *infelicem* referred to Agrippina and not the slave girl.

Q8(vi): Examiners were precise in their requirement for the tense of *discedente* to be identified. Many took it to refer to Agrippina in the sense of 'leaving behind'. It is a while since *num* has been tested on this paper - a surprising number took it as *nam* or ignored it altogether (along with the tense of *relinquis*).

Q8(vii): *simulac* was often taken as *simul* (and penalised) and *tollentem* was often taken as 'drawing' or 'holding' rather than 'raising'.

Q8(viii): Case endings often defeated candidates here (especially the dative *Aniceto* and *offerens* agreeing with Agrippina), as well as the meaning of *hic* ('here' not 'this') and the imperative form of *vulnera.*

Q8(ix): *confecta* was perhaps the least well known word of the entire passage - it needed to be taken as agreeing with Agrippina in the sense 'finished off by' or 'worn out by'. Many wrongly took the phrase as if it were an ablative absolute *plurimis vulneribus factis.* Almost all realised that Agrippina died at this point, however, and retained enough of the sense for at least 2 marks.

Q8(x): A testing last sentence required the meaning of *sic* (often incorrect or omitted - a major error according to the mark scheme), recognition of *vera* from *verus* and the form of *fuerunt* ('were' not 'were made'). Surprising errors were the number of *astrologorum* (surely as obvious a genitive plural as you could expect to see) and the failure to spot the pluperfect form of *praedixerant.* Only the most alert of candidates noticed that the relative *qui* must refer to the astrologers and not the words. Finally, despite the glossary, there were predictably regular appearances of astronomers.

A403/01 (Foundation Tier)

General comments:

The overall standard of candidates' answers was pleasing. A number of candidates did very well indeed and perhaps they could have coped with the Higher Tier paper. As with previous years, the questions requiring stylistic comment caused the most difficulty. Stylistic comment is an area teachers would do well to revise with their students. Candidates must ensure that they quote the Latin when the question requires them to do so. As expected the multiple choice questions were well answered. However, in some multiple choice questions, where more than box should be ticked, some candidates have not read the question properly and have not given the correct number of answers. Likewise it is crucially important for candidates to get their answer from the correct lines of the passage. Particular attention should be given to the line references in the question.

Comments on individual questions:

Section A

1. Generally well answered.

2. Candidates found this 'pick the Latin word and translate question' difficult. A fair number quoted the correct Latin word, but fewer translated the word correctly.

3. Generally well answered.

4. On the whole well answered.

5. The ten mark style question was the best differentiator in the section. All candidates made use of the English translation provided, but fewer quoted the Latin effectively and a fair number of candidates did not attempt to refer to the style of the Latin. Word order and sound effect were the stylistic devices most commented upon by candidates.

6. Well answered. The obvious derivation from *captivis* clearly helped candidates.

7. Nearly all candidates knew the meaning of *periculo*.

8. Most candidates scored at least one mark. The Latin *deferat* caused difficulties for some.

9. Generally well answered, although many candidates found the Latin *agenda* problematic.

10. A well answered multiple choice question.

11. Most candidates knew the meaning of *tuba*.

12. Generally well answered, although *opere* caused problems for some.

13. This question was a good differentiator as many candidates struggled with the Latin, with a fair number scoring zero for the question.

14. Most candidates got one part of the answer correct. Only the very best scored full marks on this question.

15. Well answered. A number of candidates confused *curru* with the verb *curro* and thought that Boudicca was running.

16. Well answered.

17. A generally well answered multiple choice question, although a fair number of candidates picked the incorrect answer B.

18. Generally well answered.

19. This style question was a good differentiator. The most popular answer was the use of *impollutam* and the contrast between *senectam* and *virginitatem*.

20. Generally well answered, although only the very best candidates scored full marks for this question.

21. This style question was the better answered of the style questions, with many candidates referring to *difficili effugio*. Candidates must ensure they quote the Latin in the style questions.

22. The 5 mark multiple choice question was generally well answered with a fair number of candidates scoring five out of five.

Section B

23. Well answered.

24. Most candidates knew the meaning of *domum*.

25. Many candidates didn't know the meaning of *aestate*. A good differentiator.

26. This two mark multiple choice question was well answered.

27. A good differentiator. Only the best candidates understood the meaning of the phrase *quasi solutus ceteris curis*.

28. A well answered multiple choice question.

29. Generally well answered.

30. Generally well answered.

31. Most candidates understood the meaning of *sella*.

32. Only the very best candidates know that Tacitus had asked Pliny to write this account. A fair number of candidates thought the answer was Pliny himself.

33. A good differentiator. A fair number of candidates thought that Pliny was visiting the emperor, confusing the meaning of *imperio*.

34. (a) Well answered.

34. (b) A fair number of candidates didn't know the date of the eruption, despite the fact that this was a multiple choice question.

