

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

J281/J081/R/11

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, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, 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 specifications 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 specification 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 2011

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

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Latin (J281)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Latin (J081)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

| Content | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Chief Examiner's Report | 1 |
| A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and Domestic life (Foundation Tier) | 2 |
| A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and Domestic life (Higher Tier) | 4 |
| A401/04 – the computer based test | 7 |
| A402/01 and A402/02: Latin Language 2 (History) | 9 |
| A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier) | 12 |
| A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier) | 14 |
| A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier) | 17 |
| A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier) | 20 |
| A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier) | 23 |
| A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier) | 25 |

Chief Examiner's Report

The first full sitting of the new suite of papers was generally very successful. Language papers, for the most part, succeeded in being accessible to the full range of candidates whilst differentiating well. Literature papers gave candidates the chance to demonstrate their ability to write extended answers as well as show their knowledge of the meaning of the texts. We would once more extend our apologies for the errors in paper A403/02 but can now confirm that they do not seem to have had an effect on the achievement of candidates. The Sources paper produced some excellent responses, with one examiner even commenting that there were some remarkable responses worthy of AS Level.

At the end of the marking period, it was possible to set grade boundaries which produced very similar percentages of candidates achieving the key grades of A*, A, C and F to those awarded on the legacy specification. Much of the work was a pleasure to mark and was testament to the high quality of candidates taking our subject and, not least, to the thoroughness of the way in which their teachers have prepared them.

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

The performance of candidates on this paper varied immensely.

General Points

- 1 It is often in candidates' interests to stick to their first thoughts. Frequently, changes made by candidates were from the correct, to an incorrect, answer.
- 2 Candidates should avoid using brackets or writing alternative versions, for if either is incorrect, the answer is marked wrong.
- 3
 - (a) Words which the candidate probably knew were often omitted. Thus, in Q. 9, the translation question, *tum*, *iam* and *bonos* were frequently omitted. Candidates should check every Latin word in the passage to ensure that they have translated it.
 - (b) The person and number of the verb were not always taken into account by candidates. Again, in Q. 9, *habitavi*, *dixi* and *manebo* were frequently rendered in the third person, instead of the first.
 - (c) The number and case of nouns were often incorrect, which, as with the verbs, suggests that candidates need to pay more attention to the declension or conjugation of the words in the specified vocabulary list, and their respective stems/genders/principal parts.
 - (d) Candidates did not always take advantage of the help given on the Question Paper itself. In Q. 9, *hic*, glossed as 'here', was often translated as 'this' or omitted.
- 4 It is in candidates' interests to spend enough time reading the question carefully. A number of marks were lost on Questions 7a, 11 and 15 through misreading the question. It is often a good idea on completion of the question to read it again, to ensure that you have answered the question set.
- 5 Many responses showed gaps in candidates' knowledge of the defined vocabulary list.
- 6 There were a number of errors of spelling in candidates' responses. Fortunately for candidates, incorrect spelling is not penalised, apart from glossed names in the translation question.

Individual Questions

Questions 1a and 1b caused very few problems, but Q. 2, involving straight translation, was answered less well, mainly because the meaning of *voco* was unknown to many. It was surprising to see so many candidates taking *cives* with *divum* and stating that Claudius was a divine citizen. Candidates at this level did not seem to have a secure grasp of endings. See Question 9 below.

Most candidates ticked the right box in Q. 3, but in Q. 4, Mercury was given a variety of jobs, rarely the correct one, 'messenger of the gods', although in the light of the context, 'to escort people to the underworld' was accepted.

In Q. 5, Claudius was stated to be doing all sorts of things in Britain. Several candidates mistook the number of *templum*, which was singular, and the preposition *in*. However, this and the following question were among the best answered. It was pleasing to see that the Perfect tense *venisti* was usually recognised in Q. 6.

In Q. 7a, many candidates did not know the meaning of *ferocem* or wrote about Claudius instead of Hercules. In 7b, gaps in candidates' knowledge of vocabulary were evident, as *servarent* was almost invariably translated 'serve', rather than 'save'.

Q. 8 was usually well answered, though some candidates lost a mark through failure to render the superlative.

Q. 9, the translation passage, was the least well answered question. Lack of knowledge of vocabulary combined with insufficient attention to endings produced some very weak translations. Indeed, many candidates wrote their own version of events which bore little relation to the original Latin. The words in the defined vocabulary list are an essential starting-point for successful performance in the translation section. Even in the more straightforward parts, words which candidates surely knew were omitted (see General point 3a above).

Q. 10 caused problems, mainly with *debet* and *exire*, though *statim* was often omitted or mistranslated.

In Q. 11, many candidates simply did not read the question, 'pick out the word which tells us how the gods received Augustus' opinion', and chose *acceperunt* rather than the required *laete*. However, if they translated *acceperunt* correctly, they were awarded a mark.

Questions 12 and 13a, which gave the candidates a chance to get back on track, were usually correctly answered. 13b was not so well answered, as many candidates omitted or mistranslated *nunc*.

In Q. 14, most candidates translated *perterritus* correctly, but *tristissimus* was surprisingly unknown by many.

As in previous examinations, many candidates in Q. 15 gave the meaning of the Latin word, rather than that of the English word – again, suggesting that they did not read the question. Those who did read the question produced many different derivatives of *multos*, though some could not find one from *annus*. Some gave *per annum*, which was accepted as it is often used in current English.

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

Most candidates were well prepared for this paper and it was pleasing to see so many good responses. There appeared to be plenty of time for this paper, as several candidates wrote out a fair copy of the translation question, and on the very rare occasion when questions were omitted, it was clearly due to lack of knowledge, rather than lack of time.

General Points

- 1 It is often in candidates' interests to stick to their first thoughts. Almost invariably, changes made by candidates were from the correct, to an incorrect, answer.
- 2 Candidates should avoid using brackets or writing alternative versions, for if either is incorrect, the answer is marked wrong.
- 3
 - (a) Words which the candidate probably knew were often omitted. Thus, in Q. 7, the translation question, *igitur*, *nam*, *nunc* and *quoque* were frequently omitted. Candidates should check every Latin word in the passage to ensure that they have translated it.
 - (b) The person and number of the verb were not always taken into account by candidates. Again, in Q. 7, *vixi*, *dixi*, *manebo* and *sum* were frequently rendered in the third person, instead of the first.
 - (c) The number of the noun was also frequently given incorrectly, which, as with the verbs, suggests that candidates need to pay more attention to the declension or conjugation of the words in the specified vocabulary list, and their respective stems/genders/principal parts. A frequent mistake was to take *deorum* as Accusative singular.
 - (d) Candidates did not always take advantage of the help given on the Question Paper itself. In Q. 7, *hic*, glossed as 'here' was often translated as 'this'. In Q. 1, *disputatio* was sometimes rendered in the plural, despite the glossary
 - (e) There was widespread confusion which could have been avoided by looking at each letter carefully, e.g. in Q. 5, where *laederet* was glossed, but several candidates confused it with *laudere* and wrote 'praised him'. In Q. 7, *diu* was translated as 'god', and *vobis* as 'words'.
 - (f) A number of candidates did not seem to understand the function of *se* and *suus*, which usually refer to the subject of the main verb. Thus, in Q. 5b, *se* must refer to Claudius, the subject of the sentence, not Hercules, and in the last sentence of Passage B, *uxore sua* must refer to Claudius' wife, yet this was often translated as 'my' or 'your wife'.

