

# **OCR Report to Centres**

---

**June 2013**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

#### Latin (J281)

### General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

#### Latin (J081)

## OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Overview	1
A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Foundation Tier)	2
A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Higher Tier)	5
A402/01 Latin Language 2: History (Foundation Tier)	9
A402/02 Latin Language 2: History (Higher Tier)	11
A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier)	14
A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier)	17
A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier)	20
A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier)	22
A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier)	25
A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier)	27

## Overview

The third full sitting of the new suite of papers was very successful. Language papers seem to have remained accessible to the full range of candidates while still containing sufficient demand to differentiate. On difficult texts, literature examiners were impressed again by much of the work they saw, though further improvements can perhaps be made in how teachers prepare their students for the extended 10 mark questions (which require detailed reference to the Latin text to access the full range of marks). On the Sources paper, the performance of candidates was generally strong, though the Principal Examiner notes that more candidates need to back up their knowledge of Roman life and culture with specific reference to the source material they have studied.

As last year, a small number of centres prepared their candidates for the wrong literature texts. As literature prescriptions only run for two years before changing and notices to centres are no longer routinely posted to heads of department, teachers are encouraged to check the OCR website regularly for details of current prescriptions and other useful information. Set texts for examination in 2014 can be found here: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/78269-notice-to-centres-set-texts-for-examinations-2014.pdf>

Following last year's 5% increase, it was encouraging to note a further 4% increase in the number taking the full course this year. Though numbers for the short course option were down, it is hoped that this option will remain an attractive proposition for students who would like to take up Latin in the sixth form and achieve a GCSE qualification but who do not have time to prepare for the full range of papers.

As in previous years, examiners would like to acknowledge the high quality of candidates taking our subject and the hard work and expertise of their teachers.

# 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.

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 correct answers were often changed to incorrect responses. Any alterations need to be clear and unambiguous, and the rough version of the translation should be crossed out.

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 *hortus* and *villa*. The usual ‘little’ words (*itaque*, *statim*, *semper*, *tamen* etc.) were often not known. Candidates should be reminded to make use of the glossary provided, noting in particular the nominative case of proper nouns: ‘*ex horto Atlantis*’ was commonly translated as ‘from the garden of Atlantis’.

Noun number was an issue for some candidates, with *amicorum*, *poma* and *annos* commonly translated as singular, and *canis* and *montem* translated as plural. Noun case too caused problems, particularly in the translation question: in the first section, for instance, *dea* was often translated as ‘for the goddess’ and *Herculem* as the subject of the verb. Candidates are advised to look very closely also at verb endings when deciding on the tense of a verb. Unsurprisingly, the pronouns *ea*, *eum* and *sibi* were a challenge for many.

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 *olim*, *tamen*, *semper*, *itaque* and *ubi*. 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.

## Individual Questions

**Q1:** candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though a few translated *primus* as ‘at first’, and some omitted *deorum* or did not recognise the genitive plural case.

**Q2:** a straightforward tick-box question, which was usually answered correctly, though some failed to tick three boxes. Candidates are reminded to make any alterations as clear as possible.

**Q3:** this was a very good discriminator: while most understood that *auxilium* was the object of *rogavit*, not all candidates knew the meaning of the verb, and only some were able to recognise the plural *amicorum*. *paucorum* was rendered correctly in only the strongest responses.

**Q4:** a straightforward tick-box question, which was usually answered correctly, though some ticked C (when).

**Q5:** another straightforward question for most, though a few struggled with the meaning and number of *omnes*, offering instead answers such as ‘one’.

**Q6:** this was a challenging question for some: although *portare* was understood by many candidates, the second half of the answer was often muddled, resulting in references to Atlas’ head being carried in the sky.

**Q7:** a straightforward question for the majority of candidates; the meaning of *hortum* was incorrectly rendered by a few as ‘home’ or ‘farm’.

**Q8:** this was a good discriminator, which required candidates to recognise that *multi* was the subject of *vellent*, and not the object of *auferre*. Only the strongest responses displayed recognition of *vellent*, which was quite frequently translated as a noun (‘many villains’) or omitted.

**Q9:** 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).

‘Once a goddess ordered Hercules to bring three apples from the garden of Atlas.’  
Many candidates made a good start to the first section, and scored at least two marks. The main problem in this section was *iussit*, and teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the present tense (e.g. *iussi* rather than *iubeo*) is good practice. Other common errors included the omission of *olim*, confusion between *dea* and *deus*, and making Hercules the subject (‘the god Hercules’).

‘However, this was difficult, because a fierce dog was always guarding the apples.’  
The first part of the sentence was usually handled well, though *tamen* was sometimes confused with *tandem* or omitted. Noun number was an issue in the causal clause, with *canis* often rendered as plural, and *poma* as singular, though no marks were lost if this was a repeated error. *semper* was commonly omitted.

‘And so, when Hercules came to the house of Atlas, he asked him’  
The main issue in this section was the omission of words, such as *itaque*, *ubi* and *eum*. Some failed to recognise the case endings of *Hercules* and *Atlantis*, and candidates are reminded that the glossary provides the nominative and genitive singular noun cases. *villam* was occasionally confused with the French *ville* and translated as ‘town’.

‘to give the apples to him. “I am able to go into the garden at once,”’  
This was the most challenging section for the majority of candidates, with failure to recognise verb forms being the main issue. The imperfect subjunctive *daret* was often not known, and although many knew the meaning of *possum*, few recognised the tense and person. *ire* was often omitted or replaced by an attempt to translate *statim* as the verb ‘to stand’.

‘Atlas replied, “if you hold the sky for one hour.”’  
Although many coped well with the structure of the conditional clause, some struggled with the phrase *unam horam*, confusing *horam* with *hortum*, while others did not know the meaning, tense or person of *tenebis*.

**Q10:** this proved to be a good discriminator, as only the strongest responses demonstrated understanding of *nolebat*.

**Q11:** as with Q10, the modal verb *volo* was challenging for many, and the position of *pulvinum* in the text caused confusion for some candidates, who thought that Hercules was speaking to the cushion.

**Q12:** most candidates scored at least one of the two marks, but *risit* (see earlier comments on *iussit*) was commonly omitted or translated as ‘he rose’.

**Q13:** the correct answer was given by almost all candidates, though *quattuor* was occasionally translated as ‘fourteen’, ‘forty’ or ‘a quarter’.

**Q14:** this was a straightforward question and answered correctly by most; some candidates referred to ‘a big meal’, but no marks were lost, as *magna voce* was not required by the Mark Scheme.

**Q15:** another tick-box question, which proved to be a good discriminator, as only the ablest ticked the correct box, with many confusing the interjection *minime* with the superlative form of *parvus* and consequently ticking A (I’ve only got a little!).

**Q16:** this was fairly well answered, though some lost the mark for *in montem*, by stating that Perseus turned Atlas into a stone, which was not the answer required by this question. Candidates should be reminded that the answer is usually to be found in the Latin quoted in the lemma, not elsewhere in the paper (including the introductions in English to the passages).

