

GCSE

Latin

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J281**

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

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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 2015

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Latin (J281)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Latin (J081)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Foundation Tier)	4
A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and Domestic life (Higher Tier)	7
A402/01 Latin Language 2 (Foundation Tier)	11
A402/02 Latin Language 2 (Higher Tier)	13
A403/01 (Foundation Tier)	15
A403/02 (Higher Tier)	18
A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Foundation Tier)	21
A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Higher Tier)	23
A405/01 Sources for Latin: (Foundation Tier)	28
A405/02 Sources for Latin: (Higher Tier)	30

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. The majority of candidates seemed to have been entered for the most appropriate tier, though a few scored very high marks, and might have been more suited to Higher Tier.

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

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

Many candidates were well-acquainted with the Defined Vocabulary List, though there were some errors with the meaning of some common words, such as *iratus*, *filia* and *laetus*. The usual 'little' words (*itaque*, *tandem*, *sed*, *tum* etc.) were often not known.

Noun number caused few problems this year, but noun case was an issue for some candidates, particularly in the translation question: in the second section, for instance, *patrem* was sometimes translated as the subject of the sentence. Candidates are advised to look very closely also at verb endings when deciding on the tense of a verb.

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 *semper*, *itaque*, *tandem*, *ibi* and *tum*. Candidates should therefore be advised to check that they have translated every Latin word in the passage. With the passage printed above the space for the answer, it is an easy matter to look at the answer and tick each of the Latin words translated.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Q1: most candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though some lost one mark by failing to recognise the superlative form, and a few translated the adjective as 'irritated' or 'annoyed'.

Q2: this question was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Q3: another straightforward question for many, though some struggled with the meaning of *quid*, or offered general answers such as 'whether the rumours were true'. Candidates should be reminded to focus on the Latin in the lemma.

Q4: a straightforward tick-box question, which was almost always answered correctly.

Q5: this was usually answered correctly, though some candidates failed to offer two points about the nymph. Candidates are reminded to look carefully at the number of marks available, as well as the emboldened words in a question.

Q6: a surprisingly good discriminator, as many candidates were not familiar with *dixit*. Teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the present tense (e.g. *dixi* rather than *dico*) is good practice.

Q7: another good discriminator: a number of candidates did not realise that the pronoun *te* referred to Io and consequently lost the second mark by answering 'him' or 'them'.

Q8: as both *formam* and *vaccae* were glossed, most candidates were awarded at least one mark on this question, though a number lost the first mark by rendering *formam* as a verb.

Q9: success in this question depended largely on recognising *dare* (see earlier comment on *dixit*).

Q10: most candidates achieved at least one mark in this tick-box question, and Examiners were pleased to note that very few candidates ticked only one box.

Q11: 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).

'Argus was always watching the cow, but Io did not want to stay near him.'

Many candidates made a good start to the first section, and scored at least two marks. The first clause was usually handled well, but many candidates failed to recognise *nolebat* and struggled with the meaning of *manere*. Other common errors included the omission of *semper* and the phrase *prope eum*.

"'You frighten me," she said. "I want to find my father."

The second part of the section was usually handled well. In the first sentence, many confused the verb *terres* with the noun *terra*, which resulted in answers such as 'You are my earth'. Some candidates failed to recognise the accusative *patrem meum*, making the father the subject of the verb (see General Comments). Teachers are reminded that the testing of nouns in cases other than the nominative (e.g. *patrem* rather than *pater*) is good practice.

'And so she decided to go away. At last Io arrived at the river of her father.'

Most candidates scored at least two marks in this section. The main issue was vocabulary, with *itaque* and *tandem* often wrongly translated or omitted. Some candidates struggled with the meaning of *constituit*, which led to problems with *abire*. Teachers are reminded that a knowledge of compound verbs is required at both Foundation and Higher Tiers.

'There mooing she wrote in/on the sand, "I am Io."

Although the majority of candidates grasped the point that Io was mooing, very few recognised the present participle. *in harena* was sometimes omitted or misplaced, and the meaning and tense of *scripsit* caused problems for some.

'Then the god of the river said very sadly, "Why are you a cow, daughter?"'

This was a challenging section for some, with failure to recognise verb forms being the main issue. Other common errors included the omission of *tum*, *tristissime* rendered as an adjective and *filia* translated as 'girl'. The final four words were particularly problematical, and translations such as 'Why is my daughter a cow?' were frequently seen by Examiners.

Q12: although many candidates were awarded full marks, *servare* was often not known and translated as 'to serve'.

Q13: this was usually well answered, though several candidates confused *caperet* with *caput*, and, perhaps distracted by the meaning of the glossed verb *detruncare*, suggested that Jupiter asked Mercury to cut off Argus' head.

Q14 (a): this was answered correctly by almost all candidates.

Q14 (b): most candidates were awarded the mark available, though some included the answer as part of Q14 (a), and referred to the beheading of Argus in Q14 (b). This was credited by Examiners, but candidates are reminded again to focus on the Latin in the lemma.

Q15: most candidates selected the adjective *laetus*, though a few struggled with its meaning.

Q16: this was a very good discriminator: while most understood the meaning of *neicare*, only the strongest candidates handled *volebat* correctly, and some failed to recognise the pronoun *eam*.

Q17: another good discriminator: the majority of candidates scored two marks for *in Aegypto habitabat*, but only the strongest candidates understood *dea facta est*, with many saying simply that Io was a goddess.

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

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

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

General Comments:

Examiners considered this paper to be of an appropriate standard, though perhaps slightly more challenging in one or two questions than last year's. The standard of candidates' performance was generally high, but there were some very effective discriminators, which meant that only the strongest candidates were able to achieve full marks. There were very few marks below 30. Only a handful of candidates would seem to have been entered for the wrong tier, and may have achieved a better mark on the Foundation Tier equivalent.

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

One of the benefits of sitting all four GCSE units at the end of the two-year course is that candidates have the opportunity to look at plenty of practice papers, and Examiners were pleased to note that errors of exam technique were relatively few. This was particularly apparent in the derivatives question. However, as has been noted in previous reports, some candidates showed a tendency to provide alternative answers, using either brackets or an oblique stroke. In Q1 (a), for instance, a number of candidates offered the response: 'She was angry/irritated'. Teachers should discourage their students from doing this, since an incorrect alternative response negates the mark they would have been awarded. In addition, occasionally candidates did not read questions carefully enough, and gave a response based on Latin elsewhere in the passage, but not in the lemma for the question.