Individual Questions

Answers to the first two questions were usually fully correct, though a few candidates had problems with the meaning of *nolebant*.

The first major hurdle came in Q. 3, where many candidates mistook the Indirect Statement for an Indirect Command, and wrote 'Mercury told Jupiter to approach the old man'. Candidates giving more thought to this question might have wondered why *senem* was in the Accusative case instead of the Dative, which is the case normally taken by *appropinquo*.

Q. 4a caused few problems, though a few candidates confused *capite* with *capio*.

Q. 4b was a good discriminator, as many candidates confuse *nonne* and *num*. The former expects the answer 'Yes', the latter 'No'. It is the expected rather than the actual answer which determines which one is used.

In Q. 5a, several candidates wrote about Claudius, rather than about Hercules.

In Q. 6, the two most frequent errors were failure to render the superlative *plurima* and to recognise the tense of *dedi*.

As expected, the translation passage (Q. 7) discriminated best between the strongest and the least able candidates. Here omissions (see above) and inattention to endings caused candidates to lose many marks. In the first sentence, *deorum* was frequently taken with *lanum*, and some took *lanum*, glossed as *lanus*, as the subject of the sentence.

In the second sentence, *ille dixit* was often translated 'He said that/to this', or 'He himself said', and the natural, but regrettable, tendency to translate each word as it comes produced 'Claudius must not be made a god', which would have been accepted, had the agent 'by us' been inserted, but generally, it was not. The same tendency produced 'nothing was said before' later. It is a tried and tested method of translating Latin to look for the main verb first. In the same sentence, the comparative *crudelior* was not always recognised, though any reasonable rendering of the Dative or Ablative case after a positive or superlative rendering of the adjective was accepted.

The more complicated structure of the last sentence defeated the weaker candidates, though the better ones coped very well with the Ablative Absolute *uxore sua necata*, producing such neat versions as 'having killed his wife, Claudius...' or 'After he had killed his wife, Claudius...'. Too many candidates, however, made *necata* a finite verb without proper coordination with, or subordination to, the following verb, which was not acceptable. A number of candidates misplaced *quod*, and wrote 'Because I am angry, Claudius decided', which should have warned the candidate that this was wrong. However, the majority coped well with the last four words.

There were some vocabulary weaknesses. Apart from the omissions noted above, the meanings of the following words were often unknown: *sentiret*, *ceteris*, *surrexit*, *diu*, *vixi* and *manebo*. There were also instances of candidates not choosing the most suitable meaning of a word in its context, e.g. *debeo*. Many candidates wrote 'We do not owe Claudius to make him a god', or 'We do not owe to make C. a god', whereas any of the other three meanings given in the Specification, 'must, ought, should' would have been more appropriate. This tendency was repeated, though less frequently, in Q. 9.

Nevertheless, several candidates produced faultless translations, for which they are to be commended.

In Q. 8, most candidates managed to score some marks, but several confused *vobis* with *verbis*, or thought that *vobis* was singular and wrote 'No one will believe him' (or even 'it').

There were several good answers to Q. 9, where the main errors were taking *septem horis* as expressing time how long, rather than time within which, and confusing *discedere* with *descendere*.

Questions 10 and 11 were very well answered, but in Q. 12, many candidates did not render the passive voice.

In Q. 13, a few candidates, confused by the root *terr-* and the context, thought that Claudius had gone underground. The vast majority, however, scored full marks on this and the following question.

In the last question, some candidates are still putting the meaning of the Latin word, rather than that of the English derivative. As the meanings of some derivatives from *civis*, e.g. civilisation and civilian, are hard to explain ('non-military person' was rarely given for the latter), a variety of meanings were allowed. A variety of explanations of 'civil servant' were given. On the other hand, derivatives from *credet* were excellently explained, e.g. 'creed – a statement of beliefs held by Christians', though there was some confusion between the meanings of credible and creditable.

An examiner's report, by its very nature, is bound to give attention to weaknesses and errors in candidates' responses, in the hope that these will be corrected in future examination series. It should be stressed, therefore, that the majority of candidates coped very well with the paper, some even achieving full marks, which reflected both the candidates' and their teachers' hard work and enthusiasm for the language.

A401/04 – the computer based test

Only nine candidates sat this option. For fuller feedback on the Higher Tier option, see the A401 02 report.

Responses to the following questions were almost entirely correct, so no comment is made on them: 1, 4(a), 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15.

Question 2

Two candidates failed to include any reference to *nolebant*.

Question 3

Most candidates correctly translated the indirect statement, though *senem* was not always identified as the subject of it.

Question 4 (b)

There was considerable confusion as to how to answer this question. *nonne* expects the answer 'Yes', *num*, 'No'. Candidates should ask themselves what answer is expected, so phrase their answers accordingly, e.g. 'It's Claudius, isn't it, isn't it Claudius, surely it's Claudius?'

Question 6

Most candidates failed to render the superlative *plurima*, simply putting 'many gifts'.

A few candidates failed to spot the Perfect tense (as in the translation question), and wrote 'he would give'.

Question 7

Understandably, this was the source of most of the errors made by candidates. The main source of errors was omissions or mistranslation of particles and conjunctions, e.g. *igitur*, *nam*, *quamquam*, *quoque*. Candidates should check **every** Latin word to ensure that they have translated it. There would appear to be ample time to do this, as no one failed to finish the paper.

In the first section, *deorum* was sometimes taken with *Janum*, e.g. 'the first god Janus'.

In the third section, the meaning of *vixi* was frequently unknown.

In the fourth section, approximately half of the candidates coordinated or subordinated the Ablative Absolute correctly, but the other half simply made it a main verb without inserting 'and'.

Question 9

The main stumbling block here was *septem horis*, which was often translated as 'for seven hours' rather than 'within/in seven hours'.