35. Many candidates found the Latin difficult here and didn't understand the meaning of *libernicam parari*.

36. Well answered.

37. Generally well answered.

38. Well answered.

39. Generally well answered.

40. Most candidates understood that Rectina was asking to be rescued. Fewer knew the meaning of *orabat*.

41. Generally well answered.

42. Generally well answered. Most candidates got at least one mark.

43. The 5 mark multiple choice question was well answered, with a fair number of candidates scoring full marks.

44. The ten mark style question was the best differentiator in the section. All candidates made use of the English translation provided, but fewer quoted the Latin effectively and a fair number of candidates did not attempt to refer to the style of the Latin. Word order and sound effect were the stylistic devices most commented upon by candidates. The passage lended itself well to stylistic comment.

45. Well answered.

46. Most candidates understood about the severity of the father and son's illness.

47. Well answered. The most popular answer was *pulcherrimus*. Not all candidates quoted the Latin here, as was asked in the question.

48. This four mark style question was a good differentiator. Only the best candidates got full marks and a fair number of candidates could only make one point. Teachers should ensure that their students understand how to comment on the author's style of writing.

A403/02 (Higher Tier)

General comments:

The overall standard of candidates' answers was very pleasing and students clearly enjoyed the content of both stories. It seems that candidates heeded the advice in last year's examiner's report concerning the importance of giving an answer from with the lemma / line references. This is particularly important in the 4 mark style questions. A small number of candidates did not quote the Latin when asked to do so and this resulted in lost marks.

The Pliny option (Section B) was markedly more popular than the Caesar/Tacitus/Cicero option (Section A).

Comments on individual questions:

Section A

1.   Well answered, but some candidates only gave a partial answer, omitted *annis*.

2.   Very well answered.

3.   Well answered. Candidates gained credit for both stylistic and content based answers.

4.   This question differentiated candidates effectively. Weaker candidates answered solely on content, rather than the style of Caesar's writing, and there were several instances where incomplete quotation caused candidates to miss out on marks for analysis. Candidates must quote the Latin, show they know the meaning of the Latin and analyse the style of the Latin.

5.   Very well answered.

6.   Well answered, although the Latin *petendi* confused some candidates into thinking that there was an attack going on here.

7.   Generally well answered, although some candidates did not quote the Latin which was required for this question. Most candidates made reference to gerundives and the juxtaposition of *omnia* and *uno*. Some candidates made reference to punctuation; as the original Latin would not have contained this it carried no credit. Candidates should not give quotations that are too long and these will lack focus and not gain credit.

8.   Almost all candidates answered correctly.

9.   Very well answered.

10.   This 4 mark style question was the better done of the two 4-markers on this section. Few candidates commented on the use of the result clause; most comment here was on the word choice of *impollutam* and the use of *senectam* and *virginitatem*.

11.   The translation question was generally very well handled although a small number of candidates did not understand the meaning of the Latin and scored low marks on this question. The most common error was "part of the glory" for pari gloria.

12. Most answered well on the 8 mark question. More points were made on the Tacitus which obviously inspired them more than the Caesar. There were a number of answers that repeated stylistic material from question 4 or wrote entirely stylistic essays which could claim little credit. Candidates would benefit from being reminded that there is no need for Latin quotation in these 8 mark questions. The most common comments were on Pullo and Vorenus's rivalry, the use of Boudicca and Suetonius's speeches, and the numbers of war dead.

13. Very well answered.

14. Well answered. The most common error was to simply state "Quintus's attitude" without who it affected.

15. Very well answered.

16. *Absurde* was usually translated or guessed well; *aspere* less so. *verbis vultuque* was invariably accurately translated, perhaps as this is GCSE vocabulary.

17. Well answered.

Section B

18a. Very well answered.

18b. Most candidates answered correctly.

19. Some candidates misidentified the passive *legebatur*. A number misread the rubric and mentioned that Pliny was lying in the sun, which happens prior to the quoted section.

20. The translation question was usually well handled, but some candidates dropped a mark for missed some of the less significant words such as *huic* or *quoque*. Common errors were the omission of *ullum* and the singular "tablet" for *pugillaribus*; the locative *Romae* was usually well handled but some mistranslated as "to" or "from" Rome.

21. Very well answered

22. Generally well answered, but some candidates missed out *nisi* and said that no escape by ship was possible.

23. Well answered, but some candidates did not know the meaning *orabat*.

24. A popular passage enjoyed by the candidates, with plenty of issues for discussion. Many very strong answers but the greatest weaknesses were overly relying on the narrative, not explaining or analysing the Latin beyond saying that it is vivid and failure to quote enough Latin. The weakest points tended to be from candidates relying on alliteration or assonance which belied a weak knowledge of the content. Candidates should aim for precision in identifying which features of the Latin contribute to style – for instance in the *nunc huc nunc illuc* section many candidates simply said the phrase itself conveyed a picture of the swaying buildings rather than commenting on the repetition and balance of the phrase. Some care should be taken over reference to words at "the end of the line" in prose literature.

