

GCE

Latin

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H043**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

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 2017

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Latin (H043)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H043/01 Language	4
H043/02 Literature	8

H043/01 Language

General Comments:

The new AS Latin language component elicited a very encouraging standard of response. The majority of candidates coped very well with this paper and Centres are to be congratulated on the careful preparation. There were few weak responses where candidates felt out of their depth at this level of Latin.

Useful advice which might be given to students intending to enter for this paper in future could include the following: firstly, step back from the passage under consideration, take time to think and gain a broad idea of what is going on so that unnecessary errors are not made through lack of understanding of the context; secondly, learn thoroughly all the required vocabulary, even the more obscure words, and pay special attention to pronouns in all the cases, particularly the relative pronoun.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1

The general standard reached on this question was high with few very weak responses. Comments on each section are as follows:

mox Romani legatos miserunt ut captivos redimerent. hi a Pyrrho cum magno honore excepti sunt:

This was handled well by the majority. Candidates had to choose the most appropriate meaning for *legatos*: here ‘ambassadors’ or ‘envoys’ was clearly required. Only a small minority gave ‘Roman legates’ and most recognised both *hi* and the passive verb.

et captivi sine pretio liberati sunt. unum ex legatis Romanorum, Fabricium, ubi rex eum pauperem esse cognovit.

The second passive verb was again generally well handled but some candidates struggled with a suitable rendering for *pretio*. The first confusion for many began with the accusative *Fabricium* at the beginning of the sentence, although taking it literally at this point worked well. Most could handle the *ubi* clause although a few had the king as the object and Fabricius making the discovery.

adeo miratus est ut quartam partem regni promiserit. cum Fabricius id vehementer contempsisset.

Here recognition of the king as subject and Fabricius as the object was clearly required although ‘he admired him’ worked. The deponent verb confused many who tried to make it passive without the necessary agent; *quartam* proved difficult and there were many quantities of kingdom offered. Most still kept up with the story line; some rendered *id* as ‘him’, showing the need for more work on pronouns.

quia ad hostes transire nolebat, Pyrrhus etiam maiore Romanorum admiratione tenebatur:

Some clearly confused *quia* with *qui* but most coped with this clause though had to guess at *transire*. The link between *Pyrrhus tenebatur* and *admiratione* puzzled many and *maiore* was often not recognised.

legatum igitur misit, Cineam nomine, qui condiciones peteret:

An 'easy' section where the only real pitfall was recognising the subjunctive in *peteret*.

quibus Pyrrhus illam partem Italiae, quam iam armis occupaverat, retineret:

This caused problems for those who did not recognise the cases of *quibus* or *quam* or the significance of the subjunctive *retineret*. The case of *armis* was often confused. More thought given to the story line here would have helped.

haec res tamen Romanis non placebat. senatores irati Pyrrho responderunt:

Another 'easy' section where the only common error was not realising that *haec res* was singular.

nisi omnes copias ex Italia removisset, eum nullam pacem cum Romanis habere posse:

Most handled this well although some omitted to put in the 'that' to introduce the indirect statement; *nullam* was often rendered as simply 'not' or 'never'.

iusserunt quoque omnes captivos quod Pyrrhus reddiderat infames putari, quod cum armis se dedissent:

Many found this confusing because they made no mental reference back to the first section and the captives mentioned there and so they had Pyrrhus being ordered to return the captives.

ita Cineas ad Pyrrhum regressus est. a quo cum rex quaereret qualis urbs Roma esset, ille respondit;

A very difficult section for many; some made the deponent verb passive. Others did not see the connection between *Pyrrhus quaereret* and *a quo*; many did not know *qualis* and so could make little sense of the indirect question

se terram plenam regum invenisse: sicut enim Pyrrhus solus in Epiro rex esset, ita omnes ibi esse:

This was the most taxing section but the best performing candidates steered safely through it. Most recognised the indirect statement but some could not handle the tenses of the infinitive. The phrase *terram plenam regum* posed problems for some in selecting a suitable meaning for *terram* and recognising that *regum* was from *rex* and not *regnum* and then making sense out of the combination; many did so but some floundered. The second part proved even more challenging as many did not know *sicut* and failed to understand *ita omnes esse*.

Question No.2

This question proved a popular choice and it was generally well handled until the end. Those who gave deeper thought to the storyline and what was actually happening fared better as might be expected. Candidates should be advised to take note of the number of marks allotted to each sub-question and answer accordingly.