**Q17:** this was an overarching question designed to test candidates’ understanding of the character of Atlas within the context of this story. To gain full marks for this question, candidates needed to make a point about the character of Atlas, which had to be supported by a specific example from the text. Weaker responses tended to be very imprecise or uncertain, often containing inaccurate details. Many candidates, however, responded well to the question, demonstrating a good understanding of the storyline in their answer.

**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. However, some 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. *unam*: under). As there are usually many 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

The majority of candidates entered for this paper performed well, and a number gained full marks. There were very few marks below 30. Only a handful 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 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 few examples of 'No Response', suggesting that candidates of all abilities were able to engage with the questions.

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 correct answers were often changed to incorrect responses. Any alterations need to be clear and unambiguous, and the rough version of the translation should be crossed out.

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.

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 *villa* and *caput*. Noun number was an issue for some candidates, with *fratrum* and *poma* commonly translated as singular. Candidates should be reminded to make use of the glossary provided, noting in particular the nominative case of proper nouns: '*ad villam Atlantis*' was sometimes translated as 'to the house of Atlantis'.

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 *igitur*, *statim* and *ipsum*. 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.

## Individual Questions

**Q1:** candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though a few translated *primus* as 'at first', and some omitted *deorum* or did not recognise the genitive plural case.

**Q2:** this question was accessible to candidates of all abilities, since only two out of a possible four points were required. Most answers referred to the first two points, but strong candidates offered all four. The first point was almost always rendered accurately, though a few failed to mention whose son Jupiter was. Most candidates recognised the comparison made in the second point, though there were some references to Jupiter being a strong father. The third



point was generally well understood, though occasionally Jupiter and his father were transposed. Most understood *rex novus* in the fourth point, though *factus est* was not always known.

**Q3:** this was generally well done, though *petivit* was sometimes incorrectly rendered and *aliorum* not known or omitted. As a general rule, candidates should be advised to translate nouns in the genitive case as ‘of (the) + noun’, as errors in the use of the apostrophe can make a response incorrect (e.g. ‘the god’s help’). A few candidates confused *auxilium* with *consilium*.

**Q4:** this was a very good discriminator: only the strongest responses demonstrated the ability to recognise the genitive plural *fratrum*, and see that *omnes* does not agree with it. The most usual answer was ‘all his brothers’. Other candidates offered the answer ‘his brother’, presumably thinking that *fratrum* was a singular form.

**Q5:** most candidates were awarded the first two marks, but *in capite* was often translated as ‘in captivity’ or omitted. Some referred to Jupiter forcing Atlas to support the sky ‘on his shoulders’, perhaps relying too heavily on their previous knowledge of the myth. Third declension noun stems can cause problems, and centres are advised to draw attention to this area of accident.

**Q6 (a):** this was a good discriminator, with only the ablest recognising *plurimi* as both nominative and superlative. The meaning of *cuperent* was often not known, and rendered as ‘tried’. The number of *ea* was an issue for some, who translated it as ‘it’ or ‘the apple’. A few candidates were not awarded any marks, since they referred only to *tam pulchra erant*, which does not address the question.

**Q6 (b):** a straightforward question for most; the number of *cane* was incorrectly rendered by some, and *ingenti* was sometimes omitted or mistranslated. *poma* was occasionally translated as singular, though no marks were lost if this was a repeated error.

**Q7:** 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).

‘Therefore Hercules, after he arrived at the house of Atlas, asked him to give three apples to him.’

Most candidates made a good start to the first section, and scored at least three marks. A common error in this section was the meaning of *daret*, and teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the principal parts is good practice. Other errors included the mistranslation of *igitur*, and the omission of *eum*. Occasionally *tria* was mistranslated, and centres are reminded that candidates are expected to be familiar with cardinal numbers 1 to 10 (including all forms of *unus*, *duo* and *tres*). *villam* was occasionally confused with the French *ville* and translated as ‘town’. The indirect command was rendered by a few as an indirect question, with *ut* translated as ‘if’.

‘Atlas replied, “I shall do it, if you hold the sky for one hour.”’

Though there were some excellent translations of this section, some candidates failed to recognise the tense and person of *faciam*, and others confused the verb with *facile*, resulting in responses, such as ‘That will be easy’. A few transposed the clauses (‘If I do this..., you will hold...’). The accusative of time was usually handled very well.

‘After the sky had been placed on the head of Hercules, Atlas went away at once, in order to look for the apples.’

The ablative absolute was handled well, and examiners accepted both literal and more natural translations. Some candidates lost marks through a lack of subordination to or coordination with the main clause. Others struggled with the vocabulary within the construction: *posito* was sometimes not recognised as the perfect passive participle of *ponere*, and the case of *Herculis*

was an issue for some, who made Hercules the subject. Candidates are reminded that the glossary provides the nominative and genitive singular noun cases. Even the strongest responses occasionally omitted *statim*. As any omitted word is regarded as a major error, teachers are advised to remind their students of the importance of checking their work carefully. Some translated *abiit* as 'went', and candidates should be reminded that they are expected to be familiar with compound verbs formed by using the prefixes printed in the Defined Vocabulary List. The purpose clause caused very few problems.

'Hercules was waiting for a long time; Atlas however, when he had at last returned, did not want to hold the sky now,'

Most candidates handled this section very well, with almost all showing a good understanding of the structure. As elsewhere in the translation question, the main problem was mistranslation or omission of 'little' words, such as *diu*, *tamen*, *tandem* and *iam*. Occasionally *nolebat* was translated as 'was not able'.

'and promised that he himself would carry the apples to Juno.'

Many candidates coped very well with this final section, though even the best sometimes omitted or misplaced *ipsum*. Surprisingly, the best discriminator in this section was *lunonem*, frequently translated by even the most diligent as 'Jupiter'. Once again, candidates are advised to make full use of the glossaries. The indirect statement was generally handled well; some chose to transpose the active *portaturum esse* to a passive rendering, but usually expressed the correct agent, which is acceptable.

**Q8(a):** most candidates scored at least two of the four marks, but *grave* was sometimes mistranslated as 'serious', which was not accepted in this context. Others, who correctly answered 'heavy', negated the mark by adding additional harmful information, such as 'very', 'quite' or 'so'. Some candidates referred to Hercules wanting 'to cushion', rendering *pulvinum* as a verb. As previously mentioned, judicious use of the glossary should help to prevent such errors. Occasionally *volo* was omitted.

**Q8(b):** this question was designed to produce a personal response from candidates, and most provided an acceptable answer.

**Q9:** most candidates scored at least one of the two marks, but *risit* (see earlier comments on *daret*) was sometimes omitted or translated as 'he rose'. A few lost the mark for *discessit*, by confusing it with *descendit*. Some wrote that Hercules carried the apples, which is true, but was not accepted, since the phrase *poma portans* is not in the lemma.

**Q10:** most candidates handled this question fairly well, with almost all being awarded the first mark and recognising that *nuntiaverat* introduces an indirect statement. Those who did not score full marks usually transposed *filium Iovis* and *eum*, and/or did not recognise the tense of the future infinitive *laesurum esse*.