25. Generally good reference was made to the antithesis and comparatives in particular, although many candidates only quoted one of the comparatives. Several candidates commented on the chiasmus of *faces multae variaque lumina,* which was not in the quoted section and therefore scored no marks.

26. Usually well answered, although some candidates referred to the cushions rather than the torches.

27a. Generally well answered, although a few references to "making for the shore". Some candidates seemed to confuse this for the *cervicalia* passage.

27b. Generally well answered, although some candidates did not refer to the sea.

28. Well answered, but a sizeable number of candidates did not mention any unadmirable traits for Pliny, despite very detailed analysis of his admirable moments, and this affected their mark. Teachers should aim to make sure that candidates know for a "to what extent" style question candidates are required to produce an argument with some balance.

29. Well answered. Some candidates translated carus as "cared for" or "dear to". Most candidates scored at least 1 mark.

30. Generally fine, although some candidates thought *huic* referred to Arria.

31a. *vivere* almost universally known. Some candidates went beyond the lemma saying that her son had slept well and was eating willingly. A fair number of candidates missed the comparative in the second part of the question.

31b. Well answered.

32. Well answered, but a sizeable minority of candidates put *roganti* or *ageret* instead.

33. The better handled of the 4 mark style questions. Some candidates who gave 'listing' as their answer failed to give a quotation. Candidates should also take care to suggest just how the Latin and its style makes a passage dramatic, rather than just saying that a certain style feature is dramatic of its own accord.

A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

The entry for this paper was very small with Section B (Virgil, Aeneid IX) being chosen by some 75% of the candidates. The majority of those who entered put up a creditable performance and a few scored very highly; nonetheless, it is true to say generally that those entered for this paper were entered at the right level. Nearly all made a real effort to answer the questions adequately and there were only a very few whose performance suggested they had found the texts altogether too challenging.

It was pleasing to see the positive and appreciative response of most candidates to these texts. Many showed good knowledge of the textual details and were able to offer interpretations of the text, such as why Catullus mentions Jupiter, or wind and water, in Poem 70. In Section B a good proportion of candidates scored well on the earlier questions, showing a grasp of both text and story-line.

Candidates were less happy as a general rule with the stylistic questions (Qs 5, 12 & 15 in Section A and Qs 20, 24 & 27 in Section B). They were in many cases uncertain what constituted a point of style (though examiners are generous in their interpretation of that concept) or the importance of relating their examples to the question that is asked. There is no requirement to use technical terms and there is no penalty if they are used wrongly as long as the point made is otherwise clear. There were in fact some creditable (and occasionally very good) attempts. In the 10-mark questions most showed an appreciative sympathy with the love agonies of Catullus or a feeling for the drama in the young heroes' discovery by the enemy even if they found it difficult to meet the full requirements of the question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A

Q.1(a) & 1(b) Quite a few candidates did not know these details.

Q.2(a) Mostly correct. (b) Many knew that he was 'gnashing his teeth' even if they were not certain which Latin word tells us this.

Q.3(a) Some knew this but others guessed incorrectly on the basis of present-day experience.

Q.3(b) Ideas of place and of quantity of fish were needed for the 2 marks.

Q.4 Again, candidates needed both the idea of place and some rendering of *frequens.*

Q.5 To gain marks here candidates had to identify points of style and show how they gave emphasis to what Ovid was saying: many found this quite difficult, though the repetitions in line 1 offer some clear examples. There was a tendency to fall back on an interpretative comment on what Ovid has to say; this would usually be acceptable in the wider 10-mark question but here the focus must be strictly on style. Examiners are, however, sympathetic to candidates who make a stylistic point but struggle to express it in clear terms.

Q.6 Candidates appear to enjoy this type of question. All ticked the right number of boxes and most got at least three right.

Q.7 This was well answered in its three subsections and candidates showed a good understanding of the lines.

Q.8 Mostly well answered, though not all candidates understood that wind and water are symbols of impermanence.

Q.9 & Q.10 Again, candidates answered well and showed a good grasp of the poem.

Q.11 Most earned the mark here.

Q.12 This is a less rigidly stylistic question than Q.5. Candidates scored marks where they selected an appropriate Latin word, phrase or clause and explained how it showed Catullus' unhappiness; there is wide choice of possibilities and most parts of the passage were accepted if satisfactorily explained. *nunc te cognovi* and *vilior et levior* were popular choices but *qui potis est…* is not a good choice (despite its being a rhetorical question) as it does not of itself express unhappiness. There was some misunderstanding of the sense of the final line.