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 *capere* and *filia*. In addition, there were relatively frequent errors in confusing the names and understanding the gender of the characters. Candidates should therefore be reminded to make use of the glossary provided, noting in particular the genitive case and gender of proper nouns. Easily confused words were a challenge for some: prime examples are *tamen/tandem*, *descendere/discedere*, *num/nam*.

Candidates' knowledge of syntax was judged to be generally sound, though one or two areas caused particular problems: different types of *ut* clauses; passive tenses and infinitives; present tense of *esse*.

Noun number and case caused problems for some candidates: *loco* and *arte* were commonly translated as plural, and the case of nouns such as *patris* and *dolore* was not always recognised.

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

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

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

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Q1 (a): candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper, though a few lost the mark by adding an alternative translation of *irata* (see General Comments).

Q1 (b): most candidates gained the mark for *fidelem*, though some lost the second mark for *esse* by using the pluperfect tense.

Q2 (a): the main issue here was vocabulary, with many candidates confusing *discedere* with *descendere*.

Q2 (b): this was generally well done, though the meaning of *cognosceret* and the tense of *faceret* were not always known.

Q3: almost all candidates gained the mark here.

Q4 (a): most candidates gained at least two marks, though some translated *crudele* as an adverb.

Q4 (b): the Mark Scheme offered some flexibility with *capere*, but, even so, a number of candidates only achieved one mark for *formam vaccae*. Teachers are reminded of the importance of regular practice with all verb forms (see General Comments).

Q5: a straightforward tick-box question designed to be accessible to all candidates, and almost always answered correctly.

Q6: this was a different type of question, testing both knowledge of pronouns and understanding of the story. Examiners were impressed by the number of candidates who gained full marks, and felt that the question was a good discriminator.

Q7: another good discriminator, since only the strongest candidates gained 4/4. The main issues here were the handling of the indirect statement and the participle *captam*.

Q8: 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).

‘Argus was guarding Io so carefully (that) she was able to walk alone in almost no place.’ Many candidates found this one of the most challenging sections of the translation, and there were relatively few scores of four marks. *tam* was often omitted or mistranslated, which meant that the rest of the result clause often suffered. In the second half of the section, there were several small elements which were easy to miss, each one constituting a minor error.

‘(With) Argus was watching, the nymph was wandering around for very many hours. At last, crying loudly,’

Most candidates dealt quite well with this section, scoring at least two marks. The ablative absolute was the best differentiator here, with some not recognising the construction at all, and others translating it as ‘With the nymph watching Argus’. Other common mistakes included not recognising the superlative *plurimas*, the handling of the present participle *lacrimans* and not knowing the meaning of *vehementer*.

‘she arrived at the river of her father Inachus. There lo wrote her name in the ground with her hoof,’

This section was usually handled very well, with many candidates gaining full marks. Occasionally *patris Inachi* was made the subject of *advenit*, and some candidates were not familiar with the meaning of *ibi*.

‘in order to show who she was. Then the god of the river was overcome by great grief.’

The majority of candidates scored at least two marks on this section. Most errors occurred in the second sentence, involving the handling of the passive verb *superatus est* and the ablative *magno dolore*.

“How unhappy I am!” he exclaimed. “Surely you are not my daughter?”

Some candidates struggled with vocabulary in this section, with *quam* and *num* often not known. In addition, a number did not recognise the two forms of the present tense of *esse* (see General Comments).

Q9: this proved to be an excellent discriminator, with only the strongest candidates recognising the comparative adjective *tristiores* followed by the ablative of comparison *filia*.

Q10: most candidates achieved at least one mark, but the meaning of *peteret* caused problems for some.

Q11: a straightforward question, with most candidates achieving full marks.

Q12: this second tick-box question was answered correctly by almost all.

Q13 (a): most candidates scored at least one of the two marks, though not all recognised the present passive infinitive *puniri*.

Q13 (b): this question posed few problems for the majority, though a few struggled with the pronoun *eam*.

Q14: this was another very good discriminator, with only the strongest candidates recognising the ablative *arte* and handling *summa* correctly.

Q15 (a): another question which tested candidates’ knowledge of the passive voice (see General Comments).

Q15 (b): most candidates gained the mark for referring to Io as a goddess, but recognition of the passive *dicitur* was required for full marks.

Q16: this question is designed to be accessible to candidates of all abilities, and it was pleasing to see that plenty of candidates achieved full marks. Indeed, as in 2014, Examiners noted that the general standard of response to this question seems to improve every year. Most candidates were able to give two correct derivatives, often including an example to support their answer. A few candidates are still translating the Latin word instead of giving a word derived from it. Others are giving English words, which begin with the same letters as the Latin word, but which are not derivatives (e.g. *caput*: ‘capture’).

OCR Report to Centres - June 2015

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

A402/01 Latin Language 2 (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

Examiners were impressed with the performance of candidates this year. Relatively few failed to follow the gist of the story and well over a quarter scored more than 50 out of 60.

A feature of the translation section was the use of direct speech with first person verbs which caused some difficulty (especially *ero* and *do*).

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

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1: An easy first question, on which almost everyone scored the mark.

Q2: There was predictable confusion between *habebat* and *habitabat* and the meaning of *summam* was not always well known.

Q3: Those who identified the part of the lemma that contained the answer (*postquam urbem cepit*) often answered well. It is worth helping candidates to revise common irregular perfect tense forms (e.g. *cepit*, *dixit*, *duxit*).

Q4: This easy question was well answered, though some missed the superlative form, for which there was an extra mark.

Q5(a): The Latin was straightforward enough, but it was a good test of the knowledge of case endings. 'Allucius' was accepted as the correct answer but not 'Allucio'. Examiners traditionally give some latitude in the spelling of proper nouns, but on this occasion felt it was worth discriminating between those who recognised that *Allucio* was not the nominative form and those who didn't.

Q5(b): This was answered well.

Q6: This was a good test which required candidates to see the *milites suos* was the object of *iussit* and *Allucium* the object of *invitare*. Teachers who keep lists of easily confused words might usefully add *intrare* and *invitare*!

Q7: This was well answered. The meanings of *benignus* and *salutare* were clearly well known by most.

Q8: The tense of *liberabo* was not required, though many got it. The more common error was to omit *statim*, which was needed here.