Question 12

Most candidates failed to render the passive *liberati sumus*, and simply wrote 'at last we are free'.

Examiners' Reports – June 2011

Despite these errors, the answers produced by the majority of candidates were very good, some excellent.

A402/01 and A402/02: Latin Language 2 (History)

Following the very small entry for the January sitting, this was the first session in which it was possible to compare the performance of the full range of candidates with performance on the legacy specification 1942. Despite changes to the structure of the papers and the method of marking the translation elements, the results were very similar indeed (e.g. the mean mark of 47.7 out of 60 for the Higher Tier paper A402/02 was very close to the mean of 48.4 on the last sitting of legacy paper 1942/21 in summer 2010). The papers seem to have been successful in being accessible to candidates with less experience of Latin; at the same time, though the high marks suggested that stronger candidates found the Latin relatively straightforward, there was still enough to stretch the very best. The relatively straightforward storyline of the Scipio passages resulted in very few losing the plot entirely.

A402/01 (Foundation Tier)

The entry of 187 was relatively small and the standard pleasingly high – over 20% of candidates scored 50 or more out of 60. The comprehension section was generally handled more confidently than the translation.

Q1(a): this question was generally well done. Many guessed sensibly at 'Roman soldier'.

Q1(b): this was either handled perfectly, or rendered as 'won many wars'. A good discriminator.

Q2(a): a good test as to whether the candidate had learnt their vocabulary.

Q2(b): generally well done.

Q3: very well done.

Q4: this was the most tricky of the comprehension questions. Many showed that they knew *clarus* but stumbled at the rest.

Q5(a) and (b): some thought there was only one pirate, perhaps because glossed words always appear in the vocabulary list on the paper in the singular. Candidates need to be aware that glossed words may be plural.

Q6(a): many included *domum* within their answer by assuming that 'they came to his house to kill him'. Only the best saw that it was the object of *oppugnarent*.

Q6(b): candidates who had followed the plot thus far realised that the Latin must mean that Scipio refused to let them in.

Q7: 'when Scipio saw the pirates coming forward to the gate, he ordered the slaves to defend the villa against them'. *portam* was commonly translated as 'port' and *contra eos* was commonly omitted.

'The pirates put down their arms and slowly approached the door': *lente* was often overlooked but there were some good efforts at handling *deposuerunt*.

'Then in a loud voice they said that they were not enemies but admirers; they asked Scipio to receive them into the villa': *deinde* (as with other conjunctions and adverbs) was sometimes omitted, *magna voce* was taken as nominative (this was common at Higher Tier too) and some did not spot the indirect command after *rogaverunt*.

'Soon he opened the door and invited the pirates to dinner': *mox* was often omitted but the sentence was otherwise well handled. As at Higher Tier, it was surprising that so many translated *aperuit* as 'appeared', despite being glossed as 'open' on the paper.

'Having been received by Scipio in this way, the pirates gave him many gifts': as at High Tier, the phrase *hoc modo* was not well done and many were unsure who had done the welcoming.

'Then, very happy because Scipio had greeted them so warmly, they returned with very great happiness to their ships': most missed one or both of the superlatives *laetissimi* and *maximo*, *tam* was often overlooked and many turned *gaudio* into a main verb.

A402/02 (Higher Tier)

8329 candidates were entered for the paper. The new mark scheme for the translation section is relatively tough, but, even so, over half the entry scored 50 or more out of 60 on the paper.

Examiners felt that the paper was generally accessible and the majority of candidates were able, at least broadly, to 'follow the story'. However, it also contained some challenging parts, which only the most able correctly worked out. Only a fairly small number would seem to have been entered for the wrong tier and may have achieved a better mark on the Foundation Tier equivalent.

Q1: despite the setter's best intentions of writing a straightforward sentence to start the passage, the Latin involved in this question proved to be a real test. Apart from the failure to recognise the form of *vicerat* or the meaning of *gentes*, the most common error was to take *multas* with *bello* and answer that Scipio had waged or been successful in many wars. This gained, at most, one mark out of three. Teachers using this passage as a classroom exercise or mock exam might want to draw the attention of their students to the use of the ablative *bello* ('in war') and the -as and -es accusative plural endings of the noun and adjective combination *multas gentes*.

Q2: those who did not know the meaning of *miror* struggled here. A variety of translations of *virtutem* were accepted (e.g. strength, courage, virtue).

Q3: a very straightforward question which the vast majority answered correctly. Those who lost marks did so by not using all the relevant information in the Latin sentence – for full marks they were required to say that 'Scipio was living in his villa near the sea'. Only a few had Scipio living with his mother in old age or seemed to think that Scipio was living in the ancient equivalent of 'a retirement home'.

Q4: this question was a good test of those who knew the meaning of *sperabant* and could see that the form of *conspecturos* showed that the pirates were hoping to catch a glimpse of Scipio rather than that he would catch sight of them. For full marks, recognition of *tantum* or the phrase *tam clarus est* was required – i.e. candidates needed to show that the pirates hoped to see Scipio because he was something of a celebrity.

Q5: a straightforward question, answered well by most.

Q6: the wording of the question helped candidates to identify this as a fearing clause, but many struggled with the sense of *oppugnarent* ('attack' rather than 'fight') or failed to see that *domum* was accusative and the object of *oppugnarent*.

Q7: *maluit* caused some difficulties, but even so most got the idea that Scipio initially decided to drive the pirates away rather than invite them in.

Q8: 'while the pirates were going forward to the gate of the villa, Scipio and the terrified slaves were preparing everything to drive them back'. In this first sentence the meaning of *dum* was not always known. Those who took it as *tum* will have lost a mark straightaway – the omission or mistranslation of conjunctions is treated quite harshly by the new mark scheme for unseen translation. *portam* produced a number of ports and harbours, perhaps understandably given the sea-side location of the story. Some teachers make a point of drawing their students' attention to similar, easily-confused words to help them to distinguish them (a quick glance at the vocabulary list suggests *audax/audeo/audio*, *celer/celo*, *cogo/cogito*, *doceo/duco*, *forte/fortis*, *iaceo/iacio*, *iter/iterum*, *libenter/liber/liberi/libertus*, *malo/malus*, *prope/propter*, *reddo/redeo*, *soleo/solus*, *tamen/tandem*, *vir/virtus*). Relatively few noticed that *omnia* was neuter and the object of *parabant* ('they got everything ready') rather than going with *servi*. The gerundive *ad eos repellendos* was mostly handled well.

'Therefore the pirates laid down their arms and approached the door slowly': this sentence was straightforward. One examiner commented that 'in over 10 years of marking GCSE language papers, I don't ever remember an ablative absolute being handled better'. Those who omitted *igitur* or confused it with another word lost a mark.