- (a) This proved easy for all to gain 2 marks.
- (b) All but a tiny minority recognised the superlative here.
- (c) Almost all gained 3 marks here but a few made *qui* singular.
- (d) Another straightforward question which was universally correct.
- (e) Almost all gained the mark here.
- (f) 4 points were required here and the majority achieved this. Some were confused about the position of the writing case.
- (g) The mark scheme allowed recognition of 6 out of a possible 7 points and so most were able to attain this, although *quem de sceleribus eius ediderat* was rarely taken as referring to Nero's crimes and *abiise* was sometimes rendered as 'he was absent'.
- (h) (i) All gained the mark here.
- (h) (ii) This was by far the most discriminating question on the most difficult section of Latin but the very top candidates scored all 5 marks. Others showed little understanding and were able to make no valid points. Many gave too brief a response for a 5 mark question which clearly required an expanded answer. Candidates should be aware that the gerund may occur and while many recognised *scribendi* they did not recognise *legendi* because they assumed it meant 'legend'.
- (i) Very few were able to give a satisfactory explanation here as many took *fruit* to mean 'he did'. 'The dream came true' without further elaboration could not be accepted as it was Fannius' interpretation of the dream which was realised.

Question No 3

This was generally handled well by all those who chose it. Candidates should be advised not to attempt this question unless they have practised the techniques beforehand and can be confident of their ability to render the Latin accurately. They should remember that verbs can be required in first and second persons. The importance of correct spelling of the Latin words and very clear handwriting should also be stressed.

- (a) This sentence was for the most part well handled. A common error was to use *tam* with *timebant* but the result clause was correctly rendered.
- (b) Here the second person ending defeated many and they were unsure of the correct relative pronoun.
- (c) The indirect command construction was less well known and many used a present infinitive instead. Some forgot the first person ending required for the subjunctive verb. Many omitted anything for 'my' but those who tried it often failed to make it agree.

- (d) Many successfully used the ablative absolute; others chose *postquam* but some failed to make the past participle agree. The rest of the sentence proved straightforward but there was some uncertainty about *duos* and making it agree with *annos*.
- (e) This was probably the easiest of the sentences, with indicative verbs, and generally well done except for confusion with the tenses required, particularly with the correct future of *adiuvo*.

H043/02 Literature

Examiners felt candidates had performed extremely well given that this was the first sitting of the new specification. They had learnt the meaning of the text, had a solid grasp of the prose texts in particular and were able to write intelligent extended responses to the 10-mark essay questions.

Candidates should be careful that they do not lose focus in extended answers just because there is more time available than in F362.

The examiners would like to thank teachers for all their hard work in preparing candidates for the AS paper. Most candidates wrote with great interest in and enthusiasm towards the texts, and this at least in part will have filtered down from passionate teaching!

General points

Examiners noticed the following:

- some candidates, as always, needed to remember to answer the question set, rather than the one they wanted to answer.
- linked to that, some candidates might have been well advised to spend longer considering their answers to the content/style questions to ensure they were focused and relevant, rather than rushing through them in order to get to the essays. There is sufficient time in this examination for candidates to approach the questions calmly and with thoughtful planning.
- handwriting continues to cause concern in a growing number of cases: it is difficult to justify awarding marks where it is virtually impossible to read what the candidate is saying!
- doing the questions in the wrong order often seems to confuse the candidate, with one or two shorter questions regularly being missed out by mistake.

The vast majority of candidates attempted Cicero, rather than Tacitus. Cicero was perhaps deemed the 'easier' Latin, but it was noticeable that those who did brave the Tacitus seemed to produce superior answers to the content/style questions in particular.

There was more of an even split between Virgil and Love Poetry. Candidates overall found the Virgil more straightforward, but some of the best answers came from the Love Poetry, where it was obvious they had really engaged with their study of the three poets.

Types of question

1. Translations:

These were almost always done very well. Centres should ensure they are familiar with the new marking grids. Examiners are able in H043/02 to award a 4 rather than a 3 more commonly than in F362. This seems fairer as candidates have to work harder for their 5 marks in the H043/02 passages.

2. Content/style questions:

Centres will have noticed that there is no set requirement for style points in H043/02, and candidates can comment purely on content. However, examiners were pleased to see that most candidates included literary techniques anyway, and of course it can be easier to show how an author creates drama/persuasiveness by referring to such points.

It is still vital that the candidate answers the question set. To earn marks, candidates must 'express a valid point'. Therefore candidates who correctly translate a piece of Latin but do not address the question are unlikely to be credited.

As with F362, generic discussions of literary features (eg the purpose of rhetorical questions or the harsh sound of plosive alliteration) need to be accompanied with the more specific application of the technique in the context of the passage in order to gain credit. Candidates need to be wary of relying heavily on alliteration points, as this year examiners found quite a few examples which were debatable at best. Alliteration needs to have been employed by the author to create a specific effect, which must be clearly explained.