**Q11:** this question was fairly well answered, though some lost the mark for *in montem*, by stating that Perseus turned Atlas into a stone, which was not the answer required by this question. Candidates should be reminded that the answer is usually to be found in the Latin quoted in the lemma, not elsewhere in the paper (including the introductions in English to the passages).

**Q12:** this was an overarching question designed to test candidates' understanding of the character of Perseus within the context of this story. To gain full marks for this question, candidates needed to make two points about the character of Perseus, which had to be supported by specific examples from the text. Weaker responses tended to be very imprecise or uncertain, often containing inaccurate details or material drawn from prior knowledge of Perseus, which was not contained in Passage C. Many candidates, however, responded well to the question, demonstrating a good understanding of the storyline in their answer.

**Q13:** 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, examiners noted that the general standard of response to this question seems to improve every year. However, 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. *tria*: trial). As there are usually many possible derivatives, candidates are advised to choose words, which they are able to define.

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: History (Foundation Tier)

### General Comments

Examiners felt that the paper was generally successful in proving accessible to those candidates who might have struggled with the Higher Tier alternative. Only a handful of candidates failed to follow the gist of the story and a large number scored more than half marks. The entry of 249 was very closely in line with 2012.

A feature of the story were four regular *-iter* adverbs (*fortiter, ferociter, crudeliter, graviter*). Teachers planning to use the paper as a classroom exercise or mock exam might want to revise adverbial forms with their students beforehand.

### Individual Questions

**Q1:** An easy first question, which was consistently well answered.

**Q2:** Also well answered.

**Q3:** Those who took *duxit* as *dixit* got into difficulties here, but most at least got the idea that Rome ended up in great danger.

**Q4:** Not everyone seemed to know the form or meaning of *daret*, but most got the idea of poor citizens getting their own land to farm.

**Q5:** Many answered that ‘many liked it’, which was good enough for 1 mark but not for 2. A surprising number did not include *laudabant* in their answer, either because they did not recognise it or because the idea of ‘praising a law’ was perhaps slightly odd.

**Q6:** As at Higher Tier, this proved to be a good differentiator. Some took it as a ‘why do you think ...’ type question and used their imagination (e.g. ‘they didn’t like Gracchus’ plan’), without working out the meaning of the Latin quoted (‘Gracchus didn’t ask for their opinion/advice’). Most, however, gained 2 marks of the possible 3.

**Q7:** This was not well answered, perhaps because of the word order or because *cupit* was not known.

**Q8(a):** Indirect statements are often found difficult at this level, but many got the idea that Gracchus had gone to the Capitol with his friends. Nearly half gained full marks.

**Q8(b):** The mark scheme offered alternative ways to achieve the 2 marks here; many were successful. Again, nearly half gained full marks.

**Q9(i):** ‘Then the senators climbed the Capitol bearing arms’. A surprising number took *ascenderunt* as ‘came down’ and, as at Higher Tier, the phrase *arma ferentes* caused difficulty.

**Q9(ii):** *ibi* was not well known (considered a minor error on this paper) and the indirect command introduced by *rogavit* was not well done. Some took *resisterent* as a noun and the adverbial form of *fortiter* was often missed.

**Q9(iii):** Again, the adverbial form (*ferociter*) was often missed. Those who took it as 'fierce' then tended to take the main verb *oppugnaverunt* as a noun. Those who missed the *tam* then also missed the sense of *ut* at the start of the next section.

**Q9(iv):** Apart from the omission of *ut*, this was generally done well.

**Q9(v):** As at Higher Tier, *ceteri* was often not known and too many took the accusative *Gracchum* as the subject.

**Q9(vi):** There was confusion about who killed whom. It had been hoped that the context of the story would have helped here. The third appearance of an *-iter* adverb unfortunately caused as much trouble as the other two earlier in the story.

**Q9(vii):** Not everyone understood the form of *currens* but the glossing of *cecidit* allowed most to get the right idea here.

**Q9(viii):** The *cum* clause was generally handled quite well and most saw that it was Lucius Rufus who wounded Gracchus with a sword and not the other way round. It was a surprise to see *gladio* taken so often as 'gladiator'.

**Q9(ix):** There were plenty of issues here. *sic* is not always well known at this level, the fourth *-iter* adverb was sometimes taken as an adjective, and the superlative form of *miserrimam* was sometimes missed. But the general sense was much clearer than the significantly more difficult Higher Tier wording, and if candidates understood that Gracchus was wounded and died miserably they were likely to score at least 2 of the 4 marks.

**Q9(x):** This sentence provided an easy conclusion to the paper for many candidates.

As at Higher Tier, standards of literacy and legibility, though variable, were generally acceptable or better. On a testing piece of Latin, candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the large amount of sense they made of it.

## A402/02 Latin Language 2: History (Higher Tier)

### General Comments

It was pleasing to see that the entry of 8827 was up again this year. The vast majority of candidates were adequately prepared for this level – a few candidates might have found the Foundation Tier alternative better suited to them.

Examiners generally felt that the paper was accessible to less able candidates while containing enough difficult parts to stretch and challenge. Very few candidates lost the thread after the first sentence but managed to retrieve it in the last sentence.

If the section for translation was generally fairly straightforward, there were some catches for the unwary in the section for comprehension. One examiner noted the number of candidates who performed fairly poorly on the comprehension questions but then produced accomplished translations; examiners wondered whether some centres might neglect comprehension passages in their preparation, concentrating instead on straight translation. Those using past papers as a classroom exercise might like to insist that candidates produce a literal translation of the section for comprehension, if they do not already do so.

### Individual Questions

**Q1:** There were regular errors with the agreement of *clarissimi* (it was Gracchus' father, not Gracchus, who was described as 'very famous'), the superlative of *optimus* was sometimes missed, and *patris* was sometimes wrongly taken as 'homeland' but the mark scheme was generous enough to get the majority of candidates off to a successful start.

**Q2:** For full marks, candidates needed to spot the plural forms of *multas virtutes* and then choose the most appropriate meaning of *virtutes*. Possible options were 'many virtues' and 'many strengths'. Also needed were the meaning of *gravissimum* (the danger was not merely 'great') and the sense in *adduxit* that Gracchus had brought Rome into serious danger or had caused it. The question differentiated well.

**Q3:** This was mostly found to be straightforward. There were a number of possibilities for *agros* ('farms', 'farmland', 'fields'), though some candidates wrongly had the idea that land was to be taken from the poor citizens rather than being given to them.

**Q4(a):** This turned out to be a good test of the pronoun *ei*. It was not enough to simply write *multi* without showing understanding of *favebant ei*.

**Q4(b):** Some took this as a 'why do you think ...' question and used their imagination (e.g. 'they didn't like Gracchus' plan'), without working out the meaning of the quoted Latin ('Gracchus didn't ask for their opinion/advice'). The question differentiated particularly well – it was the least successfully answered question on the paper.

**Q5:** This question also differentiated well. For full marks it was necessary to show knowledge of *auderet* and the sense that what Gracchus might have been dared to do, was to make himself king.