Q.13(a) Most scored a mark, but not if they merely translated *miser* (a very obvious word).

Q.13(b) This proved a difficult question as it is hard to separate the two ideas: the affair is over + he should accept it/move on. Some scored the two marks though.

Q.14 Most gave an acceptable answer but some, perhaps surprisingly, did not.

Q.15 There were some good, appreciative answers to this question and there were others that contained good material even if not enough of it to score highly. In some instances poor answer technique was the main problem. It is not necessary to provide Latin, or a stylistic device, for every point but as a translation is given the candidate who offers a point of content must explain clearly what it shows of Catullus' feelings. A simple example would be: "In calling her 'wicked girl' Catullus shows how angry he is at the way she has treated him." If a stylistic point is made ("He uses a lot of rhetorical questions") we need to know whether Catullus is using them to reveal his anger, vindictiveness, bitterness, pain or whatever; picking out a specific example with an explanation would be a good extension to the basic point. As the Mark Scheme shows, the answer must contain some correct Latin reference and some convincing point of style to gain a mark above 6 on this question.

Section B

Q.16 Whilst many scored well here others were decidedly hazy about the details.

Q.17 Only a few knew this and many were tempted by *exitio* to speak of their 'leaving' somewhere.

Q.18(a) Most came up with at least one correct point but not very many managed three.

Q.18(b) There were some thoughtful and ingenious responses to this question and most candidates got a mark. All plausible answers were accepted.

Q.19(a) & (b) Generally answered well.

Q.20 There was a mixed response to this question as candidates often merely picked an example and said that it was like someone giving orders (or words to that effect). Others did identify a point of style (short clauses and use of 'command' verb forms being popular choices) but having found one often struggled to find a second. Most remembered to include the Latin but occasionally copied out lengthy chunks to no great purpose.

Q.21(a) There were not many right answers here with 'the city (of) Latina' being all too common a choice.

Q.21(b), Q.22, Q.23 There was a lot of uncertainty over these details, though Q.23 fared slightly better than the others.

Q.24 There were some good attempts at this question and quite a few candidates showed that they appreciated the build-up of drama and tension in the passage and were aware of some of the means Virgil uses to create it. Only a few candidates included sufficient material to score at the top level and one or two larded their answers with poorly-understood technical terms neither appropriately deployed nor explained. The best answers chose examples from the text (either Latin or English), explained how they created or increased the drama and (for at least some examples) pointed to a stylistic device which added to the effect. Well-chosen examples were the flashing of Euryalus' helmet (though Latin words from the first four lines were often incorrectly used), the sudden shout of Volcens, the flight into the woods and the actions of the cavalry in the last two lines. Points of content are accepted provided that their relevance to the question is made clear and whilst Latin and points of style are not needed for every point there must be at least one of each for the answer to gain more than 6 marks.

Q.25 Part (a) was almost always correct, part (b) more problematic.

Q.26 Candidates struggled with this and only a few scored the 2 marks; *toto* was accepted but not the translation 'total'.

Q.27 As a 'style' question this proved challenging for candidates often because they did not really understand what was being asked. They need to identify points of style, whether this be striking vocabulary (*diverberat*), emphatic positioning (*frangitur*), alliteration (*volvitur…vomens*) or gruesome detail (*calidum…flumen),* adding a brief explanation of how this makes the passage vivid or what is being highlighted. Accurate matching of the Latin to the English translation provided is therefore important.

Q.28 Most scored quite well on this and all ticked the right number of boxes.

Q.29(a) & (b) Candidates showed some appreciation of the similes but were not always sure of the precise details. Some did not grasp the need to explain how a given detail about the flower shows us something about Euryalus. Examiners were pleased to see, however, the efforts that many made to make sense of the comparisons, though the modern connection of poppies with death in warfare was felt to be inappropriate here.

Q.30 Answers here varied from the very full and exact to the vague and/or almost wholly inaccurate. Any two correct details of Nisus' attack on Volcens and death were sufficient to gain the marks.

A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

As in previous years the Virgil, Aeneid IX option proved much the more popular but there was still a significant number of candidates who studied the Ovid/Catullus selection with evident enjoyment and appreciation. The overall textual knowledge and understanding displayed by the candidates was impressive on both Sections and it is gratifying to see the extent to which these ancient texts continue to engage the student of today. Candidates had much that was appreciative and perceptive to say about the attitudes to women and love displayed by Catullus and Ovid, responding with no inconsiderable indignation to Ovid's 'advice' and entering sympathetically into Catullus' agonised feeling. On Section B the drama and pathos of the story of Nisus and Euryalus evidently appealed to candidates and vigorous discussion of the rights and wrongs of their actions clearly lay behind the many very good answers to Q.23. The number of candidates who had found the texts altogether too challenging was very small.