Q9: There was confusion between the Romans and Rome, but a pleasing number new the meaning of

Q10(i): *ubi*, with its different meanings, often causes trouble, as here. Some missed the superlative form of *laetissimus*.

Q10(ii): The position and unfamiliar form of *ero* caused regular difficulties, and not everyone took account of both *nunc* and *semper*. Candidates who scored 4 marks here did particularly well.

Q10(iii): This easier sentence was handled well, though some took *puellae* as dependent on *castra* rather than *pater*, and there was some confusion between *intravit* and *invitavit*.

Q10(iv): The purpose clause here was handled well.

10(v): *volo* was well known and most took *liberare* correctly ('I want to set her free').

10(vi): *ubi* caused difficulties again but *persuasit* was well known and most handled the *ut* clause acceptably.

10(vii): The participle form of *tenens* was problematic and *manibus* was often confused with *maneo*. As at Higher Tier, many fell into the obvious trap and wrongly took *dixit Allucio* as 'Allucio (or Allucius) said'.

10(viii): There were some interesting attempts at the meaning of *ecce* and many did not seem to recognise *do* or *tibi*, but even so most got the gist here and picked up at least two marks of the available four.

10(ix): A good number coped well with the participle *superatus*, but many were misled by the *cum* and took *cum puella discessit* as 'when the girl left' rather than '(he) left with the girl'.

10(x): The last sentence had not been intended as a final stumbling block, but here, as on Higher Tier, it turned out to be one. *sic* was not well known and the phrase *omnes vincebat* ('he overcame everyone') defeated most. Only the best understood that *sua* went with *humanitate*.

A402/02 Latin Language 2 (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

Examiners were generally impressed with the performance of candidates this year. The mean score was over 50 out of 60 and, though some were confused by the part of the story involving Scipio and the girl's father, most followed the plot. Those who decided early on that Allucius was a woman must have found the story rather confusing, however.

Examiners felt that the paper overall may have turned out to be marginally easier than in 2014 but there was still sufficient difficulty to catch out the unwary and test the best.

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

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1: However much a comprehension exercise is designed to be a test of understanding rather than mere translation, examiners are looking in this section for the precise understanding of grammatical forms and vocabulary. Thus, in this question, there was a mark for recognising the superlative form of *ferocissimus* (many missed it) and candidates needed to show that they knew the meaning of *ostendebat*. For the latter, translations such as 'displayed', 'showed', 'wanted to show' were accepted but 'had', 'used' offered' and 'gave' were not, even though they made more or less acceptable sense in the context. This balance between the need for comprehension and translation is an uneasy one at times - candidates should be advised to be as precise as they can in order to show their understanding of vocabulary. Similarly, a clear sense of *summam* ('great', 'very great', 'highest', 'deepest, the most' etc.) was required.

Q2: Examiners decided to require knowledge of *quandam*, which proved to be a good differentiator. 'He had captured the city' did not gain full credit.

Q3: This question was answered well and the vast majority got the idea of eyes turning towards the girl (and thus full marks) even if they may not have seen that the girl was the subject of *verteret*. Those whose French was stronger than their Latin gave Allucius' betrothed green eyes (which were invariably stunning!) with a confusion of French 'vert' with *verteret*.

Q4: A catch for the unwary here was the form of *Allucio*. Examiners usually allow some leeway with the spelling of proper nouns but here it was felt right to require the nominative form of Allucius' name in the answer. For *principi*, 'chief', 'leader', 'general', 'head' were all allowed but 'prince' and 'emperor' were not.

Q5: Errors here were mostly limited to the form of *illum*. There was no mark for saying 'her' or 'them'.

Q6: Difficulties here were the meaning of *benignis* (those who clearly took it as some form of *bonus* did not win full credit) and *locutus est* (there was quite a lot of 'placing kind words').

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

Q8: The correct tense of *servavi* was required here as it mattered in the context - Scipio had kept the girl safe until he could hand her over to the Allucius. *servavi* predictably caused confusion between 'serving', 'saving' and 'slaves', and *redderem* was sometimes taken in the sense of 'returning' somewhere rather than 'giving back'.

Q9: This turned out to be a good test. The open-ended question required candidates to work out the meaning of the whole sentence and even those who identified the second half of it as containing the answer (*omnibus Romanis credere poteris*), often assumed that Scipio wanted to gain the trust of the Romans. Perhaps the minority realised that what Scipio wanted was for Allucius to be able to trust all the Romans after seeing Scipio's own humane behaviour.

Q10(i): The ablative absolute was often very well handled, though perhaps too many took *his* as 'his'. Knowledge of *manum* (often confused with *maneo*) and *tenens* was less secure, and candidates often chose to omit translation of them altogether.

Q10(ii): It was often difficult to establish with certainty whether candidates had really understood the word *se*, but normally they received credit for their answer. 'Would be ... in the future' was extremely common, even in otherwise excellent answers, but was credited, even though examiners wondered if candidates had really understood the form *futurum esse*.

Q10(iii): The gerundive was impressively well handled and this proved to be one of the easier sections of the translation overall. *interea* was frequently omitted, however - the omission of words like this is considered a major error (i.e. a maximum of three marks for the section) so it is worth candidates being sure of them.

Q10(iv): *quamquam* as 'however' was a common error, but most candidates got the gist of the sentence, and therefore at least two marks, even if they were unsure of its exact meaning. There was occasional confusion between *volebat* and *nolebat*.

Q10(v): This section was generally well done. *oravit* proved to be the main vocabulary challenge but the indirect command was usually well recognised.

Q10(vi): *primo* caused candidates problems, who often took it with *donum* ('the first gift'). *libenter* threw others who thought it was something to do with *liberare*.

Q10(vii): This was one of the hardest sections in the passage. The most frequent errors were taking *ante* as *antequam* and misunderstanding the meaning of *pedes* or *posito* (or both). The unwary were easily caught out by the word order of *Allucio dixit* - teachers using this paper as a 'mock' paper or classroom exercise in future might do well to draw their students' attention to it. Even the best candidates sometimes wrote 'Allucius said'.

Q10(viii): *hanc* and *quam* caused problems and only the better candidates knew *obtulit*.

Q10(ix): Most had Allucius feeling some degree of joy but *tanto* was often incorrect and the second half of the sentence was often poorly handled, with *puella* taken as nominative and *regrederetur* in the sense of 'was given back'. *domum* was unexpectedly confused with *donum* from earlier on in the story and, more predictably, the girl was said to be very happy rather than Allucius.