**Q6a:** Accurate knowledge of the tense of *convenisse* was not required here, but the sense of the compound verb ('come together', 'meet') was required in order to win full marks. For *comitibus* 'comrades', 'friends', 'allies', 'supporters' were all acceptable – his 'committee' was not.

**Q6b:** This was also found to be difficult. Those who knew the sense of *deberent* here ('having to not 'owing') realised that what the senators were considering was 'what they ought to do'.

A feature of this year's translation section was three uses of *ut* in an indirect command, result cause and purpose clause. Teachers using it as a mock or classroom activity might want to take the opportunity to revise the uses of *ut*. Many candidates routinely take it as 'so that', which is not a bad approach, but it is worth revising typical verbs introducing an indirect command (including less familiar words like *hortor*) and showing candidates that 'so that' will not always quite do.

Also tested this year were some less common deponent verbs (*hortor, patior, conor*) and three present participle forms (*ferentes, currens, conantem*).

**Q7(i):** 'Scipio the consul feared that Gracchus would destroy the power of the senators'. The form of *ne* caused predictable problems and those who couldn't identify the cases of *imperium* and *senatorum* tended to struggle to win marks. For *imperium*, 'power', 'rule' and 'command' were all accepted, but 'empire' was not. *consul* was sometimes omitted and some examiners were surprised that some candidates appeared to have no idea what a consul was. For a paper containing passages taken from Roman history, it is very worthwhile for teachers to explain and return to the meanings of terms like this.

**Q7(ii):** 'Therefore he encouraged them all to save Rome'. For *hortatus est*, occasional references to gardens were predictable; weaker responses displayed a tendency to take *servarent* as 'to serve'. 'So that they saved' was not accepted as a translation of *ut* (it was taken as a minor error).

**Q7(iii):** 'After hearing this, the senators rushed to the Capitol bearing arms'. Examiners were lenient with *quo audito*. Even so, very many got it correct. The form of *arma ferentes* (as the participle *currens* later) caused unexpected problems. Some candidates took it as something to do with *ferox* – others omitted it altogether.

**Q7(iv):** 'There, Gracchus and his friends were preparing everything to resist them'. One of the most common errors on the paper was to take *omnia* as *omnes*. In the event, it was generously taken as a minor error of agreement and so many were still able to score full marks. On another occasion, this might be considered a major error, so that those who know their adjectival terminations may be clearly differentiated from those who do not.

**Q7(v):** 'The senators, however, attacked them so fiercely that very many fled terrified'. Common errors here were to take *oppugnauerunt* as 'fought', to omit *eos*, and to miss the superlative form of *plurimi*. The latter occurs fairly regularly in passages of this sort, and it may be worth teaching it as a separate vocabulary item ('very many') rather than as part of revision of irregular comparatives and superlatives (the same might be said for *optimus* earlier in the paper).

**Q7(vi):** 'The rest, who had defended Gracchus with the highest courage, were soon overcome'. Many struggled with the sense of *ceteri* (it was often taken as *celeriter*) and even the very best responses sometimes missed the pluperfect form of *defenderant*. *summa virtute* also caused problems – some thought that it referred to the summit of the hill. Teachers setting this as a mock exam or classroom exercise should be ready to draw attention to the error of taking *Gracchum* as the subject of the *qui* clause. The word order (with *Gracchum* promoted earlier in the clause rather than after *summa virtute*) was deliberately designed to test recognition of the accusative form. The plural form of *defenderant* should have also alerted them to the fact that Gracchus could not be the subject. 'Were oppressed' was not felt to be quite the right sense of *oppressi sunt*, for which 'were defeated', 'were crushed', 'were overpowered', 'were overwhelmed' were accepted.

**Q7(vii):** ‘When Gracchus himself, running from the Capitol, fell by chance to the ground’. Many missed the force of the participle *currens* (e.g. taking it with *ubi* instead), *forte* was often wrongly connected with *fortis* and some confused *cecidit* with part of *celare*. But most got the idea that Gracchus had a fall on the way down from the Capitol. One nicely took *forte* as ‘accidentally’.

**Q7(viii):** ‘As Gracchus was trying to get up, Lucius Rufus wounded him with a sword’. To be sure of full marks here, candidates needed to make clear who was trying to get up. The use of the participial phrase *eum conantem* in the accusative was a good test.

**Q7(ix):** ‘In this way, Gracchus, having received a very serious wound, suffered a cruel death’. The phrase *hoc modo* was sometimes problematic, as was the sense of *accepto*. Those who took it as ‘having accepted that he was wounded’ also lost credit for taking *vulnere* was a verb. Many correctly understood the ablative absolute, but did not see that ‘accepting’ a wound is not quite the same as ‘receiving’ one. It is worth helping candidates to practise words from the Defined Vocabulary List that have multiple meanings – even at this level candidates can be expected to choose the meaning that the context demands. *passus est* was a regular problem, perhaps because the tempting mis-translation ‘he passed into death’ fitted the context too well. This paper can contain stories with varying amounts of suffering and so the forms of *patior* (and *morior*) are worth revising.

**Q7(x):** ‘On the same day, his body was thrown into a river’. This section mostly provided candidates with a straightforward finish, though many did not recognise the form of *eodem*, *iacio* was confused with *iaceo*, and *flumen* was also sometimes taken as *flamma*. Only a very few, perhaps used to the fact that strange things happen in Latin unseens, thought that Gracchus had performed the unlikely feat of throwing his own dead body into the river.

On the translation section, it was pleasing to see that relatively few candidates seemed to lose the plot altogether and fewer than usual lost marks by omitting the ‘little’ words (*itaque*, *ibi*, *autem*, *tam* etc.) Standards of literacy and handwriting were generally acceptable or better. One plea from examiners is for those who are allowed to use a word processor to type their translation double spaced – many tend to leave no room for examiners’ annotations.

Overall, candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated for the sense they made of some difficult Latin.



## A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier)

### General Comments

Overall most candidates seemed to have been entered for the correct tier; several candidates began to answer both Section A and Section B of the paper, and teachers should attempt to ensure candidates' familiarity with the format of the paper as fully as possible. Some candidates failed to quote Latin when asked and accordingly lost marks. Some candidates were unsure of how to tackle the ten-mark extended writing question and teachers must ensure that candidates are fully prepared for this type of question.

### Section A

**Q1:** Candidates generally answered correctly.

**Q2:** Most candidates scored at least 1 out of 2; some candidates selected only one response, and should be encouraged to read the instructions carefully. Candidates should also be aware that there are three different types of multiple choice questions: questions requiring one tick, two ticks or five ticks. Teachers should ensure that candidates have seen past papers so that they are aware of the different style of questions.

**Q3:** Candidates generally answered correctly.

**Q4:** Most candidates scored 1 out of 2 for 'Curtius Rufus'.

**Q5:** Nearly all candidates answered this correctly; there were however occasional rogue answers of 'car', 'horse'.

**Q6:** Candidates generally answered correctly.

**Q7:** The majority of candidates associated 'morbo' with death instead of disease, and so scored '0' for this question. Knowledge of the Latin let many candidates down here.