Examiners also continue to be impressed with the ability of candidates to provide analysis of literary and linguistic effects. Technical terms were deployed again this year with ease and familiarity, and for the most part correctly and appropriately. Candidates are not penalised if they do not use technical terms, nor if they use them incorrectly (provided the relevant point is made by other means), but it is nonetheless pleasing to see the extent to which candidates have developed these skills and how they have added to their appreciation of the texts.

Most candidates showed a good (and often excellent) understanding of the requirements of the different questions but, as the specific comments below will indicate, there were some who might have scored higher had they paid a little more careful attention to what the questions were asking. On Section B, for instance, there was a tendency to treat Q.17 in a similar way to the 8-mark essay-style questions, rather than focusing closely on the Latin text; this problem did not arise in Section A as the comparable questions focused on different authors but here a number of questions asking for elucidation of the author's meaning needed more precise attention to what the author was actually saying at that point.

Finally, the usual plea from examiners for scripts to be legible! It cannot be stressed to candidates too strongly that impenetrable handwriting not only makes examiners' lives hard but can result in candidates not being fully credited for the answers they offer. Examiners make every effort to read difficult handwriting, to discover where candidates have hidden parts of their answer and to link stray pieces of writing to the correct question; nonetheless the only way for candidates to ensure that their work is fairly and fully assessed is to write clearly and legibly, within the spaces provided, and to indicate clearly where answers continue on extra pages. Section A candidates in particular need to be reminded that there is extra writing space at the end of the Question Paper; because scripts are scanned onto computer the accessing of booklets (often with just a few lines of writing) is far more difficult for examiners.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A

Q.1(a) Almost always answered correctly with two out of three possible details.

Q.1(b) A few answered 'How…' here but reference to place was essential, as was *frequens* (however interpreted).

Q.2 Nearly always correct, though a few strayed outside the lemma to mention sails.

Q.3(a) & (b). Candidates had difficulty in interpreting the question here. The key to the explanation is that these are (mythological) examples of 'would-be lovers' who had to travel a great distance (unlike the lover in Rome): this, with some detail from each example (Perseus brought Andromeda from India; Paris snatched Helen from Greece), would provide the best answers, and quite a few candidates provided something along these lines. Examiners allowed quite a range of answers on this question, permitting candidates to score highly in nearly all cases.

Q.4 Most understood the passage and coped extremely well with the series of correlatives (examiners were indulgent towards slight vagaries of English grammar). Omission of words (*tam* in line 1; *tua* in line 5) and confusion between *dabit* in the first line and *habet* in the last were common errors. Examiners always accept a range of translations that fully and accurately represent the meaning of the Latin.

Q.5 Candidates responded vigorously to this question and usually with considerable indignation at Ovid's representation of women; it was very interesting to read what candidates had to say on this subject. Candidates showed good textual knowledge and a real attempt to use the textual details to provide an answer to the question. A good deal was made of Ovid's comparison of women to animals of many kinds, whether prey to be snared by hunters or the victims of predatory creatures. Not many, however, made any distinction between the application of brute force by Romulus' men in the distant past and the 'hunting' for women at the theatre in Ovid's own day.

The comparison of women at the theatre to ants and bees was also generally regarded as demeaning, although a few felt there were positive elements in this comparison. The more nuanced answers looked at Ovid's comment on the motives of women attending the theatre and considered what this revealed of his view of women. A few raised the question of whether it might have been a fairer portrayal in Ovid's day than it would be in our own and a few also argued that the portrayal of men in the poem could equally be considered unfair. The humorous/satirical aspect of Ovid's poem featured in a few answers and the jury appeared to be out on whether Ovid's attitude to the plight of the Sabine women was one of horrified sympathy or amused neutrality. Examiners would have liked to see these more varied considerations appearing a little more frequently.

As always with questions of this type there is no right or wrong answer and all points of view are acceptable to examiners as long as they are backed up with convincing evidence from the texts. Candidates should aim to include a good range of comments in relation to the question, supported by specific textual evidence; there is no requirement for any Latin reference, nor are lengthy opening and closing paragraphs which merely repeat points contained in the body of the essay either necessary or a good idea where time is at a premium.

Q.6 The most common fault here was to omit mention that Jupiter was a god, perhaps on the grounds that it was too obvious! Nevertheless, since Catullus' comments depend for their force entirely on the fact that Jupiter was the king of the gods (or at least a god), this does need explaining.

Q.7(a) Most got this right and managed to provide two words.

Q.7(b) Generally answered well but some candidates didn't see the need to say anything about wind and water as such.

Q.8(a) The text was well understood here.