'Then in a loud voice they announced that they were not enemies of Scipio but admirers of his virtue.' The commonest error in this sentence was to take *magna voce* as the subject of *nuntiaverunt*, which was counted a 'major' error (i.e. enough to bring the mark for the sentence down to three). Surprisingly many turned *admiratores* into a verb, despite it being glossed.

'The pirates even/also begged that Scipio now came out himself': the meaning of *orabant* was problematic as many took it as 'spoke', which meant that they also tended to take *ut* as if it was introducing an indirect statement. Even very good candidates occasionally omitted *ipse* or *nunc*, thus losing one or two marks. *nunc* was often taken as *non*.

'After the slaves reported this to Scipio, he himself opened the door and invited the pirates to dinner': *postquam* was often wrongly taken as 'afterwards' and the perfect tense of *refero* caused difficulty. When teaching irregular verbs like *fero* it is worth making sure that students have seen them in compound forms as well.

'Having been greeted kindly by Scipio in this way, the pirates gave him many gifts, which are accustomed to be offered to gods': unfamiliarity with the phrase *hoc modo* and the adverb *benigne* caused widespread difficulty here – it was not sufficient to say 'in this kind way'. Most got at least close to the meaning of the relative clause *quae deis offerri solent* but this clause proved to be the best differentiator on the paper – only the very best took *solent* correctly as a present tense and *offerri* as a passive infinitive. *solent*, as usual, was commonly confused with some part of *solus*.

'Then, rejoicing very greatly because Scipio had welcomed them willingly, they turned back to their ships': common errors here were missing the superlative form of *maxime*, confusing *libenter* with books or freedmen, and missing the plural form of *naves*. Anecdotal evidence about the paper suggests that there is a perception among students that examiners no longer worry about things like singulars/plurals – centres are advised that this is certainly not the case. In the last sentence, the omission of *tum* and an error over the ending of *naves* (a common combination) left candidates with only two marks out of four even if the rest of the sentence was correct.

There was no evidence that candidates were short of time. In fact, one had the impression that many will have completed it with plenty of time to spare, in which case examiners might have hoped for a higher degree of neatness and legibility. It is particularly important that students who make rough translation before copying up in neat make sure that they indicate very clearly that they do not wish the rough version to be marked – a simple and effective way to do this is to strike it out with a diagonal line and write ROUGH VERSION across it.

A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

The paper was generally well answered by candidates. There were a number of outstanding candidates, who could have scored well on Higher Tier, but there were also a number of candidates whose knowledge of the Latin was insufficient.

Candidates generally did well on the short comprehension questions, although they must be sure to use the lemma on the question as this guides them to the answer. Some candidates were taking their answer from sections of the text outside the lemma. The multiple choice questions caused more difficulties than anticipated. Candidates should think carefully through all the options before giving an answer. Some candidates seemed to tick the first likely option in the list, rather than going for a more considered approach.

Candidates found the ten mark extended writing questions more difficult and these questions were the best tools for differentiation. The English translation, which is given on these questions in Foundation Tier, clearly helped, but a number of candidates only referred to the English, and did not quote the relevant Latin, which they are instructed to do in the question. Some candidates omitted to address one of the bullet points. They should use the bullet points to guide them when answering the question.

There was no evidence that candidates struggled to complete the paper within the allocated time.

Individual questions

Section A

- 1 This was generally well done. Some candidates based their answer on *corripitur* and wrote about corruption.
- 2 Well done. Some mistranslation of *viribus*. Candidates thought it meant men, rather than strength.
- 3 Generally well done. Most candidates knew the answer from the context of the story.
- 4 Candidates found this more difficult. *salubritate* caused difficulties.
- 5 The first of the 10 mark extended writing questions in Section A. As with all the 10 mark questions, this proved to be more challenging to candidates than the shorter comprehension questions. Candidates were generally able to pick out the key Latin words and link them to the question, although some candidates wrote good answers without referring to the Latin at all, losing marks in the process. Candidates did best on the third bullet point, concerning Agrippina's accomplices. Some candidates gave information about the types of poison used from outside the passage. They should only refer to the lines within the passage.
- 6 This was generally well done.
- 7 The first of the multiple choice questions. This was generally well done.
- 8 This proved to be the hardest of the multiple choice questions. *velut* is a difficult word, which relatively few candidates recognised.
- 9 This was generally well done. Most remembered this from the context of the text.
- 10 This was well done. Most candidates recognised the English derivations from *paterni*.
- 11 Very well done. A small number of candidates wrote *cubicle*, giving the derivation of *cubiculo* rather than its meaning.

- 12 Candidates generally did very well on this question. The question is very accessible, but it demands reference to the Latin, which some candidates ignored. Candidates should take note of the rubric and make an attempt to quote from the Latin rather than miss out that part of the question entirely.
- 13 This was generally well answered.
- 14 Candidates struggled with this question as their knowledge of the Latin often was not up to selecting the correct Latin word.
- 15 This question caused some difficulty as many candidates did not know the meaning of *importunae*.
- 16 Candidates did very well on this question.
- 17 The second of the 10 mark extended writing questions. Candidates found plenty to comment on, but as with the first question, they did not always refer to the Latin as instructed. Pupils make some excellent points concerning *flagrare* and *inflammata*, and also did very well on the third bullet point concerning the innocence of Melinus.
- 18 Candidates generally did very well on this question.
- 19 Candidates generally scored well, but some lost marks as they did not refer to Sassia's action. Candidates must read the question thoroughly in order to avoid such errors.

Section B

- 20 Nearly all candidates answered this correctly.
- 21 Generally well answered. Some candidates took their answer from outside the lemma and referred to Piso's clients.
- 22 This was well answered, although there was some confusion by candidates concerning which part of the tricolon referred to the camp – *desidiam*, *licentiam* or *lascivientes*.
- 23 Very well done.
- 24 The first of the 10 mark questions in Section B. Candidates found this question accessible and they clearly enjoyed the passage and sympathised with Germanicus' plight. Some candidates did not refer to the Latin, as instructed. Most were able to pick out the key phrases in English, the best candidates matched these phrases to the Latin.
- 25 Very well answered.
- 26 Well answered, although some chose the distractor *released victims*.
- 27 Very well answered.
- 28 Well answered.
- 29 Candidates answered this question well, although not all referred to the Latin. Some struggled to find five points, as the second half of the passage proved more difficult than the first.
- 30 This was generally well done. Candidates who knew the context of the passage did very well.
- 31 Very well done.
- 32 Candidates found this question difficult, with a fair number scoring 0 out of 2. *rerum novarum* in particular caused problems.
- 33 Candidates generally did well on this question.
- 34 Many candidates guessed the answer, as *nefandas* was not well known.
- 35 Candidates found this quite difficult, with many ignoring the lemma and answering from their knowledge of other parts of the text, giving *the province* as their answer.
- 36 The second of the 10 mark questions in Section B. Candidates generally found this the harder question, although a number clearly enjoyed the passage and analysed the passage and the sadness it provokes very well. Some candidates did not really answer the question, but just paraphrased the English translation given. Some attempt must be made to analyse the Latin and, of course, answer the question.
- 37 This question was generally well answered, but some candidates did not give reasons for their answer, as the question asked.