**Q8(a):** There were a wide range of answers to this question; however, approximately 50% answered correctly; many guessed from vague contextual knowledge rather than the passage on the paper.

**Q8(b):** This was generally answered correctly; a fair number put 'D' instead of 'C'.

**Q9:** This was very well answered, though examiners are unable to give credit if no Latin is quoted; candidates seemed to know this section well. Candidates must be sure to quote the Latin when asked to do so.

**Q10:** This question was reasonably well answered, although not all candidates quoted the Latin. Generally speaking, in questions where the English translation is provided, some reference to the Latin will be required.

**Q11:** The ten-mark question was the best differentiator in the paper. It was generally well answered, although there were perhaps fewer outstanding answers compared to previous years. Most candidates addressed both bullet points equally, though often not making quite enough points for higher credit. Only a very few used no Latin at all in their response, so candidates seem to be getting used to the requirements of the ten mark question. Candidates must be sure to answer the specific question, rather than provide a vague commentary of the text.

**Q12:** Most candidates achieved at least 4 out of 5 correct answers here. These five-mark multiple-choice questions are generally well answered.

**Q13:** Nearly all candidates scored full marks here.

**Q14(a):** There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates struggled with the meaning of *exercitum*.

**Q14(b):** This was not very well answered, with '*campo*' translated as 'camp' instead of field / plain.

**Q15:** Most candidates scored at least 1 out of 2, requiring the extra detail for both marks.

**Q16:** Mixed responses were provided here, with many candidates relying on background or contextual knowledge rather than the specific details in the Latin text. This is a common error on the foundation paper, where the knowledge of the Latin lets the candidate down.

**Q17(a):** This question was generally well answered, most candidates scoring full marks with '*deum deo nato*', '*regem*' or '*parentem*' correctly translated; half marks were awarded if no Latin was quoted.

**Q17(b):** Most candidates attained full marks, selecting the correct information with required detail for all 3 marks.

**Q18 (a):** Candidates generally answered correctly.

**Q18 (b):** This was generally well answered. A wide variety of answers were credited.

## Section B

**Q19:** Candidates generally answered correctly.

**Q20:** This was well answered. This year the 'pick out and translate the Latin word' questions were well answered in both sections.

**Q21:** This was well answered.

**Q22:** This was generally well answered.

**Q23(a) and (b):** This was generally well answered.

**Q24:** This was generally well answered with Latin mostly matched to English. Unfortunately a small minority of candidates did not quote any Latin and so could not receive any credit. As in Section A, candidates must ensure they quote the Latin when asked to do so. Quotation of Latin is required in a number of questions, and not just the ten-mark question.

**Q25:** Most candidates selected at least 4/5 correct answers. Candidates did well in the five-mark multiple-choice questions in both sections A and B.

**Q26:** This was well answered.

**Q27:** This was well answered.

**Q28:** This was usually answered correctly.

**Q29:** Most candidates achieved 1/2, sometimes referring to their own contextual knowledge rather than the Latin on the paper.

**Q30:** This was usually answered correctly.

**Q31:** This was not so well answered; '*lectulo*' caused problems, and candidates' background knowledge was usually not detailed or specific enough to infer the answer. There is no substitute to knowing the Latin in detail.

**Q32:** This was generally answered correctly, though there were several answers of 'the Egyptian prophet'. Candidates must read the question and the lemma carefully. The answer is usually within the lemma.

**Q33:** This was usually answered correctly.

**Q34:** This was very well answered.

**Q35:** Most candidates selected 1 out of 2 correct answers. Some candidates only ticked one box when they were asked to select two answers. Candidates must ensure they read the questions carefully.

**Q36(a):** There were mixed responses to this question, with most candidates achieving at least 2/4; the specific detail and selection of supporting Latin proved challenging.

**Q36(b):** This was generally answered correctly when supported with details from the passage. Some candidates could not translate the Latin and relied on their general knowledge of the story to answer the question.

**Q36(c):** This proved to be the most challenging question on the paper, with very few candidates attaining full marks; most managed 2/3 for 'sluggish joints and cold limbs slowly obeyed...' OR 1 for 'using my name and did not stop until...' This question required specific information to be gleaned from the text and accordingly was problematic to many.

**Q37:** The ten-mark question was the best differentiator in the paper. It was generally well answered more so than the equivalent Q11 on Section A, although there were perhaps fewer outstanding answers compared to previous years. There was evidence of excellent understanding and appreciation, as well as well-matched Latin to the English. The most challenging point was for candidates attempting to explain the effect of the short clauses '*manu nasum prehendo: sequitur; aures pertracto: deruunt*', and successfully linking content, form and effect.

## A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier)

### General Comments

The paper was well answered by candidates who generally had a good knowledge and understanding of the text. The vast majority of candidates followed the rubric and quoted the Latin when they were asked to do so, but candidates should understand that failure to quote the Latin when asked to do so in the question will result in a loss of marks. Timing was generally not an issue, although a very small number of candidates appeared to run out of time in their final questions. The ten- and eight-mark questions were the best differentiators and a few candidates seemed unprepared for these questions. It is important for teachers to explain to their students how best to tackle these questions. Examiners found that students' handwriting was less neat than in previous years and a small number of scripts were not easy to read. The candidates seemed to enjoy the subject matter of the prose literature and this was particularly evident in the answers to the 8-mark questions.

### Section A

**Q1:** Nearly all candidates answered this question correctly.

**Q2:** This question was well done by candidates. There was a wide range of answers available to candidates.

**Q3:** This question was generally well done, but a fair number of candidates put 'imagination', clearly distracted by the Latin *imaginem*.

**Q4(a):** This was well answered, although a few candidates thought the notice was a warning about the presence of ghosts and a few answers were too vague.

**Q4(b):** Some candidates wrote 'the price', and lost the mark as they did not stipulate that Athenodorus was suspicious about the cheapness of the price. Candidates must ensure they read the whole lemma and not stop once they think they have reached the key word. Translation of *pretio* wasn't enough; they needed to reflect *vilitas* in their answer.

**Q5:** This was generally well answered, although some candidates didn't refer to the bed, but rather the writing tablets, pen and light, which were not in the lemma. This provided good discrimination for a short question.

**Q6:** This question was only partially answered by many, who omitted either 'all' or 'his'.

**Q7:** This question was the best differentiator in Section A, picking out the better responses. There was a wide range of points available for the candidates to make. As in previous years, candidates must be sure to quote the Latin, show that they understand the Latin and analyse the quotation, showing how it provides evidence for answering the question. Although credit is given for content points, candidates must aim to comment on the style of the Latin as much as possible.

**Q8:** This question was generally well answered.

**Q9:** Candidates must be sure to answer the question, explaining their quotation. Latin quotations should be focussed and not too long.

**Q10(a):** This was generally well answered, but several candidates answered from outside the lemma.

**Q10(b):** This was generally well answered, although a number of candidates failed to mention ‘the will of the gods’.

**Q10(c)(i):** This was generally well answered although a number of candidates struggled with the translation of *colant*.