Q10(x): The balanced word order (*non solum armis sed etiam clementia*) here proved to be a very good differentiator. Many accounted for all the words but not necessarily in the right order. Particularly regular errors were *sic* ('if'), *armis* ('army'), *solebat* ('showed'), the cases of *armis* and *clementia*, and the sense of *vincere* (not many grasped the idea of Scipio 'defeating' or 'winning over' everyone).

A403/01 (Foundation Tier)

General comments

The overall standard of candidates' work was generally good. A number of candidates did very well indeed and would probably have been able to take the Higher Tier papers. The candidates clearly enjoyed the texts they studied and this shone through in their answers. A sizeable number of candidates resorted to guessing the meaning of the Latin, often through the derivations. Greater learning and understanding of the Latin must be a priority. The style questions and questions that required reference to the Latin caused candidates the greatest difficulty. Candidates must understand that analysis of the style of the Latin is more than just giving a translation or commenting on the content. Multiple choice questions also caused surprising difficulties. Candidates must look carefully at the Latin given in the lemma and base their answer on this, rather than guessing the answer from the context.

Comments on individual questions:

Section A

- 1 Well answered.
- 2 The multiple choice question was well answered.
- 3 The multiple choice question was well answered.
- 4 Candidates found this 'pick the Latin word and translate' question difficult.
- 5 Candidates generally found this straightforward, some guessing the answer from derivations of *clamor*.
- 6 Candidates found this question quite difficult, although the Latin words *impudentiam* and *audaciam* were known by many.
- 7 Many candidates incorrectly thought the answer was *praetor*.
- 8 As always the 10 mark question was the best differentiator. Even though the English translation is given, many candidates struggled to give Latin quotations that related to their answers. There were a number of outstanding answers that would have scored highly on the Higher Tier paper. Candidates must ensure that they comment on the style of the Latin rather than just the content. Weaker answers tended to be a paraphrase of the translation with little reference to the Latin or the style.
- 9 The 5 mark multiple choice question was very well answered. Candidates clearly had a good understanding of this part of Cicero's speech.
- 10 Style of writing is not necessary in this answer, but it was credited if commented upon by the candidate. Some candidates had difficulty matching up the English translation with the Latin text, although a fair number of candidates completed all three bullet points perfectly.
- 11 Generally well answered.
- 12 This question, which required reference to the Latin, was a good differentiator. A lack of detailed understanding of the Latin caused difficulties for some.

- 13 Some candidates tried answering this question from their general knowledge of the story. Candidates must understand the need to look carefully at the Latin text.
- 14 Generally well answered, although some candidates thought the answer was *his father*.
- 15 Generally well answered.
- 16 This question is a context question, requiring knowledge of the story. This caused difficulties for some.
- 17 Generally well answered.
- 18 Candidates found this question difficult, with a significant number incorrectly thinking that he was performing a sacrifice. The word *sacrificium* in the lemma created this misunderstanding.
- 19 Well answered.
- 20 A surprising number of candidates got this answer wrong. Many candidates incorrectly guessed the answer from the context of the story.
- 21 Generally well answered.
- 22 This was a difficult final question that only the best candidates answered correctly.

Section B

- 23 A surprising number of candidates answered this multiple choice question incorrectly.
- 24 Generally well answered.
- 25 A fair number of candidates also found this multiple choice question difficult.
- 26 Well answered.
- 27 As always the 10 mark question was the best differentiator. Even though the English translation is given, many candidates struggled to give Latin quotations that related to their answers. There were a number of outstanding answers that would have scored highly on Higher Tier. Candidates must ensure that they comment on the style of the Latin rather than just the content. Weaker answers tended to be a paraphrase of the translation with little reference to the Latin or the style.
- 28 Well answered for a style question. Candidates had a good knowledge of this section of Pliny's letter.
- 29 Fairly well answered, although some candidates struggled to express clearly what they meant.
- 30 Generally well answered. Candidates understood the Latin, but many did not refer to the style of the writing. Candidates must ensure that they understand the demands of these style question.
- 31 Well answered.

OCR Report to Centres - June 2015

- 32 The first part (*remedium*) was generally well answered, but candidates found *formidinis* more difficult.
- 33 Generally well answered.
- 34 Generally well answered.
- 35 Many candidates got one point, but only the best candidates got both points.
- 36 Generally well answered.
- 37 Candidates found this 'pick the Latin word and translate' question difficult.
- 38 Generally well answered. Some candidates thought that *stomachus* referred to Pliny's stomach, rather than his windpipe.
- 39 The 5 mark multiple choice question was very well answered. Candidates clearly had a good understanding of this part of Cicero's speech.
- 40 Generally well answered.
- 41 Candidates found this question challenging. The phrase *se dabat* was misunderstood by many.
- 42 Generally well answered.
- 43 A surprising number of candidates answered this multiple choice question incorrectly.

A403/02 (Higher Tier)

General comments

The overall standard of candidates' work was very good. They had clearly enjoyed both set texts and found the subject matter interesting and stimulating. The vast majority of candidates understood clearly the demands of the questions, and I was particularly impressed with how they answered the extended writing questions. Very few candidates failed to quote Latin when asked to do so and candidates understood the need to avoid vague references in the 8 mark questions.

One area where a sizeable minority dropped marks was by ignoring the lemma. A number of candidates quoted Latin from outside the line references quoted in the question, and hence lost marks unnecessarily. It is clearly crucial that candidates read the question clearly and don't assume that the answer can come from any section of the passage of the Latin.

There were very few really weak scripts and candidates had a good knowledge of the text.

Comments on individual questions:

Section A

- 1 Very well answered.
- 2 Very well answered.
- 3 Well answered, but occasional confusion between the tunic & the cloak.
- 4 Few problems.
- 5 Very well answered.
- 6 Very well answered.
- 7 The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. A small number of candidates didn't know the answer at all and scored zero.
- 8 As always the 10 mark question was the best differentiator. The majority of candidates understood the need to quote the Latin, translate their quotation or at least demonstrate an understanding of the Latin and explain how their quotation showed how Cicero conveyed the terrible situation. Candidates generally answered the question well giving excellent answers full of terminology, analysis and examples. The passage was full of emotive language and Ciceronian rhetoric and the candidates clearly enjoyed analysing the passage. Candidates must look to make style rather than content points where possible and the rubric of the question asks candidates to discuss stylistic features. Occasionally candidates over-generalised, or gave vague answers and accordingly lost marks.
- 9 This 6 mark style question was a good discriminator, producing a wide range of performance. Despite being a short passage, it provided a wide range of possible answers.
- 10 This 8 marker was generally well answered, with candidates giving full answers concerning both Verres and Cleomenes. As with all 8 mark over-arching questions, candidates must ensure that they avoid vague references but refer to a specific part of the text to back up their analysis.