Q.8(b) In questions of this type it is essential to provide some Latin reference in support of a point which answers the particular question: here it is how Catullus shows that he has bitter feelings. This not an exercise just in translating the Latin: candidates must explain how the

chosen example shows his bitterness. Stylistic points can be accepted if relevant but this is not a stylistic question as such and answers will generally be ones of content. There is a good range of possible answers and many candidates answered this very well. A few tried to make two points out of *vilior et levior* but as these words are so tightly bound together both in sound and in meaning they can only constitute one point. A number of candidates picked on *qui potis est…* but this questions Catullus' paradoxical feelings rather than displaying his bitter ones.

Q.9 Though candidates knew roughly what the line meant they did not always grasp that Catullus makes two points, one referring to the past ('it's over') and the other referring to the present/future ('accept the fact/move on'): both were needed here.

Q.10 This required both the meaning of the Latin and an interpretation of it: it was usually well answered, though a few thought *tibi* referred to Lesbia rather than Catullus.

Q.11 There were many very good answers to this question and candidates usually understood that the focus of this 10-mark question has to be on the details of the Latin. Detailed references to content can be used to answer this question as well as points of style but to gain a mark in the higher range the answer must include some style point and some Latin reference. A good approach (though it is far from the only one) is to work through the passage commenting on relevant points with a brief Latin reference; the Latin must either be translated or its meaning made clear in the course of the comment. Points frequently made were the use of imperatives, the emphasis on endurance/holding fast, the modes of address to Lesbia and the rhetorical questions. Many candidates noted that Catullus does not use Lesbia's name but dismisses her or insults her with *puella/scelesta*. Some also noted the increasingly personal note in the questions, suggesting perhaps a weakening of Catullus' resolve and necessitating the reiteration of instruction to himself in the final line.

Examiners were interested and pleased to see the varied ways in which candidates interpreted the passage (the rhetorical questions in particular): all interpretations are acceptable provided textual support is forthcoming. To attain the highest marks candidates must ensure that they cover a good range of examples, and/or that they make a sufficient range of comments about the examples they have chosen. Many candidates made several good points but just not sufficient in number, or else not sufficiently well developed, to reach level 4. It is not a good idea to quote and then translate lengthy sections of Latin (such as all the rhetorical questions) with little or no comment as little credit can be given in that instance. Again, a correct stylistic observation may be made but unless the candidate can show how it brings out Catullus' feelings it may not receive credit: a case in point might be the polyptoton of question words in lines 7-10.

Section B

Q.12(a) Nearly always correctly answered.

Q.12(b) With so many answers to choose from few failed to get 3 marks but 'Hyrtacides' could not be accepted as the name of Nisus' father and attempts to get two points out of the weapons in line 3 were doomed to failure.

Q.13(a) & (b) Again almost all scored full marks.

Q.14 Only rarely was an unacceptable Latin word chosen and explanations were usually good but context was important in some cases: *unus* refers specifically to *amor* so references to other kinds of 'oneness' were not acceptable; *pariter* means that they did things together rather than that they were equals in some other sense.

Q.15 Mostly correct though imprecision in details cost some candidates marks: fire/horses were insufficient answers on their own; fire was 'dying down/flickering' rather than blazing; horses could be tied up or cropping the grass, but not 'bound according to ritual' as if about to be sacrificed. A few confused Messapus' camp with the earlier one and spoke of up-turned chariots.

Q.16 The range of possible answers here meant that most candidates scored well but there was some textual misunderstanding: *absistamus* taken as 'we must leave/go', *lux inimica* taken as 'the lights of the enemy'. Generally, though, candidates fully grasped the difference between Nisus and Euryalus here. A few interpreted this as a style/Latin question and so provided answers that were not well targeted. Attempts to make a point out of *sensit* or *breviter* were not accepted.

Q.17 There were many interesting and thoughtful answers to this question which showed a sensitive understanding of how Virgil builds up the dramatic tension. Candidates were very alive to the irony of the helmet (a protective piece of head-gear) 'betraying' Euryalus and of the heroes 'trusting in the night' (which had just given them away). This perception did, however, led quite a few candidates into writing at undue length about Euryalus' responsibility for the disaster in a way that is appropriate in an 8-mark essay question but not in this 10-mark question: what is needed here is a wide range of details focusing on the specifics of the text.

Other candidates did not score as well as they might because they assumed that Nisus and Euryalus were the ones just approaching the camp (rather than Volcens and his men). Some also believed that Nisus had already prayed to the moon and launched his spears at this point in the narrative or that Volcens knew of the slaughter perpetrated at the camp.