A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier)

General Comments

The general standard of the paper was high, with some truly outstanding answers. A small number of candidates, however, did not have sufficient knowledge of the Latin and struggled in particular with the translation and extended writing questions.

Candidates generally performed very well in the short comprehension questions which seemed accessible to all.

The 8 mark overarching questions were handled well by most candidates, although candidates should aim to structure their answer more fully in this type of question. Candidates are not expected to quote Latin in the 8 mark questions, although they must give examples in English from the text to back up their answer. Candidates should plan their answer to ensure they make a wide range of points.

The 10 mark extended writing questions were the best differentiators and some candidates struggled with these questions. The best approach was from those candidates who quoted the Latin (either in brackets or quotation marks), translated and then explained how their quotation addressed the bullet points to answer the question. The clearest answers addressed each bullet point separately. Candidates wrote at length on the 10 mark questions, with some candidates filling several pages. Candidates should be careful to keep to the point, rather than repeating themselves or making irrelevant points. Some candidates referred to sound effects created by the author, for example alliteration, but failed to quote the Latin, or describe the sound effect or say what effect the literary device has on the passage.

The translation questions were generally well done, but it was clear that some candidates did not have sufficient knowledge of the text and they struggled to make sense of the Latin passage. A number of strong candidates dropped a mark or two in the translation due to careless mistakes or omissions.

Timing did not seem to be an issue, with many candidates writing far more than the lines allocated in the question paper. Indeed some candidates wrote at far greater length than was required, perhaps wasting valuable time in the process. A number of candidates, however, seemed to rush the last part of the 10 mark questions, possibly because they spent too long addressing the first two bullet points. Candidates should be careful to give equal time to each part of the question.

Questions 25 and 26 should have read *Canius* instead of *Pythius*. The vast majority of candidates answered the question as if it did refer to *Canius*, following the lemma. Those candidates who answered with respect to *Pythius* were given full credit.

Question 28 should have read Cicero instead of Tacitus. No candidate attempted to answer the question with respect to Tacitus and the majority showed no sign of noticing the mistake and answered the question as intended. Those candidates who noticed the mistake tended to underline or circle Tacitus but to write about Cicero, as intended.

Individual questions

- 1 Very well done.
- 2 Candidates found this question quite tricky. *quam + superlative* was often omitted or mistranslated.

- 3 Generally well done. Some candidates thought that *ipsum* referred to Narcissus or did not make it clear who *ipsum* referred to.
- 4 Very well done. Some candidates omitted *inimicos*, thinking that Narcissus hoped Britannicus would drive away his father.
- 5 The first of the 10 mark extended writing questions in Section A. Candidates generally addressed the three bullet points well. Most candidates picked out *olim certa* and *propera* as suggestive of Agrippina's determination. Most candidates understood which types of poison Agrippina chose, but fewer addressed the question explicitly, stating how this made Tacitus' description vivid. Most candidates picked out Agrippina's accomplices but some made no comment on Tacitus' description of the accomplices and how this added to his description.
- 6 Very well done.
- 7 Most candidates answered correctly. Some mistranslated *ubi* as 'why'.
- 8 Most candidates did well on the 8 mark over arching question. Some candidates did not address the question itself, but instead retold the story, with no analysis. The best approach was to answer the question by making individual points, which are then backed up by an example from the text. Candidates should make it clear when they are making a new point, rather than merging their points into one. There were some excellent, highly perceptive answers to this question and it was clear that the candidates enjoyed the exciting and dramatic storyline.
- 9 Generally well done. *dignitas* caused very few problems, but *concordia* was less well understood.
- 10 Candidates found this question difficult with relatively few candidates getting full marks.
- 11 Generally well answered.
- 12 Very well answered.
- 13 The second of the Section A 10 mark extended writing questions. Candidates found plenty to comment on in this dramatic passage by Cicero. Some candidates, however, gave little evidence that they understood the meaning of the Latin, either not quoting the correct Latin or not translating the quotation. Some candidates who did translate the Latin, did not quote the Latin, and did not analyse the text.
- 14 Candidates tended either to know the passage well or not at all. Some strong candidates dropped a mark by making a careless omission or error.

Section B

- 15 Very well done. Some candidates got their answer from outside the lemma and therefore did not get credit.
- 16 Generally well done.
- 17 Most candidates answered correctly.
- 18 The first of the Section B 10 mark extended writing questions. Candidates clearly appreciated this passage and sympathised with the plight of Germanicus. Candidates must ensure that they answer the question rather than simply translate and quote the Latin. There must be some analysis to answer the question. The best approach was to make focused quotations, quoting individual words or short phrases, and to comment on the Latin, rather than quoting longer sections and just translating the Latin.
- 19 Very well done.
- 20 Candidates generally did well, although a significant number translated *templa* in the singular.
- 21 Most candidates did well, although *immoderato* caused some problems.
- 22 Very well done.
- 23 Candidates seemed to enjoy answering this 8 mark overarching question. There were some outstanding answers and many candidates wrote at length. The best approach was to give a characteristic of Piso and then back it up with an example from the text. Some candidates did not give a wide enough range of answers and lost marks due to a narrowly focused answer.

- 24** Many candidates did well on this translation question, although some were let down by careless mistakes and omissions.
- 25** This question should have read *Canius* instead of *Pythius*. Credit was therefore given for answers referring to both *Canius* and *Pythius*. The question was very well answered by candidates.
- 26** This question should have read *Canius* instead of *Pythius*. Candidates found the question straightforward, although *feriae* caused some difficulties.
- 27** Generally well answered.
- 28** This question should have read *Cicero* instead of *Tacitus*. No candidate tried to answer the question with reference to *Tacitus*. Candidates did better on the first two bullet points than the third. With the third bullet point, some candidates made no attempt to analyse the Latin or pick out key words, but rather quoted and translated the Latin only. The first bullet point was especially well addressed with many candidates picking out the rhetorical questions and appreciating the mocking tone of *Cicero*.