- 11 The translation question was generally well answered, although a small number of candidates clearly did not have sufficient knowledge of the text; regular errors included: '*si possim*' translated as if possible; omission of '*in vicem*'; various incorrect translations '*iuvant*'.
- 12 The superlative was often missing; otherwise few problems.
- 13 Well answered.
- 14 Absence of '*fere*' occasionally lost candidates a mark.
- 15 The multiple choice question was very well answered.
- 16 This style question was good at discriminating. Some candidates gave the correct quotation, but failed to back up their quotation with sufficient analysis. Candidates must be sure to answer the question rather than simply translate the Latin they have quoted.

Section B

- 17 The multiple choice question was very well answered. A small number of candidates gave the incorrect answer A.
- 18 Generally well done: the most common error was the omission of 'a little' with regard to sleeping; but this only affected a few candidates.
- 19 A mixed response here; a sizeable minority did not give the crucial point about 'as if in another day'.
- 20 A few candidates gave the answer 'after dinner' but generally well answered.
- 21 The section B translation caused a few problems in particular with the sentence '*erat Miseni...regebat*'. The most common errors in the passage were '*imperio*' and/or '*praesens*'; also '*tibi*'; '*fere*'; comparatives of '*verius*' & '*propius*'; superlative of '*eruditissimo*'. Some issues with '*quae visa est ei*'; '*apparere*' was often 'had appeared'.
- 22 As always the 10 mark question was the best differentiator. The majority of candidates understood the need to quote the Latin, translate their quotation or at least demonstrate an understanding of the Latin and explain how their quotation showed how Pliny made his account of his uncle's mission dramatic. There was a real abundance of possible answers in this particularly dramatic passage and the majority of candidates made a wide range of points. Weaker candidates tended to translate the passage and say what happened rather than analyse the passage. Teachers must ensure that candidates understand the need to analyse the Latin effectively.
- 23 A fair number of candidates did not discuss word order at all, despite it being clearly asked for in the question. This question was a good discriminator. Candidates must read the question carefully to ensure they understand clearly the demands of the question.
- 24 This question was generally well answered. Latin was not required for the marks, although candidates who gave style answers including the Latin were given full credit. Some candidate analysed the very end of the section which is not included in the lemma.

- 25 This style question again discriminated well. Some candidates did not think about the style of writing, but simply translated the Latin and gave general responses that did not really show use of language. The style questions are clearly worded and candidates should understand the demands of such questions.
- 26 Well answered, although the meaning of '*ut*' caused problems for some.
- 27 Almost all candidates correctly answered the first point; 'inflamed' was occasionally omitted and some candidates thought that Pliny the Elder's ailment was to do with his stomach.
- 28 This 4 mark style question was well answered. Most candidates correctly analysed '*nonne*'; weaker candidates again did not think about the style but tended to translate the Latin only.
- 29 Occasional omission of first point but generally few problems with this question. '*conduxit*' was mistranslated by some candidates.
- 30 Generally well done, but some candidates struggled to explain the point clearly.
- 31 The second point concerning 'with great force' was regularly omitted. Most candidates got the first point correctly.
- 32 Most candidates had a good knowledge of the three Pliny letters and referred to all three letters in their answers, making specific points that answered the question directly. Vague points that did not show a good knowledge of the text lost candidates marks. There were plenty of possible points for candidates to draw on, but some candidates, perhaps because they were tired at the end of the paper, did not refer widely enough to the text, and the lack of breadth lost them marks.

A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

The entry for the Foundation paper this year was again very small and there were very few, if any, candidates who might have been better sitting the Higher Level paper. A fair proportion of those who sat the paper showed knowledge of the texts they had studied and were able to make a positive and informed response. There were, however, quite a few candidates, who left many questions blank or gave random or very short answers.

The multiple choice questions gave many candidates an opportunity to display what they knew and marks on Qs 11 and 24 were usually 3 or above. Candidates often put up quite a good showing on other questions relating to the narrative but those requiring detailed textual knowledge floored most. The 10 mark questions were also done quite well as a general rule as candidates could show some powers of literary analysis without having to battle with difficult text. Some of these answers showed a pleasing level of perception. To gain more than half marks, though, candidates had to provide some accurate reference to the Latin text in their answer. There was also a ceiling of 6 if no point of style was included. Few candidates made a wide enough range of points to access level 4.

Comments on Individual Questions:

SECTION A

- 1 – 2 Usually candidates gained some marks here though in 2b) most gave *dormire* which is outside the lemma.
- 3 The usual answer was that they were going too slowly rather than that they hadn't progressed at all.
- 4 – 5 Most gained some mark for the action of the passenger and many knew the meaning of *quarta hora*.
- 6 – 7 The sense of line 1 was quite well understood but most thought the road was rocky rather than steep.
- 8 – 9 Candidates were good at finding appropriate Latin to match the scorching wind but the reason for the 'smoke full of tears' was not well understood, the burning of unseasoned wood on open fires not being the common occurrence it once was!
- 10 Candidates found quite a few points of lively description here and were usually able to quote some relevant Latin: the 'town that can't be named in verse', *vilissima rerum...aqua*, and the varying qualities of bread were favoured examples.
- 11 Candidates scored well on this, most getting three correct answers and many five.
- 12 Many gave a good reason here and quite a few picked the correct name for the god of the winds in 13.
- 14 Candidates often used the translation provided quite well to pick out images that give a vivid impression of the start of the storm. To gain more than a few marks they must also match their examples with a Latin reference, at least in some cases, and provide some stylistic observation, though not necessarily for every example. Quite a few candidates picked out good examples and made some Latin reference. Popular choices were

cavum...impulit, the 'army column', *clamorque...rudentum*. Examiners were pleased to see references to the repeated *-que* and sound imagery in the latter phrase, alliteration in line 1, and the personification/listing of the winds. Few candidates provided quite enough points to gain the top level of marks.