That said, many candidates showed both detailed knowledge of text and context and a clear understanding of how to approach the question; indeed nearly all candidates made a creditable attempt. A good approach is to work through the passage citing points from the text and showing how they create drama: the points may be ones of content or of style or indeed both and Latin needs to be quoted for at least some of the points. Content points would include the gradual approach of Volcens' army in line 1 and the sudden flashing of the helmet in line 4. Points of style from early in the passage are the doubling and chiasmus of verbs in line 1; *procul*, *laevo,* L alliteration and historic infinitive in line 2, enjambement of *prodidit*, positioning of *immemorem* and mysterious alternation of light and dark in lines 3-4. It should be stressed that candidates do not have to use technical terms to make their point and they are not penalised if they use them incorrectly provided their point is otherwise clear; where they quote Latin, though, they should either translate at least the key word(s) or make clear its meaning in the course of their comment.

Candidates had plenty of illuminating things to say about the sudden burst of direct speech and Volcens' voice of command and interrogation, though some had him standing on a column for greater impact! It is not really a good idea to spend time writing out and translating the whole string of questions however: a pertinent comment with a brief illustrative reference is all that is required. Again, does the polyptoton of question words in fact add to the drama of the passage, and if so, how? The final two lines also provided candidates with many sound points, the positioning and anaphora of *hinc atque hinc* perhaps winning out in terms of popularity.

In many good answers there were just not quite enough points made overall to qualify for the top level of marks: if only five points or so are made these need to be both fully valid and very fully developed to reach the top level.

Q.18 The correct answer featured (and was accepted) under a wide variety of appellation.

Q.19 Though there were many good answers from candidates who understood the text well, some candidates struggled to provide a coherent and logical response and/or were hampered by inadequate understanding of the passage. The question asks about 'style of writing' and answers based on style are required, though this can be stretched to include word choice or graphic description as well as alliteration, enjambement and other more obviously stylistic devices (as ever, technical terms need not be used). In line 1 the word choice to go for is surely *diverberat* yet many chanced their arm on *volans* which is neither historic present (as often asserted) nor particularly graphic (what else can a spear do?) Correct stylistic observations can only be credited if backed up by correct interpretation of the text (though this does not have to be at great length): his vomiting is not highlighted by enjambement of *volvitur*, 'alliteration' of *flumen frigidus* is not a convincing point given that the stream was hot, not cold (though it is possible that a convincing explanation could be offered and it would be accepted if that were the case). Good (and simply expressed) points would be:

The metaphor of the spear 'cleaving' the air (*diverberat)* highlight's the force behind the spear-throw.

The emphatic position/enjambement of *frangitur* highlights the moment when the spear shatters.

The contrast between the hot stream (of blood) (*calidum…*) and his coldness (*frigidus)* makes his death vivid/exciting.

All of these points made regular appearance and there were many more.

Q.20 Candidates were being asked here for four details from either of the two comparisons and for a brief indication of how this helps us to imagine what is happening to Euryalus; in each case there must be reference to the flower simile AND to Euryalus: a number of candidates forwent marks through omitting one or the other. Two different details from the similes could show the same thing about Euryalus (his head/body slumping forward for example) and would each gain a mark. Generalised comparisons of Euryalus to a delicate flower were also acceptable. However, examiners saw the modern association of the poppy with warfare as anachronistic and did not accept points based on *forte* in the second simile as they do not help us to imagine how Euryalus was at that moment of his death.

Q.21 Most gained 2 marks. Latin was essential here but the points needed were very simple. The examples chosen did have to relate to Nisus' intention to kill Volcens (so probably not *ruit in medios*). A number of candidates mistook *moratur* for *moritur.*

Q.22 Translations from many candidates were accurate and of a high standard, with perhaps omission of a word or two (*comminus, donec, adverso*) giving rise to mark loss.

Q.23 Candidates very much came into their own on this question and provided a well-reasoned discussion with plenty of supporting evidence. Most attributed the failure of the expedition to a combination of the three factors mentioned and not all wished to come down on the side of any one of the three. As always, examiners were happy to credit all opinions provided that textual support was forthcoming. The highest scoring answers gave consideration to at least two of the factors and usually all three, even if they then chose one to bear the blame. Those who focused solely on one factor to the complete exclusion of the others usually scored less well, not because the approach was necessarily unacceptable but simply because they could not marshal enough material to give a convincing answer.

A405/01 Sources for Latin: (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

There were a few candidates who might have been more challenged by the questions on the Higher Tier though most found the organised focus given for Foundation Tier questions more accessible. Candidates were able to stay on target, complete nearly all questions and complete the paper. The quality of written communication and legibility was very good.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1a) The English translations made this question more accessible but some candidates lacked the requisite knowledge to identify A.

1b) This question revealed a lack of knowledge in some over the way in which a hypocaust worked, however the organisation of the question into two parts offered an opportunity for more to answer.

1c) Again, as in the previous question, the layout of the question enabled more detailed responses to be offered. Candidates who studied the images and made good use of them scored well.

2a) Candidates knew that Menogenes was trying to get an invitation to dinner.

2b) Again some good answers including some literary appreciation. Those responses which simply picked out phrases without any further development did not gain credit.