A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

This paper was taken by a relatively small number of candidates, of varying abilities: some candidates would have coped quite well with the Higher Tier paper; others seemed to have very limited knowledge of the prescribed texts. That said, there were some very good answers to the questions which required more extensive responses and the majority of candidates seemed to have been entered for an appropriate Tier.

There was little evidence of candidates having difficulty completing the paper in the time allotted. It was a little surprising that a number of candidates answered both sections of the paper, but where this happened, candidates were given the mark for the section in which their score was highest. A number of candidates made little or no effort to answer the longer questions and many seemed to have only a rudimentary knowledge of Latin. Although Latin was specifically required in the longer questions, too many candidates relied too heavily on picking out parts of the printed translation and so missed out on the highest marks.

Comments on individual questions

Section A: OCR GCSE Latin Anthology

Q1: This was generally well answered, but the full range of answers was covered.

Q2: The commonest mistake was to state that Ovid was being ordered to go **to** the furthest borders of Italy/Ausonia.

Q3: Even some of the strongest candidates referred to a lack of 'space'. Many candidates failed to spot that their answer should somehow refer to the text.

Q4: A high proportion of candidates did not refer to the text and talked about the effects of Ovid's exile. Some confused *mora* with *mors*.

Q5: There were some very good detailed answers produced, but too many candidates were unable to use the text to support their observations.

Q6: This was generally well answered, although the gods were quite a popular choice.

Q7: This was not well handled by many and was commonly omitted. Answers which mentioned the Capitol, some approximate spelling of it or referred to the centre of Rome were credited.

Q8(a): The majority of candidates realised that Ovid was addressing the gods, but some thought he was talking to his wife, friends or priests.

Q8(b): A good number of candidates relied on misplaced common sense and stated that the gods lived in temples or the sky. Those who had struggled with (a) tended to omit the question.

Q9: This produced lots of vague answers referring to seeing the temples or commenting on how beautiful they were.

Q10: A rare few could identify this as Rome. There were a number of vague answers and a surprising number of references to Quintus. The 'Vatican' perhaps showed ingenuity but was not deemed worthy of a mark.

Q11: This was generally well answered.

Q12: This proved difficult. Mistranslations included 'greetings', 'want', 'very' and 'help'.

Q13: There were plenty of 'kisses' but also a fair number of 'hugs', 'property' and some 'money'.

Q14: This was possibly the best answered question in the section.

Q15: The majority of candidates knew enough of the Mettus story to gain full or almost full marks, although some made vague references to him having horses. Some candidates confused Mettus with Ovid and referred to exile.

Q16: There were some very good answers here, but quite a few candidates were unsure when Catullus was talking to himself and when he was asking questions of Lesbia. Some seemed to think that someone else was talking to Catullus or that he was advising a friend.

Q17: This was generally well answered. Occasionally a candidate ticked six answers and so lost a mark.

Q18: This was almost universally answered correctly.

Q19: *nescio* was usually spotted, but some candidates misidentified *sentio*.

Q20: Almost everyone identified *excrucior* but few made it clear that they understood that it was a passive verb.

Section B: Virgil

Q21: The majority of candidates knew that Aeneas was speaking, but there were some who thought Anchises was the speaker.

Q22: Candidates generally knew Aeneas was asleep or dreaming but some assumed that he was trembling at the sight of the ghost.

Q23: Most candidates identified *maestissimus*; not everyone translated it as a superlative but this was not required in the mark scheme.

Q24: Weeping was generally correctly identified but there were some votes for 'trembling' and 'looking enormous'.

Q25(a): Candidates were not always able to identify details from the specified Latin: the most common incorrect answer was reference to Hector's beard.

Q25(b): The majority of candidates had some idea of the story; those who were floundering tended to state that the ghost was upset, had died or had come from the Underworld.

Q26: This proved difficult. Shouts or screams were reasonably popular, but few referred to the blaring of trumpets and there were many references to noise in general.

Q27: A number of candidates were unable to identify Aeneas as being brave and reckless here.

Q28: Anchises' house was the most popular answer, but all options did appear.

Q29: This was generally well answered, but some candidates thought Aeneas had gone there to get a better view of the battle, to gather men to fight or to talk to Anchises about the battle.

Q30: Generally candidates knew what was happening here but a number had clearly confused Aeneas and Anchises. A good number thought that Anchises did not want to go to or attack Troy; often candidates referred to leaving his home and leaving Troy as two separate actions and a number referred to him not wanting to 'suffer in exile'.

Q31: There were some excellent answers to this question, but too many candidates relied upon the printed translation. As a consequence, assertions such as *inutilis* = 'burden' were quite common.

Q32: The commonest error was to mistake the 'initial mood in the house' as the reaction to the flame rather than the underlying sense of grief. Over-reliance on the translation led many candidates to comment on the significance of the word *pasci* 'play' or generally to misidentify the Latin.

Q33: This was generally not well answered and thunder was rarely mentioned.

Q34: Identifying the Latin word was beyond many candidates. The commonest mistakes were *genitor* and *tollit*.

Q35: This proved difficult for some candidates and revealed confusion about the episode and the character involved. Some suggested that he instructs his slaves and family to leave; others that he armed himself to go out and kill as many Greeks as he could.

Q36: Those who knew the story correctly identified option D; those who didn't guessed the full range of alternatives.

Q37: This was often omitted. Weaker candidates were clearly confused about where in the story the episode occurred and referred to Anchises' refusal to leave.

Q38: There were lots of vague answers to this question. Many candidates referred to Anchises' family and some were confused by *servate* and thought he wanted the gods to protect his servants.

Q39: The majority of candidates were able to score 4 or 5 marks on this question. A handful lost a mark for ticking too many options.

A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier)

General comments

Marks were generally high and indicated that candidates had responded well to the first full sitting of this new format of the Verse Literature paper and had been well prepared by teachers. That said, a number of candidates seemed to be out of their depth and would have been better advised to have entered for the Foundation Tier. In general, candidates seemed to have sufficient time to answer all questions, although some seemed to spend too long on the two ten-mark questions and leave themselves a little short of time on the final eight-mark question. A number of candidates used page 22 as a continuation sheet and so, either through oversight or lack of time, failed to answer question 30.

Many candidates coped very well with the extended responses, writing answers which were detailed, intelligent and a pleasure to read. It is worth mentioning that 'choice of words' gives plenty of scope for comments without the need to make every point reliant on stylistic features. When quoting Latin, succinct and relevant quotes work best.