15 – 16 Most managed to pick out Oronten (sic) but Lycios as a group of people defeated almost everybody. Marks were picked up on the fate of the ship and the helmsman but accurate answers to 16 were rare indeed.

SECTION B

17 – 18 These were reasonably well answered.

19 – 21 Correct answers here were relatively few and a good many were misled by *portanda* in 21 into giving 'guard the gate' as their answer.

23 – 25 Candidates picked up quite a number of marks here and the multi-choice question was particularly well done.

26 Some candidates did quite well here: they were able to match relevant parts of the translation with appropriate Latin and identify some style points. The rhetorical questions were a popular choice as was the repetition of *audit*; some picked out examples of alliteration (not the most obvious figure in this passage) and made a fair attempt to explain their force.

27 – 30 Few knew the text well enough to score marks in 27 but 28 was done well and quite a number were able to refer to offerings Nisus or his father had made to the goddess, even if they did not get the full details. In 30 a mark was gained for 'crowd' even if *turbare* was wrongly selected.

31 – 33 Candidates usually knew the answer to 31 but struggled to give appropriate Latin to match the details taken from the translation. *stridens* provided a useful example of sound imagery, onomatopoeia or (slightly dubiously) personification and the T alliteration of the final two lines could readily be identified. Candidates could generally produce at least one reason for Volcens' frustration.

34 Quite a number of candidates took advantage of the supplied translation to produce coherent and well-structured answers. The higher marks could only be obtained if they were able to find matching Latin reference for some of the points and identify some valid points of style. Typically identified were the direct speech used to threaten Euryalus, the alliteration of *poenas persolves*, Nisus' repetition of *me, me*, and his desperate appeal to the Rutulians. Few made a sufficient number of points to reach level 4.

A404 Latin Verse Literature: (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

There was once again a very good entry for this paper and Examiners were pleased to see that candidates had engaged actively with the texts they had studied and had for the most part prepared thoroughly for the examination. Whilst Aeneid 9 with all its gory details was much the preferred option there were equally good scripts for Section A where candidates moved with ease between the very different texts of Horace and Virgil. Candidates' answers across the board showed not only a good knowledge of the texts but an impressive ability to analyse them in detail.

The 10 mark questions in particular call for detailed textual analysis and there were many very good answers. Candidates not only need to pick out the details which relate to the question asked but also to show how the author's style of writing contributes to the effect. Though technical terms are not required (and their inaccurate use is not penalised) Examiners were very pleased to see such ready, precise and relevant use not merely of the ever-to-hand alliteration but also of assonance, anaphora (for which 'repetition' is just as acceptable), enjambement, polyptoton, polysyndeton and several more. Observing the figure is not enough, of course, and candidates do need to explain how it brings out the violence of the storm, for example, or Volcens' ferocious anger. There are always some candidates who offer comments based on modern punctuation: these never receive credit as it does not reflect the ancient practice and candidates do need to be reminded of this.

A small number of candidates fell into the trap of quoting a piece of Latin as an example of, say, Nisus' desperation, but failing to bring out the meaning of the Latin, whether by translation or in the course of the comment. They may have understood the Latin perfectly well but they must display this knowledge in order to gain credit. A few candidates veered off into generalised comments or comparisons with other parts of the text which may be valuable in the 8 mark questions but miss the point in the 10 markers: here it is the detailed analysis of the printed passage which gains the marks. Most candidates, though, were clearly well practised in this skill and showed a sympathetic engagement with both the content of the passages and the author's techniques.

Candidates were somewhat less happy with the 6 and 4 mark 'style of writing' questions (though as ever there were many good answers). They perhaps needed more practice in selecting suitable points, providing an appropriate piece of Latin (which may be as little as one word provided that it exemplifies the point made) and explaining how this highlights the point at issue.

The 8 mark questions ask for an informed overall response and candidates certainly relished the opportunity to express their own opinions. Examiners were interested to see such a wide variety of views. In Section B almost every possible assessment of the actions of Nisus and Euryalus could be found: all opinions were acceptable as long as they were given valid textual support. Some candidates did find it a challenge to organise their answer effectively given the wide range of possibilities. Qu 10 in Section A offered less in the way of controversy but needed to identify what it is that makes Horace's poem such an enjoyable read. Many focused not just on the amusing anecdotes but also on variety of tone and the strongly personal note of Horace's comments upon himself and his companions. Again there were many answers that were a pleasure to read, though there was some tendency to dwell on very slight details rather than on the more substantial aspects.

A brief note on practical matters. Examiners have found the standard of handwriting slightly better overall this year but there have still been all too many examples where scripts could be read only with very great difficulty and there were places where what the candidate wrote could not be read at all. Candidates should also be aware that parts of the paper do not appear on the examiner's screen and they should confine their answers as far as possible to the space provided. Additional pages are available where the candidate really needs to write more but a more concise approach to answering the shorter questions especially would benefit candidates as well as those who mark their work. A number of candidates used additional answer booklets: their use is to be discouraged as they are particularly cumbersome to deal with on the on-line marking system and in almost all cases were wasteful and unnecessary as the Additional Pages (22-24) remained blank.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

SECTION A

- 1 *modico hospitio* – a rendering of both words was needed for the mark.
- 2 Almost always correct.
- 3 A few picked *cauponibus* instead of *malignis* but most scored 2.
- 4 Most got full marks here.
- 5 Examiners accepted a literal translation of *ventri indico bellum*. 'Waiting for his friends to finish eating' was the point most often missed.
- 6 'Shelter' was occasionally given as an answer here.
- 7 Well translated for the most part. Common mistakes were missing the supines in line 4 and the superlative in line 6. Although the spelling of names was not penalised in any way Examiners were always pleased to see candidates rendering *Coccei* and *Caudi* into the nominative.
- 8 Most got this right but some spoke of corruption to the road; 'rain' was needed to get the mark for *imbri*.
- 9 This proved a testing question and quite a number of answers were vitiated by poor understanding of the lines: Gnatia being built **by** water goddesses, incense **burning** rather than melting. Good points were the polysyndeton or near-tautology of *risusque iocosque* and the personification in *persuadere cupit*. At the least, these expressions need to be translated or explained to show their relevance to the question; the best answers explained **how** they (or other selected examples) 'poked fun'.
- 10 Good answers made a number of general points and illustrated these with plentiful detail (amusing anecdote: Horace kept awake, the irate passenger, skinny thrushes, inn nearly burnt down; H's personal experiences: illness, friends joining and leaving etc) but quite a few answers contained inadequate textual reference or included lengthy accounts of the historical background (which in fact features little in the poem) There were also candidates who made too much of some vivid, though minor, detail of the text ('fishy' Bari, for instance) rather than focusing on substantial points. It is unnecessary and unduly time-consuming for candidates to repeat the question in every paragraph. The best answers were as always a real pleasure to read and it was interesting to see how candidates responded to this text.