**Q10(c)(ii):** Many candidates scored one mark, with only the best responses achieving two. Too many candidates translated the Latin only, and failed to answer the question about how Romulus emphasised his point.

**Q11:** Many candidates knew the importance of Caesar’s crossing of the Rubicon. Teachers must ensure that candidates know the basic contextual background to the literature.

**Q12:** This was very well answered.

**Q13:** Nearly all candidates scored at least one mark. *quod non ... proferretur* caused problems for many, resulting in a fair number of candidates losing the second mark for this question.

**Q14:** This was mostly well done, although a very small number of candidates didn’t know the text nearly well enough, and either omitted the translation question altogether, or were a long way off the mark. There were still too many omissions by candidates, eg *dein, sua, quidem*.

**Q15:** This question was well answered and there were interesting responses from candidates who preferred Suetonius or Livy. It was also interesting that there is an underlying distrust of governments among the candidates. In a similar way, distrust of bankers manifested itself last year. A small number of candidates didn’t read the question and referred to Pliny’s passage as well. Candidates must be sure to avoid vague generalisations about the text. The examiner is looking for specific references to the passages which back up the candidates’ point of view.

## Section B

**Q16:** This was well answered, but a number of candidates failed to convey the meaning of *pererrans*, writing ‘walking’ or ‘travelling.’

**Q17:** A well-answered question, although some candidates thought that his money had been completely used up rather than diminished. Candidates needed to be more specific than just stating ‘he was poor.’

**Q18:** This was very well answered.

**Q19:** Well answered, although some misread the question thinking it read ‘what was the old man offering.’ Reading the questions should not be rushed. Candidates needed to refer to guarding ‘a dead body / corpse’ rather than just ‘the dead,’ a trap that some candidates fell into.

**Q20:** This was generally well answered. A wide range of answers were available to candidates.

**Q21:** Nearly all candidates answered this correctly.

**Q22:** This was well answered, although some candidates mistranslated *introrumpit*.

**Q23:** Some candidates wrote ‘everyone’, so the question picked out those responses which demonstrated understanding of the difference between *omnes* and *omnia*.

**Q24:** A fair number of candidates failed to translate *imo*. It is in the lemma and therefore candidates should include it in their answer.

**Q25(a):** This was well answered.

**Q25(b):** This was fairly well answered. A fair number of candidates didn't really understand what the phrase meant and failed to convey in their answer the speed of her infidelity / change of loyalty.

**Q25(c):** This was well answered.

**Q26:** This question was the best differentiator in Section B, picking out the better responses. As in Section A, a wide range of points were available to the candidates to make. Candidates must be sure to quote the Latin, demonstrating that they understand the Latin and analyse the quotation, showing how it provides evidence for answering the question. Although credit is given for content points, candidates must aim to comment on the style of the Latin as much as possible. A number of candidates commented far too heavily on alliteration, claiming there to be significant alliteration where it wasn't the case.

**Q27:** This was well answered. Many candidates had an excellent knowledge of the text and this was evident in their answer. Candidates clearly enjoyed the story.

**Q28:** This was generally well done. A wide range of points were available to candidates, who commented in detail on the Latin.

**Q29:** Nearly all candidates scored two marks here. The commonest error was *agitat digitos*. 'Moving his fingers' was not sufficient.

**Q30:** *evades* needed to be translated in the future. This was omitted by a number of candidates.

**Q31:** This question was generally well done.

**Q32:** As in Section A, candidates often omitted a word or phrase. '*vertit adlocutionem*' was sometimes missed out or blurred with the next expression; *eisdem* was not always translated; *quousque* occasionally was translated as 'why'; *ne tantulum quidem* was quite often under-translated.

## A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier)

At 139 the entry for Latin Verse Literature Foundation Tier was rather lower than last year. It was good to see a fair number of entries where the candidates showed knowledge of the texts and gave evidence of both appreciation and enjoyment of what they had studied. There was, however, wide diversity in the levels of performance on the paper; a few candidates would probably have made a fair showing on the Higher paper but the vast majority were clearly correctly entered for the Foundation Tier.

Quite a number of candidates who had prepared for Section B were lured, presumably by the names 'Virgil' and 'Aeneas' below Passage A1, into answering some of the Section A questions. Generally these were then crossed out but in a few cases parts, or even all, of both sections were attempted. Please encourage candidates to read the rubric on the front cover and in the question paper carefully.

### Section A

**Q1-3:** were generally answered quite successfully with most, though not all, knowing who Venus was and what she was bringing.

**Q4:** some candidates found this a little more difficult but most candidates scored at least 1.

**Q7:** gave the most difficulty with 'attacking Cytherea' a frequent answer.

**Q8:** *sub quercu* was more frequently recognised than *adversa*.

**Q11:** Candidates were fairly successful in matching equipment to the descriptions.

**Q12(a):** was answered incorrectly in all but a very few cases, the occurrence of *solis* at the beginning of line 7 clearly making D the much favoured answer. An error here still allowed the possibility of focusing on the concept of brightness and gaining 2 marks in **12(b)**.

**Q13:** Some good answers were given to this question showing an appreciation of the ways in which Persius is ridiculing the man and his behaviour and highlighting such literary and linguistic features as the repetitions, the rhetorical question and the personification of the coin. A few candidates were able to refer to these features accurately in the Latin text and to show how they were used for the purpose of ridicule. Less successful responses identified, for example, repetition of *iam* but did not display any clear understanding of the context in which it was used. Indeed, many answers displayed a very limited grasp of the thrust of the passage.

The factual knowledge required for **Qs 14 & 15** was only rarely forthcoming though many scored a mark on **Q16**.

**Q17:** Good efforts were made to explain how what Caesar says here was likely to be persuasive. Copying out a section of text and matching it, generally accurately, with a translation was not on its own sufficient to gain any marks.

**Q18:** Candidates understood the point of at least one of the two words pretty well.

**Q19:** Many observed the repetition of *hic* and a number were able to explain the significance of *utendum est iudice bello*. There was considerable misconception, though, about what Caesar meant by his reference to Fortuna.

## Section B

The first few questions were usually well answered though **Qu 24** was not consistently well answered. Whilst the majority of candidates knew who Mars was, a significant minority did not and very few understood the meaning of *invadunt Martem*.

**Qs 26-27:** Most came up with a plausible and often ingenious explanation for the earth's groaning and were able to give some impression of the fight. Merely quoting a section of the Latin and equating it with a translation could not earn any marks.

**Q28:** Some candidates showed a good grasp of how Virgil uses his extended simile to bring to life the duel between Aeneas and Turnus; there were some, though, who were unaware that this was a duel and thought that whole armies were involved. The most successful answers saw the need to make explicit the connection between bulls and heroes, and between cowherd/cows and spectators, and to bring out in their answers the meaning of the Latin phrases they quoted. Others scored lower through feeling, perhaps, that the presence of the translation meant they did not need to do this. Alliteration of M in line 4 was an obvious (and very acceptable) point of style but gained full credit only when accompanied by clear indication of what is going on at this point and how the alliteration highlights it. The final line with its C alliteration and onomatopoeic *fragor* was another very acceptable favourite. Reference to *gemitu...remugit* in line 8 was more problematic as candidates were very uncertain who was groaning at this point. There were a number of answers which, despite the translation, showed very little grasp of the scenario unfortunately.

