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## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates. The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report. A full copy of the question paper can be downloaded from OCR.

## Paper 1 series overview

Examiners felt that both the Livy and Ovid passages were harder this year than in 2018. There were few really easy sections of GCSE/AS Level standard, and some elements of the Ovid certainly stretched even the best. Even so, examiners were also concerned that many candidates seemed to lack the knowledge of accidence required to cope with largely unadapted Latin at this level. As a result, the mean mark was lower this year.

No examiners commented on illegibility as a particular problem this year, but some commented on candidates who use brackets to add alternative translations of a word or phrase. What they write inside the bracket is often quite different from their unbracketed translation and examiners therefore routinely ignore bracketed alternatives. Candidates should be advised not to use them.

## Question 1

1 Translate the following passage into English. Please write your translation on alternate lines.
[50]

Q1(i): the first sentence was intended to be a gentle lead-in to the story, but candidates found unexpected difficulties. The wording of the introduction should have helped with the meaning of ad Alliam ('at Allia') but many took it as 'to Allia'. Candidates should be aware that the wording of the introduction to a passage is designed to help them. prodidit ('betrayed') was often confused with perdidit. The confusion of similar words with different meanings seemed more prevalent this year: among examples were vix/vis, totus/tutus, praefectus/profectus, voluntatem/volentem, saluti/saluto, iacebant/iaciebant, milia/milites, fors/fortis, tenes/tendens, monstra/monstro, odium/otium, cupido/cupio, audenti/audienti, monimenta/munimenta.

Q1(ii): difficulties here included the meanings of vix and quinquaginta (numbers are common in Livy and worth revising) and the form of secuti sunt. At this level it is expected that candidates recognise the latter as a deponent verb and in the perfect tense. Teachers using this passage as a mock paper or classroom exercise might usefully linger over the meaning of cum after the semi-colon - many who missed the ablative case of altero consule moriente and the indicative mood of fuit wrongly took it as 'when' or 'since' rather than 'with'. prope needed to be taken with totus ('nearly the whole army').

Q1(iii): the keys to handling this difficult sentence were the deponent form of the glossed word gratularentur and the fact that the verb needing to be taken in the indirect command after suaderent was daret ('they were urging that he should give'). Better responses saw that reliquum was an adjective rather than part of relinquo.

Q1(iv): this sentence was handled successfully only by the very best. ratus from reor was often not known, although most got the sense of the gerundive morandum ('there should be the least delay'). A wide variety of translations of immo were accepted. Few seemed to spot the subjunctive form of scias, which meant that most missed its use in a purpose clause here. The indirect question quid hac pugna actum sit was not well done, either because of the case of pugna or the passive form of actum sit. Surprisingly, even some of the best candidates faltered over the straightforward quinto die - translations which referred to 'five days' were not accepted (Exemplar 1 is typical of an excellent candidate who has got all the hard things right, but slipped on quinto die, perhaps through a brief lapse of concentration). In addition, examiners noted that the military term praefectus was often not known. Teachers preparing their candidates for a Livy unseen might usefully compile a list of common military-type words if they do not already do so. The same was true for equitum, which was often wrongly taken as 'horses'.

Q1(v): cum was again a problem here, as was the future tense form and meaning of praecedam ('I shall go ahead'). Relatively few candidates seemed to know what to do with the separation of prius ... quam. This separation is common in Livy and worth practising with candidates. Those who had been taught to move the prius to go with quam and take them together as priusquam were able to get the sense ('so that the Romans may know that we have arrived before they know that we are on our way').

Q1(vi): in this section haec res was often taken as 'these things' and nimis was widely not known. It had been hoped the most would get the sense of maior quam ut eam capere animo posset ('bigger than he could imagine') but many tied themselves in knots with attempts to give literal renderings of quam and $u t$. Examiners allowed a lot of leeway with the quality of the English here.

Q1(vii): many missed the indirect statement at the start if this section, perhaps because of the word order and the form of voluntatem, which many wrongly took as volentem. The phrase opus est was clearly not widely known, even though most got some idea that Hannibal wanted time to weigh up Maharbal's plan.

Q1(viii): examiners had expected candidates to find difficulty with the idiomatic vincere cis ('you know how to conquer'). As it was, this was handled rather well, even by lower-ability candidates. There were a number of less anticipated problems: the meaning of di (often confused with dies), the dative form of eidem, the infinitive form of uti and the predicative dative saluti esse. Ignorance of the latter produced a wide variety of versions on the theme of the city of Rome being greeted. Predicative datives are not easy and candidates should be made familiar with the more common examples.

Q1(ix): candidates preparing for a Livy unseen might have been expected to know a battlefield word like strages, but many did not. Another time, it might have been glossed. As in 2018, some were unfamiliar with foedus as an adjective meaning 'foul' (it was often confused with the noun foedus).

Q1(x): iacebant was predictably confused with iaciebant - it seemed that candidates thought it was more likely that people were throwing dead bodies around the battlefield than that the bodies were lying on the ground. The surprise for examiners was that so many took milia as 'soldiers' rather than 'thousands'. The use of tot in the first half of the sentence unfortunately led many to take the ut clause after the comma as a result clause. The eagle-eyed saw that iunxerat was indicative and therefore that the sense of $u t$ was 'as fate had joined them in battle or flight'. Versions which (reasonably enough) took pugna and fuga as nominatives were accepted. fors was regularly confused with mors, fortis and, less predictably, fores.