- 11 Though there were a few inaccuracies in detail this was a well-answered question, nautical terminology being taken by most candidates in their stride.
- 12 This proved a challenging question. There does not appear to be any external evidence about Horace's own intentions in this poem and the Examiners did not require a knowledge of the history of the period (though some candidates displayed this and were rewarded accordingly). The poem, however, is entitled in the Anthology "The ship of state in troubled waters" and it is reasonable to expect that candidates would have considered whether and in what way the ship represents Rome/the state. Candidates received credit whenever they drew a plausible analogy between the ship in the poem and Rome (or any state) with an appropriate Latin quotation: 'the gods have abandoned Rome', 'the state no longer has the resources to fight a war', 'the state is being attacked by enemies' are the kind of points Examiners were happy to accept. 'Rome is like a ship without oars' would be less acceptable as it fails to explain the comparison in any way.
- 13 Quite a few candidates knew the answer and could spell his name; others made a manful attempt and Examiners were generous in giving them credit. 'Aeneas' could not be accepted, however many letters he may have in common with Aeolus!
- 14 There were plenty of good answers, the most successful technique being to select a detail (Latin + translation/sense or vice versa) and show how it gives a vivid impression, including in at least some of the instances a stylistic point. Good points for inclusion are: *cavum...impulit, venti velut agmine facto, una...Africus, clamorque...rudentum, eripiunt...ex oculis, praesentemque...mortem*. All these offer sound content points and several possible points of style and it would be impossible to go through the many and varied points that candidates came up with (all valid observations are given credit). Errors, though, included taking *cavum...impulit* to refer to the winds and taking *impulit* and *intonuere* as historic presents: no credit can be given where such misunderstandings occur. Nor is it enough to say that 'alliteration of C in line 1 emphasises the violence of the storm': more is needed than the mere observation of a stylistic point.

SECTION B

- 15 Answers were generally correct but in b) candidates would do well to follow the requirements of the question (**two Latin words**) exactly.
- 16 This was well answered, the safest method being to give a literal translation: the thought here is quite hard to paraphrase as some of those who attempted it found.
- 17 Again few problems, though taking *magnum* as a comparative gives the wrong idea and was not accepted.
- 18 There were many very good translations of what is by no means an easy passage. *et* and *ipse* in line 1 needed to be translated and conflating *incensus* with *perfurit* was an error as was taking *in medio* as 'in/into the middle of...'. *subit* floated about rather alarmingly and though a wide range of translations for it was accepted, 'killed' was not. *magnum* was usually taken with *cratera* but could equally be adverbial with *metuens*. Examiners ignored mis-spelling of the names but were pleased when they appeared in the nominative form.
- 19 There is a wealth of possible answers here and candidates found a wide variety though often floundering as to how best to present their answers. A few canny candidates managed to make three separate points out of *totum, ensem* and *condidit* though others behaved in a more expected fashion and made them (in whole or in part) one! Word choice, word positioning and graphic detail are all acceptable 'style of writing' points but candidates do need to indicate in some way how they show the viciousness of Euryalus. It

is not enough merely to observe the alliteration of *multa morte* for example. This phrase was in fact not infrequently misunderstood as referring to the many people Euryalus had killed rather than to Rhoetus alone. In line 3 only a few candidates brought out the agreement of *purpuream...animam*, usually referring vaguely and possibly inaccurately to 'crimson blood'. Examiners also accepted the adjective as describing *ensem* following the older OCT reading, though few candidates took it that way. There was a lot of uncertainty as to the meaning of *furto* in line 4 (a tempting example of alliteration) but 'theft' seems not to fit the context.

- 20 Those who identified that she was goddess of the moon, goddess of hunting, guardian of the groves, with the implication (stated or otherwise) that she would in these capacities be useful to Nisus gained the marks.
- 21 The lemma is important here and rules out answers involving flattery of the goddess. The reference is to past offerings: two details were needed for Nisus's father and two for Nisus himself; references to future intentions are incorrect and were not accepted.
- 22 Answers (unlike Nisus's spear) were decidedly hit and miss!
- 23 Most got this right, however it was expressed, but a few thought they were looking for both Nisus and Euryalus.
- 24 Again, candidates were somewhat uncertain how best to answer this question though most could come up with some dramatic points. The lemma begins at *hoc acrior so diversi circumspiciunt* is ruled out. Favourite choices were *ecce* drawing the reader's attention to the scene, the T alliteration/graphic imagery in the last two lines and the onomatopoeia of *stridens*: the details of Tagus' fate did need to be accurate, and to quote the whole of the last two lines with the comment that it is vivid imagery is not close enough for the marks. Quite a few thought that *trepidant* and/or *haesit* were historic presents.
- 25 This produced some very good answers, the best candidates offering four or more strong points for each of Volcens and Nisus. Volcens: build-up of vivid vocabulary emphasising his rage, direct speech threatening Euryalus (with chilling *sanguine..calido* and plosive alliteration), going for Euryalus with drawn sword; Nisus: adjectives emphasising his frantic terror, sudden cry, desperate call (with repetition, broken phrasing) to focus upon him, plea to kill him instead etc. Content points are entirely acceptable but not sufficient on their own to reach the higher levels of marks.

Attempts to attribute powerful emotions to Euryalus were not particularly well-judged on the basis of this passage and there was a tendency, not always inadvertent, to interchange the names of Nisus and Euryalus. Comments on the last two lines also revealed misunderstanding in quite a few cases: Nisus does not appeal to the sky and stars for help but to witness to the truth of his claim that he alone is responsible for the deaths of Volcens' men; in the final line candidates were often uncertain who was the subject and who the direct object, and took it as a declaration of love rather than a final mournful attempt to absolve Euryalus of responsibility. These defects in some answers should not, however, detract from the praise that is due to the large number of candidates who provided such a creditable response.