**Q29:** Many candidates scored marks with *ingens* and *saevo pectore* but hardly any managed any reference to his spear.

**Q30:** Few gained full marks here but some did make valid points about the question format or the taunting of Turnus and there were a few perceptive comments on the positioning of *Turne* in line 1 and the repetition of *sive*.

**Q31:** Uncertainty arose here over who was an enemy, and to whom.

**Qs 32-35:** Despite the lack of translation some candidates had a good idea of what was going on and scored well; others resorted to inventing answers based on a word they recognised.

**Q36:** This question attracted only a few valid answers.

**Q37:** Many knew what Turnus' injury was, though to see B chosen in **Qu 38** after the mention of a severe wound was a little unexpected.

**Q38:** Nearly all candidates scored well on this question.



## A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier)

### General Comments

Though Aeneid XII (Section B) attracted the larger number of candidates, both selections produced a pleasing number of very knowledgeable responses displaying a perceptive enjoyment of the texts studied. A relatively small number of candidates were clearly at sea on this paper, though even those who were defeated by the Latin often displayed a reasonable general knowledge of the texts in their 8 mark answer. Marks were often lost by candidates through failure to observe the specific requirements of the question: the need to include Latin references, the need to include stylistic comments (“the author’s style of writing”/“stylistic feature”/“the way that he says it”) and, indeed, the need to relate points made to the question set. Technical style terms are not required and their absence (or erroneous use) is not penalised; in fact, most candidates could come up with alliteration (however spelt) and some handled very sophisticated technical terms with a degree of panache. In some other cases candidates bogged themselves down in poorly understood technical terms; a more straightforward expression of basic points would have served them better. It would be very encouraging if candidates would demonstrate their ability to distinguish between an adjective and a verb, for example (as in *rapax* in A5).

Examiners marking these scripts were always relieved to see clear handwriting, well set out answers and clear indications where answers carried on to supplementary sheets. There were all too many scripts marred by barely legible handwriting, excessive crossings-out, a plethora of asterisks and answers squeezed above lines and into margins. A significant number of candidates attempted both sections of the paper, perhaps misled by the name Virgil under Passage A. It is helpful if unintended answers are crossed out.

### Individual Questions

#### Section A

**Q1:** It was odd to see ‘gifts’ quite often given as an answer here but most scored a mark. A single item of armour/weaponry was unacceptable.

**Q2:** This was generally correct though *procul*, *egelido* and *vidit* also appeared.

**Q3:** This was mostly well answered but quoting and translating *reducta* and/or *secretum* on their own did not score marks.

**Q4:** There were many very good translations but unfortunately a number bearing no relation at all to the Latin. Common omissions were *en*, *mox* and *nate*. *promissa* was at times taken with the wrong noun and there was uncertainty over the respective attributes of the Laurentes and Turnus.

**Q5, 6, 7 and 8** caused relatively few problems.

**Q9:** A large number of candidates failed to state what the breastplate is being compared to and answers suggested that it was thought to be like the sun rather than a cloud. Relatively few candidates scored 2 here.

Most candidates gave correct answers to **Q10**.

In **Q11** most scored a mark for citing repetition of *iam* and many gave interesting interpretations of how it makes the man ridiculous. It was necessary, however, to indicate the meaning of *iam* to gain full credit. There were some excellent and perceptive comments on the personification of

the coin (“even the coin understood its owner’s foolishness”) but some took *deceptus* to describe the man here and rendered their point invalid.

**Q12:** This question attracted some very good answers; common mistakes were just to repeat the question or to go outside the line and word reference given.

**Q13:** As ‘word choice’ is a valid stylistic observation, provided it is flagged up as such, answers commenting suitably on *rapax*, *acuto* or *gaudet* were very acceptable, as also were those highlighting some aspect of the personification of Fortuna. Mistranslations of the chosen word or phrase often invalidated answers.

**Q14:** This question presented no major problems.

**Q15:** This question asks what makes Caesar’s appeal persuasive and failure to address this meant that some candidates’ list of gods could score little or no credit. A surprising number thought that *magnae* was being used as a form of address to Jupiter (or some other god). Candidates were on firmer ground with what Caesar has to say about himself and there were a lot of creditworthy points to be made here. Some became so involved with the content of the passage that they overlooked the need to refer to style. There were consequently some knowledgeable and appreciative answers that were restricted to 6 marks. Some who did make valid stylistic observations (such as the repetition of *ille*) could not be credited as they went on to misinterpret what was being said at that point in the passage.

**Q16:** This question elicited some very thoughtful and interesting responses to the texts studied. There was a wide range of views, particularly on Horace (to be taken at face value or not?) and Persius (belittling the gods or merely satirising human greed or folly?). Some thought Caesar’s appeal to the gods showed piety, others noted his cynicism in using religion for his own political ends. Some candidates showed an awareness of the difficulty of ascertaining the authors’ personal religious views from their literary works and noted that Lucan’s work expressed more about his opinion of Caesar than about his opinion of the gods. There were good observations of the contrasting presentation of Roman and Egyptian gods at the battle of Actium.

## Section B

**Q17, Q18 and Q19:** There were few problems with these questions.

**Q20:** Quite a number of candidates did not understand *invadunt Martem*, though they generally knew who Mars was.

**Q21:** There was a wide variety of plausible answers but those which went on to place whole armies on the field invalidated their explanation.

**Q22:** A large number of candidates scored two 2s here, generally by translation. In (b) ‘skill’ and ‘virtue’ as translations of *virtus* were not acceptable.

**Q23:** This question gave ample opportunity for knowledgeable, perceptive and detailed answers and there were many excellent ones. The best ones brought out the aggressive and bloodthirsty nature of the taurine and human duels and the terror and nervous expectancy of the spectators in each case, adding very often the actual clash of the ‘titans’ near the end for good measure. As with Q15 some candidates overlooked the need to cover points of style, though in a few answers it was over-concentration on style that was detrimental. Most could at least identify the M alliteration in line 4 but their observation could not always be credited through misunderstanding of whether the spectators are silent, murmuring, bellowing or even cheering at this point. A similar confusion over what noise *nemus* is ‘bellowing back’ in line 8 meant that credit could not always be given here either. At the very beginning of the passage, *ingenti* was at times wrongly taken with *tauri* and candidates were inclined to forget that Aeneas and Turnus were fighting on a plain so the mountain setting was not an immediately obvious point of comparison (the

grandiose setting of the simile highlighting the importance of Aeneas and Turnus' duel was however accepted).

**Q24:** Most knew that Turnus' sword broke but did not gain the further mark. There were a lot of ambiguously expressed answers, such as "His charioteer's sword broke".