3) Most candidates were able to make two points. At this level a balanced counterargument was not expected.

4) Many responses were detailed when using the sources but often could not develop points with outside sources.

5a and 5b) There were some good answers here; however, some could improve the clarity of the response by referring to specific detail seen.

6a and 6b) This question needed careful reading as Latin was required in a). In b) the correct Latin was not always identified. Candidates should study the translation offered very carefully.

7a) Correct responses showing careful reading of the source on the whole.

7b) There was a mixed response over jobs done by slaves in a Roman town. Some offered jobs which were more appropriate to a farm.

8) Some good answers on the whole. Variations in levels depended on amount of detail offered and ability to answer the question '*How far….*'

9) On the Foundation Tier placing the extended question at the end has proven successful particularly in encouraging full completion of the paper. Some good answers as regards argument tended to lack detail and reference to sources and therefore had to be placed in the lower levels.

A405/02 Sources for Latin: (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

Candidates clearly enjoy the range of topics studied though it was felt at this stage in the life of the specification that they should be reminded of the rubric at the beginning of the paper regarding the offering of sources beyond those in the Insert. Very good answers were characterised by reading the paper carefully and doing what the questions required in a methodical way. Excellence was achieved by the knowledge of other sources available for the teaching of this unit in the booklet of sources produced by OCR.

On the whole, the use of time was good. Not completing the paper was very rare. In addition, it was pleasing to note that legibility and the quality of written communication was good on the whole.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1a) This was usually done well with references to clothes/belongings in niches, but more general answers on benches/ventilation/no baths/arches which were not discriminating enough to identify the room as an apodyterium.

1b) This question revealed a lack of knowledge in many over the way in which a hypocaust worked. There were even fewer responses which offered two pieces of evidence from other sources. Some responses tried to present Aquae Sulis and Pompeii as new sources but these were given in the Insert. Careful reading of the question was required here as some candidates stated what a hypocaust was rather than how it worked. Some candidates did refer to different types of evidence, or specific examples of baths, e.g. Binchester, Vindolanda, Baths of Caracalla.

1c) Many candidates identified arches but needed to explain why that made Romans good engineers – "difficult to build" was felt to be too generic. Some commented upon decoration over engineering. In Image 2 for example, comments on symmetrical rows underpinning the floor gained marks.

2a) Mainly well done, apart from a few vague responses: "he's kind to him"

2b) Again usually well done with quotation and explanation from the source; some candidates were able to paraphrase and explain well; some however merely quoted from the source and left it there; the focus of the question was clearly on "how" not "what."

3) On the whole candidates felt that slippers were essential as part of the general spa experience but did not appreciate the fact that the floor was hot. This tied in with insecurity overall of the hypocaust.

4) The comparison necessary was usually understood, but often candidates could have picked features which allowed explanation of change over time. Quite a few responses could have supported points with references to the source; a simple negation was not really explanation, e.g. Seneca's had x, Scipio's didn't.

5) There were some good answers here displaying knowledge of the sources and the ability to build a coherent response to the question. However, occasionally some candidates ignored the wording of the question which clearly highlighted the need to use sources A, B and C in the insert. Most candidates referred to the sources in the Insert plus one other source. Seneca's

letters was the most well-known, but Columella was also well done, and references were made to ruins of baths in Rome or Britain, as well as finds (strigils, statues) and inscriptions to athletes. Some candidates argue excellently but do not have the range of sources for top marks in the band.

6a) Usually very well done

6b) Many candidates thought standing would be taxing without considering the alternatives of a slave's life, and that hairdressing was boring or demeaning, as was being asked to hold up and read from a large book. Candidates made inferences that could not be credited (e.g. that this was happening all the time, for a long time) but were credited where this was possible (e.g. didn't look malnourished, didn't see evidence of bruising or beatings). In Image 2 of the slave reading candidates successfully commented on evidence of an education or skill.

7a) Mostly well done, apart from those who didn't read the question and answered in English.

7b) There was a mixed response here; there were errors as the Latin and English did not always match up. Candidates are urged to study the translation offered very carefully.

8a) Again usually well done, but again problems with the emphasis being on "how" he emphasised the conditions, not what the conditions were.

8b) Usually well done. Some commented on the exaggerated nature of the story and fictional bias, others that it focused more on the working conditions of the slaves, others that no detail in the recipe or ingredients or process was given.

9) There were some excellent comparative answers and judicious references from the sources; generalisations scored less well. Some candidates focused on only Source F, not realising that the question required use Source E in the question too.

10) Most candidates referred to all three sources but did not always do so precisely or with good references to the source details; some just gave a bald general statement per source which did not score the highest marks. To fully answer the question, ideally, there should also have been some appreciation whether life as a freedman/woman would be better than their life as a slave.