- 26 There were some very spirited answers showing clear engagement with and appreciation of the text. Responses were many and various and some candidates who could see points on both sides of the argument found it a little difficult to marshal their material. Only occasionally did an argument seem perverse and contrary to textual evidence. Textual support was important and was not always provided as fully as it might have been. Most candidates thought that the slaughter in the Rutulian camp was decidedly unpraiseworthy; a number took the pragmatic line that it at least reduced the numbers of the enemy; a few

raised the question of whether it might have been viewed differently by the Roman audience or under the ancient heroic code. What Virgil's own view may have been is yet another matter for speculation. Most candidates felt that some pity was aroused by their youth, friendship and misfortune in meeting such deaths, though others were less moved and felt they brought much of it on themselves. It was impossible in the space available to cover all possible aspects of this question. Provided that candidates answered the question and offered a reasonable range of points with accurate textual support they could expect to gain due credit.

A405/01 Sources for Latin: (Foundation Tier)

General

It was to see candidates attempting all questions showing that the paper was accessible to all. Much of the material to support responses was available in the Insert which candidates are urged to use fully. Careful reading of the written material will aid comprehension which is an important element on this unit.

On the whole, responses tended to lack detail. Those who responded with thorough detail scored very highly.

It was felt by examiners that a few candidates would have achieved greater success on the higher tier. Centres are at liberty to “mix and match” their entry for units to suit their candidates’ interests.

1a Candidates were able to choose phrases from source A which focused on success.

1b This question required an assessment of reliability of sources. Those who selected suitable phrases from Source A to support their point scored full marks.

2 There were some very fine answers here and candidates had been prepared well to answer this type of question. Comprehension was key here as the question focused on Augustine and not Alypius.

3 The performance on this question was disappointing. There were few detailed answers with some one word responses which were considered to offer insufficient detail. The question’s prompt was *Give details of four different things*. The few better responses mentioned a range from specific gladiators to the awning, the emperor, the raking of the sand and so forth.

4a Candidates recognised the main reasons for the steps being on the outside.

4b This question was answered well on the whole. Safety features noted were the wall around the arena, the gangways, and outside stairs

4c The key phrases in the question was *in a building like the amphitheatre*. Responses which linked an answer relevant to the building were credited.

5 There were some very good answers here displaying good analysis of the sources from the Insert though few offered any specific reference to sources beyond this. More is expected than knowledge and details must be supported with details from specific sources.

6a A generally high - scoring question though the source should be read carefully.

6b Candidates generally selected the fact that the town mouse *barely touched* his food.

7a Not all candidates selected D

7b Most candidates knew that the social division between Patrons and Clients often meant that clients received inferior food. Detailed responses gained full marks.

7c This question required careful reading of the source and was based on comprehension and selection of suitable material.

8 Candidates were often able to suggest one or two pieces of information derived from the source but finding a third proved more challenging. The prompt *three different things* made this a good discriminator.

9a There were many plausible responses.

9b Many candidates related image 2 to modern foodbanks and charitable donations of unsold food at the end of the day. However responses based on Roman life such as gaining support for elections or “bread and Circuses” were felt to be more appropriate.

10 Some enthusiastic responses could be found for this question which was clearly communicated to examiners, though the use of sources was rather limited. When sources were used this was restricted to those in the insert (D,E and F) and very few used any other which were required for the highest band on the grid. The first bullet point was ignored in favour of the second which aided the planning of the responses. It was good to see few No responses for this question.

A405/02 Sources for Latin: (Higher Tier)

General

The key to success in this unit is the study of and reference to primary sources. The references should have recognisable detail. *Pliny tells us about patronage* provides little detail. Whereas *a source tells us about Eppia and how she abandoned her children and country for a gladiator* provides detail recognisable from Juvenal in the sources booklet. In addition, examiners are familiar with a wide range of sources beyond the OCR booklet. This year the detail of sources was known though there was considerable confusion over authorship.

Very good answers were characterised by reading the paper carefully and doing what the questions required in a methodical way. Candidates should be familiar with the following:

- Make two points
- Give details
- Other sources (that is beyond the Insert)
- Using source ...

Candidates should also distinguish between *how useful* and *how reliable*. *How far* will require some balance of argument usually introduced by *however*, or *on the other hand*.

1a Better responses chose wisely phrases from source A which focused on popularity. Both modern and ancient understanding of “ticket touts” was given credit when linked to popularity.

1b This question required an assessment of usefulness. More was expected than a list of what information the source contains.

2a A few candidates did not support points made with Latin words as required in the wording of the question. Candidates were fairly evenly split as to whether Hermes or Amabilis was the more successful. Both arguments were acceptable with relevant support.

3a There was some misunderstanding here. Quite a few responses did not focus on Augustine but instead made reference to Alypius. The best responses commented on the use of language.

3b The performance on this question was often weak. References from other sources were unknown beyond authors not liking the games. Seneca and Cicero were known to have made comments on the games but of all sources Augustus *Res Gestae* was most frequently quoted in pleasing detail.

4 This question was answered well on the whole. Safety features noted were the wall around the arena, the gangways, and outside stairs.

5 There were some very good answers here displaying good analysis of the sources. Candidates were divided as to whether written or buildings were more informative. A few candidates discussed *artefacts* such as armour and sculpture losing focus on the question.

6 There was a range of responses here many offering detail of what the sources tells us. Very few assessed the reliability of the source. Many could gain credit for the awareness of the nature of satire.

7a Patron, and ex- patron were acceptable answers. The Latin *patronus* was also offered.

7b Mostly this question was handled well. More detailed responses were able to explain that the serving of different foods at a dinner party was a form of social discrimination.

7c Candidates who offered detailed references from the sources were able to score well. The question concerned the town mouse which was missed by a few candidates in reading the question.

8a This question was handled very well when usefulness was addressed.

8b A range of responses was offered as listed in the Mark scheme.

9 There were several “no response” to this question. Very general comments such as “the Romans had farms” did not show sufficient detail.

10 Some excellent responses could be found for this question showing a very good knowledge of other sources (though sadly some then forgot Source D, E and F!) However, some candidates needed to plan their time on the paper as a whole more carefully so as to do themselves more justice on this longer question. On occasions the argument lost focus and was restricted to how easily one could buy food items. Many candidates felt that a certain high end supermarket could provide most of the exotic ingredients for a dinner.

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

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 2015