Candidates need to concentrate on a few simple guidelines for success. They must make sure they actually read the question set rather than assume what it means; they must make it clear that they know what the text means and refer to Latin when asked to do so; they must help the examiner by clearly indicating when they are continuing with answers and must state the number of the question being answered on any additional pages.

Handwriting and spelling seemed to be poor on a significant proportion of scripts.

Comments on individual questions

Section A: OCR GCSE Latin Anthology

Q1: This was generally well answered, although some answers were too vague e.g. 'morning' and occasionally candidates thought Ovid's exile needed to be placed in a historical context e.g. 'AD 54 in the reign of Julius Caesar'.

Q2: Most candidates knew that this referred to Augustus, but all options were covered.

Q3: The commonest mistake was to state that Ovid was being ordered to go **to** the furthest borders of Italy/Ausonia.

Q4: This was generally well known, although there were various spellings of Libya with Lycia cropping up occasionally. One candidate stated that she was 'on a beach in Libya'.

Q5: The majority of candidates scored full marks here, but there were some vague references to her not saying goodbye to Ovid.

Q6: Translation was generally good with some candidates making things up as they went along or bringing in other parts of the text. The commonest errors were: mistranslation of *habitantia*; omission of *inquam*; ignoring the force of the gerundive in *videnda* or, more commonly, *reliquendi*; confusion of subject and object in *quos urbs habet alta Quirini*; vague translation of *alta* as 'great' or 'mighty'; translation of *tempus in omne* as 'in all time'.

Q7: This was generally well handled, though some candidates failed to spot that Ovid was praying and talked of him adoring his wife.

Q8: *singultu* was usually correctly identified with a suitable translation. 'cries' was a common mistake. A significant number of candidates opted for *sonos* which was usually correctly translated as 'sounds'.

Q9: Reference in the question to 'the first line' should have made it clear that some form of paraphrase was required rather than a reference to Mettus. Some candidates were confused about where in the text the passage appeared and talked of a man being struck by Jupiter's lightning.

Q10(a): Candidates generally answered this question well. Some responses made garbled reference to 'avenging horses' or 'avengers' without giving sufficient detail: many candidates did not make it clear that Mettus was tied to horses as part of the punishment. Some candidates confused Mettus with Ovid, stating that he was exiled.

Q10(b): Most candidates identified treachery (in various spellings). Some were clear about his betrayal of Tullus and the Romans; others were less secure on the details. Again, there was confusion with Ovid and references were made to his writing scurrilous poetry or having an affair with the emperor's daughter.

Q11: There were some excellent answers and the majority of candidates were able to score more than half marks. The commonest mistakes were omitting Latin; not citing correct, relevant Latin; quoting Latin without translating it; failing to cover all three bullet points. A straightforward and relatively rapid way of gaining marks is to quote a well-chosen Latin phrase, show understanding through translation or paraphrase, then explain the significance of the phrase selected. Able candidates can gain full marks reasonably quickly if they follow this procedure.

Q12: This question caused some difficulty as it did not ask for translation of a specific word. Most candidates coped well, but not everyone chose the correct answer.

Q13: This question was almost universally answered correctly.

Q14: As with Q11, technique let down many candidates, but marks were generally high. Some responses seemed to imply that Horace was being led astray, dwelled too much on the derivation of Lydia and Sybaris' names or were overly concerned with the possibility of a homosexual relationship between Sybaris and Horace.

Q15: There were some very detailed responses to this question which showed a good deal of knowledge and appreciation of the text. Candidates did not always cite poems which were not printed on the paper, provide examples from a sufficient range of poems or give enough detail of their choice of example and the way it demonstrated the 'power of love'. There was understandable confusion as to who wrote which poem and some candidates focussed too much on the poem 'titles' as given in the text book.

Section B: Virgil

Q16: This was generally well answered, but some candidates referred too vaguely to Troy being on fire or being destroyed.

Q17: The majority of candidates were able to cope with this question, but answers were often rather more long-winded than they needed to be or did not make it clear how the simile related to the situation being described. Not much more than 'tree = Troy; farmers = Greeks' would have been sufficient for full marks. A surprising number of otherwise quite good candidates wrote about the wrong simile, referring at length to torrents and fires.

Q18: This question caused some confusion. Aeneas is actually coming down from the roof of Priam's palace where he has witnessed the killing of Priam. 'From the roof (of the palace/of Anchises' house)' and 'from the citadel' were accepted; 'from the top of a rock', 'from the mountains' and 'from the sky' were not.

Q19: Generally this was well answered, but candidates needed to make some reference to the flames or weapons withdrawing to gain credit.

Q20: The majority of candidates gained a mark here, although some thought he had reached his own house.

Q21: Again, this was generally well answered, but there needed to be some reference to rescuing Anchises to gain the mark.

Q22: Stronger candidates coped well with this question but weaker ones tended to omit Anchises prolonging his life, preferring to count 'leave his house' and 'leave Troy' as separate answers. A significant number of candidates had clearly confused Anchises and Aeneas, stating that he was unwilling to fight for Troy, or even to attack Troy.

Q23: There was plenty to say here and the majority of candidates answered this question well. Too often, though, answers were not detailed enough. The commonest mistakes were omitting Latin; not citing correct, relevant Latin; quoting Latin without translating it; failing to cover all three bullet points. A straightforward and relatively rapid way of gaining marks is to quote a well-chosen Latin phrase, show understanding through translation or paraphrase, then explain the significance of the phrase selected. Well-prepared candidates can gain full marks reasonably quickly if they follow this procedure.

Q24: Generally candidates translated the passage well. Those who didn't know the passage tended to refer more explicitly to meeting at the cypress tree or omitted the translation altogether. The commonest mistakes were: *famuli* translated as 'family'; *animis* translated as 'souls'; *egressis* translated as 'outside'; omission of one or other 'ancient' (usually the first); the all too prevalent misspelling of Ceres was tolerated as long as there was some approximation to the correct spelling; unsurprisingly, there were plenty of Cyprus trees mentioned but also some Cyrus trees; omission of *iuxta*; omission of *multos*.

Q25: Many candidates clearly did not read the question carefully enough and talked about why Aeneas needed to shout ('because he had lost his wife') rather than why he needed to pluck up the courage to do so.

Q26: This was generally answered correctly apart from the occasional *ausus*, *iactare* or *implevi*. Many candidates translated *maestus* as a superlative.

Q27: This question caused some difficulties. *infelix* was commonly omitted and candidates often stated that it appeared before Aeneas' eyes. Less convincing answers included 'it was transparent', 'it was frightening' and 'it had big eyes'.

Q28: The majority of candidates managed to pick out one of the two physical reactions here. Some, however, relied too heavily on *obstipui* and a vague reference to being amazed.