Exemplar 1


## Question 2 (a)

2 (a) Translate the following passage into English. Please write your translation on alternate lines.
[45]

Q2(a)(i): the glossing of me paenitet as 'I regret' unfortunately misled some candidates into assuming that paenitet Phinea belli meant something like 'I regret the war against Phineus'. It is worth teaching candidates how to make the best use of the glossary section of an unseen paper, especially with impersonal verbs like this. iniusti was often wrongly taken as 'injustice'.

Q2(a)(ii): it had been hoped that the closeness of confessas to the English 'confess' would have led candidates to see that Phineus was holding his hands out in confession/regret. Alas, many took it as fessas (a reasonable guess) or confectas. tendens ('holding out', 'stretching out') was often confused with tenens ('holding').

Q2(a)(iii): difficulties here were the meaning of monstra (often confused with the verb monstro), the agreement of tuae with Medusae, the phrase quaecumque est ('whoever she is') and the sense of tolle. tollo is regularly used in the sense of 'take away', which was the sense required here. Some candidates pleasingly wrote 'away with the face of your Medusa!' Some candidates seemed unused to the tendency of poets to use plurals for singulars - here, monstra and vultus both needed to be taken as singular (although translations in the plural were not penalised). saxificos was deliberately left unglossed - the intelligent guessing of an unfamiliar word remains a key skill at this level and examiners had hoped that candidates would be led to the meaning by the elements of the word (sax-, -fic) and the well-known context of the story. Many translated it as 'stony' but relatively few realised that it meant something like 'that turns people to stone'.

Q2(a)(iv): this was expected to be a relatively straightforward section on which most could score 4 or 5 marks, but candidates found difficulty with odium (confused with otium), regni (often 'queen') and cupido (often taken as ablative because of the -o ending). It is worth drawing candidates' attention to 3rd declension nouns with a nominative in -0 .

Q2(a)(v): this, and the next section, were the hardest sections of the paper and very few candidates demonstrated the level of grammatical knowledge required to deal with them successfully. Teachers using the passage as a mock or classroom exercise might wish to linger over them.

Questions to be asked on section (v) are what case are dicenti and audenti? If they are correctly identified as dative, why are they dative? Because Perseus is speaking to Phineus? audio and audeo are regularly confused - which verb does audenti come from? If it is from audeo, what was Phineus daring or not daring to do? Look back (respicere)? If so, who or what didn't he dare to look back at? We are now left with eum quem voce rogabat which must mean 'at him whom he was asking with his voice'. Candidates without the grammatical knowledge to unravel this admittedly tortuous sentence had to resort to guesswork here, but they were still often rewarded with 2 marks out of 5 for recognition of some aspects of the vocabulary or syntax.

Q2(a)(vi): examiners allowed quod to be taken as 'because', although it really required 'the thing which'. This led some, however, to ignore the endings of timidissime and Phineu and translate 'because you are most cowardly'. Many made a good attempt to account for the perfect form of tribuisse (even though it was actually better to take it as a present infinitive in English here), and a good number realised that the sense of munus was 'gift' rather than 'service' or 'duty'. pone metum was not well handled - many wrote 'place fear' without apparently thinking what this meant in English. 'Do not be afraid' was accepted as the most natural translation. The alternative second singular form of the future passive violabere was a stiff test, although most got the idea that Perseus was reassuring Phineus by promising not to hurt him.

Q2(a)(vii): not many were familiar with quin etiam but many seemed to grasp the overall gist of this section, strange even though it was: Phineus would become a statue in the house of Perseus and Perseus' wife, so that she could console herself by looking at the image of the man who was previously her husband-to-be! Thus, many who didn't pick up the form of violabere in the previous section did well to get the sense of spectabere here ('you will always be watched') and correctly took ut as introducing a purpose clause ('so that my wife may console herself').

Q2(a)(viii): in this section, the agreement of illam was problematic because of the word order (it needed to go with partem), as was the agreement of trepido with ore (again, perhaps because of the dislocated word order). Matching adjectives with nouns is, of course, a key skill when translating Latin poetry. Many, however, ignored the se, took trepido ore as accusative and translated 'had turned his trembling face'.

Q2(a)(ix): the sense of lumina caused problems - those who realised that it meant 'eyes' rather than 'lights' were sometimes not sure if these were Phineus' eyes or Medusa's. Some know umor (perhaps because they were familiar with the adjective umidus); those who didn't know it often came up with intelligent guesses.

## Question 2 (b)

2 (b) Write out and scan lines 5-6:
tolle, precor. non nos odium regnique cupido compulit ad bellum; pro coniuge movimus arma.

The scansion question was mostly well done. If candidates went wrong, it was almost always on the second half of the first line (odium needs to be scanned as three syllables short-short-long) and in the middle of the second line (pro is long and coniuge is long-short-short). Exemplar 2 is a good example of the latter. A small number of candidates did not attempt the scansion question, perhaps because it was over the page from the passage. Many choose to answer the scansion question before starting their translation of the passage, which makes good sense.

Exemplar 2
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