**Q25:** Most translations were good and scored at least 3. Various phrases were commonly omitted as were the words *contra* and *cursu*. *Praesens* was frequently taken with *mortem*.

**Q26:** Many gained full marks but *ludicra* was not sufficiently distinguished from *trivia*.

**Q27:** The best answers selected from the wide range of stylistic points available and commented perceptively on their effect. Points were often invalidated, though, by misunderstanding of the text and a surprising number appeared not to realise that Turnus falls at this point.

**Q28 and Q29:** There were many full-mark answers for both these questions.

**Q30:** There were many answers of excellent quality, showing knowledge and understanding together with a real enjoyment and appreciation of the candidates' reading. Quite a number, though, did not really grasp the broader approach that is needed in this final question and so concentrated too heavily on slight observations or narrow stylistic points which tended to reprise answers given earlier in the paper.

## A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier)

### General Comments:

It was felt by examiners that this year a few candidates had the required skills for the Higher Tier and their achievement was restricted by entry at the Foundation Tier.

A few candidates, when asked to suggest one reason, offered two or three reasons. Under these circumstances examiners are instructed to mark the first response only.

Candidates on occasions did not gain marks as the question needed reading with greater care.

### Individual Questions:

**Q1(a):** This was answered correctly by all candidates.

**Q1(b):** Most candidates appreciated the need to make the gods happy. Most candidates though did not offer a second reason.

**Q1(c):** Better answers were able to give a source-based response.

**Q2(a):** This question tested the understanding of the passage. Most candidates answered this correctly.

**Q2(b):** Most candidates could select phrases for what Ovid says though only the better answers answered *how* he tries to make them remember.

**Q3(a):** Answered correctly by all candidates.

**Q3(b):** The most common response was the appreciation of the large area of green grass which made the venue suitable. A few candidates misunderstood the question.

**Q3(c):** The reason for candidates not gaining full marks here was when only two reasons were offered. The most common reason for the *fun* at the festival was attributed to the vast amounts of alcohol consumed.

**Q4:** There has been great improvement in the answering of this extended question. In addition there were fewer candidates who omitted this question. Candidates who followed the instructions to consider the sources in the insert fared better. These used source A, B, and C and gave detailed knowledge about religion from elsewhere. Some knowledge was credited at Foundation Level when unsupported by detailed references to other sources.

**Q5(a)(i):** It was assumed by a large number of candidates that the women were putting on make up.

**Q5(a)(ii):** Many answers to this question lacked any detailed link to the wall paintings.

**Q5(b):** A large number of responses appreciated that fine paintings were often put in rooms that were intended to impress the visitor. These rooms were the atrium, tablinum and triclinium. Latin terms were not expected at this level but examiners were pleased to see those who knew and spelled them correctly.

**Q6:** Again examiners were pleased to see candidates using both the Latin and English translation to answer this question. There were only a very few who had difficulties with this.

**Q7(a) and 7(b):** Although all candidates could identify that Sergius was ugly, not all could develop this further and show how Juvenal disapproved of Eppia's affair.

**Q8:** This was well answered. Candidates who offered better responses appreciated the need to go beyond what Columella says and to consider *how*. The most common example was the sheer list of jobs which was deemed exhausting just to mention.

**Q9:** A range of other jobs was offered. A few were linked to the source, and these were not given credit.

**Q10:** There were a few responses which achieved full marks. These used source D, E, and F and gave detail from several other named sources. All these were used to answer the question. Other sources should be primary sources i.e. literature in translation, or archaeological evidence and artefacts. Candidates should be encouraged to look beyond Roman drama made for television and the Cambridge Latin course.

## A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier)

### General Comments:

There is still a small number of candidates who have detailed knowledge of their topics but do not use sources to support this knowledge and frequently do not use the sources on the paper. Answers with little or no support from sources can only achieve marks in the lower levels of the marking grids. Very good answers were characterised by reading the paper carefully and doing what the questions required using sources to support all points made.

A few candidates, when asked to suggest one reason offered two or three reasons. Under these circumstances examiners are instructed to mark the first response only.

### Individual Questions:

**Q1(a):** Candidates used source A well to suggest a suitable person present at a sacrifice. The most frequently occurring suggestions included a priest, executioner/ slaughter man and flute player. Augurs, who studied the flight of birds, were not in source A.

**Q1(b):** Most candidates appreciated the need to appease (please, make happy) the gods and also understood the importance of bargaining with the gods. Other responses referred to specific events, such as before a battle, which were given credit as was the study of entrails to predict the future.

**Q1(c):** Better answers were able to give a source-driven response to 1(c).

**Q2(a):** This question was well answered with the principal focus being on the fact that ghosts had feelings and needed food indicating some belief in life after death. The most common response was the fact that ghosts rose out from their graves and “reanimated”.

**Q2(b):** *The past* was occasionally interpreted as *the dead*. However, most responses focussed on learning from mistakes or upholding traditions which had been laid down by Aeneas. Candidates understood the importance of Aeneas and knew who he was.

**Q3:** Weaker responses summarised the passage using chosen phrases. Better answers heeded the wording of the question *how* which required them to explain Ovid’s techniques of persuasion. Candidates here mentioned: scare tactics, imagery, the use of anecdote, imperative verbs. Many candidates referred to the dead wanting only “small gifts” thus making the observance open to even the poorest citizen.

**Q4(a):** Most candidates appreciated the danger posed to the emperor by the “ordinary folk”. Others focussed on the image of the emperor. A few responses noted that the Ides of March was inauspicious as Julius Caesar had been assassinated on that day. This was given credit.

**Q4(b):** A number of candidates selected and copied phrases from the source. However the source was to be used to support points made. The atmosphere most commonly described was: happy, relaxed, and religious. A few candidates assumed that because folk removed their togas that this was a festival where everyone was naked.

**Q5:** There were some excellent answers here. However, some candidates did not respond to the wording of the question. Better responses focussed on *serious* and appreciated that, whereas the festival of Anna Perenna could be fun, it was indeed taken seriously.

**Q6a:** It was assumed by a large number of candidates that the women were putting on make up.

**Q6b:** Many answers to this question lacked any detailed link to the wall paintings.

**Q7:** This was answered well.

**Q8:** Although most candidates could identify that Sergius was ugly, not all could develop this further and show how Juvenal disapproved of Eppia's affair.

**Q9a:** Most candidates were able to select responses from the source; on occasions the answers were vague however and marks were lost through a lack of precision.

**Q9b:** A range of *other* jobs was offered. A few were linked to the source, and these were not given credit.

**Q10:** There has been great improvement in the answering of this question. Candidates who followed the instructions to consider the sources in the insert and discussed others fared better. There were several responses which achieved full marks. These used source D, E, and F and gave detail from several other named sources. All these were used to answer the question on how enjoyable life was. In addition most candidates appreciated that there is little from the women's point of view. It was clearly understood that tombstones often gave a rosy picture of women. Other sources cited were: Columella, Ovid at the races, the Amydone inscription, all from the OCR sources booklet, and Livy's account of Lucretia.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