Q29: There was so much to write about here that this was probably the better answered of the ten-mark questions. As with question 23, Latin and English did not always tally well and some answers were rather too vague to be convincing. Some errors were statements that Creusa refers to herself as Aeneas' wife (*coniunx*), suggestions that she was being kept safe in Olympus or that Olympus was a god.

Q30: Most candidates were able to pick out some relevant parts of the story, although they often struggled to state just why an episode was 'tragic'. Weaker answers tended to rely too heavily on the similes; the better answers referred to Hector's ghost and the loss of Creusa. There was some evidence of candidates running out of time towards the end of the paper and some seemed to omit this question because they had already used the space provided for the answer as a continuation sheet for earlier answers.

A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier)

It was felt that candidates needed to read the sources more closely.

Comments by question:

- 1 Most candidates were able to recognise the main features of a Roman garden: statues of gods, the fountains and water features.
- 2 The pillars support a covered walkway from which owners could enjoy the garden protected from the rain and sun. The pillars were not of structural importance to the main house.
- 3 a) Candidates were asked to select appropriate references from source B relevant to buildings. In questions such as these answers should avoid three points on the same subject (fire) and should avoid using the same phrase to support all points.
- 3 b) There was some misunderstanding of the term “alarm” but most answers recognised that the person at the top was in danger of the spreading fire with no escape.
- 4 a) The passage needed careful reading – Paulus was frequently referred to as Martial’s client.
- 4 b) The help offered by patrons was clearly understood.
- 4 c) Better answers need to make specific reference to the source. Supplying a list of references meant that “why” was not addressed.
- 4 d) Candidates knew a wide range of detail for the decoration in Roman houses. These included wall paintings – with specific references, mosaics, purple fabrics.

A few candidates offered modern examples.
- 5 The question excluded reference to housing which was missed by some candidates. Responses should be specific as “Roman life” was felt to be too vague.
- 6 a) Most could identify the amphitheatre (A).
- 6 b) Vague responses such as “the shape”/“the size” were less successful than those which discussed the tiered seating, oval shape.
- 7 Candidates were prompted to read source E. This instruction was missed by a few.
- 7 a) Circus and Forum.
- 7 b) Candidates appreciated the political importance of the shows and Augustus’ “need to keep the masses happy”.
- 8 a) As above selecting two quotations did not address the “how”. More perceptive answers made reference to Cicero’s use of language.
- 8 b) Candidates were able to extract the information from the source.

- 8 c) Some responses fell into the same pattern as above. Quotations from the text were offered but the prompt “explain your answer” was frequently ignored.
- 9 a),b) The inscription was well understood.
- 9 c) The most common gladiators described were *retiarii* and *murmillones*. Answers which equipped gladiators with nets, helmets, spears, daggers, long shields and round shields could not score on a “scattergun” approach. There were a few no responses.
- 10 There was a full range of responses.

Weaker responses used a passing reference to the sources and offered little specific information, making no reference to inclusion in a television programme. Better answers discussed the merits of the sources for a television programme but offered little further information. The most perceptive offered detailed analysis of all sources, considered detailed evidence from elsewhere and discussed the suitability of inclusion for television. There were some fine responses with regard to specific detail and personal response.

Points to consider for improvement:

- Read the sources carefully.
- Ensure that prompts have been noted.

A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier)

It was felt that candidates had been entered for the appropriate tier. OCR was grateful for the positive feedback received from centres.

Comments by question:

- 1 Most candidates were able to recognise the main features of a Roman garden identifying the covered walkway, statues of gods, the fountains and water features.

Many noted the lack of grass in favour of neatly clipped topiary.
- 2 The most obvious answers to this question were the *impluvium*, *compluvium* and *lararium*. Answers which do not give Latin names but make clear the particular feature are also given credit. Most could identify the decoration often with specific examples of mosaics and wall paintings. The axial vista through the house was also given credit. Mention of little furniture was also credited as was the strong box and chair.
- 3 a) Candidates were asked to select appropriate references from source B relevant to buildings. In questions such as these answers should avoid three points on the same subject (fire) and should avoid using the same phrase to support all points.
- 3 b) Nearly all candidates were familiar with the nature of Roman satire which was used to explain Juvenal's attitude. Some argued successfully on literary terms citing hyperbolic vocabulary although discussion of exaggeration was given equal credit.
- 4 a) Most candidates understood the morning *salutatio* required of the client although a range of other duties was credited. "Jobs" was too vague and particularly those such "cleaning" which were felt more appropriate for slaves.
- 4 b) The help offered by Patrons was clearly understood.
- 4 c) Again candidates need to make specific reference to the source. "He makes a long journey" and "It's early" need some support. Better answers included the difficulty of the journey and the dangers all with references to source E.
- 5 The prompt here was to compare the life of the rich and poor as shown in sources A, B and C. A few responses failed to make any reference and missed out on marks. In order to achieve the top band some form of comparison was expected. Candidates who make six bullet points were not guaranteed marks in the top level. Again repetition of points and ideas should be avoided.
- 6 a) A surprising number of answers did not identify the building as an amphitheatre.
- 6 b) Vague responses such as "the shape"/"the size" were less successful than those which discussed the tiered seating, oval shape. The capacity of the Colosseum ranged from 250,000 to 2,000 in candidates' responses.
- 7 Appropriate material was selected.
- 8 This question produced some fine answers. The "how far" prompt elicited many well balanced answers. Many came to the conclusion that although Cicero did not like the games he did have respect for gladiators himself. The most successful answers drew on the textual evidence to support their points.

- 9 a),b) The inscription was well understood.
- 9 c) The most common gladiators described were *retiarii* and *murmillones*. Answers which equipped gladiators with nets, helmets, spears, daggers, long shields and round shields could not score on a “scattergun” approach. There were a few no responses.
- 10 A good discriminator with the full range of marks achieved. Candidates were expected to draw on evidence from the printed sources D, E, F. Those who did not missed an opportunity to discuss the political importance of shows as shown in source E in particular. Answers were also expected to make reference to other sources. Most used Juvenal's Eppia and Martial's Hermes. Reference was also made to examples of graffiti, the wall painting of the riot in Pompeii and the account of Tacitus. In addition answers were expected to address “important”.

A few answers wrote an account of gladiatorial games with no reference to any sources or addressing the question of importance. Detailed as they were in knowledge they could not score very highly under the criteria of the marking grid.

Points to consider for improvement:

- Use the sources specified by making detailed references.
- Ensure that points made do not overlap information.
- Avoid using the same material to make different points.

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

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2011