Candidates are also reminded that they should only make the number of points requested in the question. It is helpful when candidates make it clear what their individual points are by creating distinct paragraphs or even by numbering them; if this is not done, it is entirely at the discretion of the examiner to determine the candidate's intentions.

3. 10-mark essays: these generally gave good detail from and overview of the texts. Under the new marking grids, a 'best fit' approach is applied. Therefore it is not impossible for an essay which only discusses the set lines to achieve level 5, but the majority of level 5 answers did include material from beyond the Latin prescription. The usual other reminders also apply: candidates must remember to answer the question set in the paper, and not the one that they have prepared in class; detailed references to the text are vital, rather than vague summaries; finally the strongest essays did feel as though the candidate was engaging with the material on a personal level, and had enjoyed studying it. The last of these, of course, is difficult to 'teach', but it is worth ensuring that each and every student is able to give and to justify their own opinions on, for example, Cicero's persuasiveness or the personalities of the love poets.

Individual questions

Cicero:

- 1a) Generally very well answered, although surprisingly common how often Milo was planning an ambush for Clodius rather than the other way around!
- 1b) Generally answered correctly.
- 1c) Generally answered correctly.
- 1d) Occasional confusion between praetorship and consulship but generally answered correctly.

- 1e) Not as successfully answered as 1f. Answers often needed much more development, and in particular literary features were identified with little discussion of the effect they had on Cicero's argument. For example, there was a tendency to make statements like 'the superlative makes his argument convincing' with no further explanation.
- 1f) Answered more successfully than 1e, but similar comments still apply.
- 1g) Generally answered correctly.
- 1h) Generally answered correctly.
- 1i) An impressive number were aware of Asconius' account. There were also some lively answers which argued that Cicero's speech had considerable weaknesses in it. The best answers recognised the significance of his *narration* describing the ambush itself and the argument of self-defence being a fundamental right.

Tacitus:

- 2a) Almost always answered correctly.
- 2b) Very well answered. Candidates had clearly learnt their text, with just a handful of minor omissions in some cases.
- 2c) Generally answered correctly.
- 2d) Many picked up on Tacitus' clever word order and choice. Incidentally, they seemed more engaged with Tacitus' techniques than with Cicero's! There were some interesting comments on the chiasmic arrangement of '*bellum ... pacem*' but again, as with the Cicero, the effect of such stylistic features was not always fully developed.
- 2e) Generally answered correctly.
- 2f) Not as successfully answered as 2d, although there were some nice comments on the contrast between Drusus' commanding presence and the soldiers' fluctuating emotions. Candidates seemed less confident about picking up on the stylistic points such as the use of historic presents, and the juxtaposition of '*pavebant terrebantque*' for example. Hardly any mentioned the use of '*ingenti*' and '*multitudinem*' to describe the sheer number of soldiers against Drusus on his own.
- 2g) Generally answered correctly.
- 2h) Generally answered correctly.
- 2i) There were some very interesting answers to this question, with many showing good knowledge of the text outside of the Latin prescription.

Virgil:

- 3a) The majority answered this well, but a few lost marks because they either focused only on Evander or they did not describe what the Arcadians were actually doing.
- 3b) The majority of candidates covered both aspects of the question, ie the alarm of the Arcadians and the contrast to Pallas' boldness. The most popular points centred on the position of the words '*terrentur*' and '*audax*'. There was some confusion over the '*subito*'. Overall, this was very nicely answered.
- 3c) This was well answered, with marks lost mainly on omission of words like '*lectos*' and '*socia*'. Overall candidates knew the text well.
- 3d) This was more confidently answered than 3b. Again, there was a tendency for candidates to identify stylistic features without explaining their effect. For example, alliteration of '*caligine caeca*' without discussing how this emphasised the sheer amount of smoke and ominous loss of sight for Hercules. The best answers made some nice comments about the sound of the Latin in '*elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur*' reflecting the choking struggle of Cacus.
- 3e) Generally answered correctly.
- 3f) Generally answered correctly.
- 3g) The best candidates picked up on the notion of piety and its particular relevance to the Augustan regime, or showed awareness of the Pallanteum's place in the grand scheme of things in terms of Rome's history. Generally candidates had plenty to say in this question.

Love poetry:

- 4a) Generally answered correctly.
- 4b) Candidates seemed to struggle with the idea of Tibullus showing his piety and his willingness to make offerings to the gods. Very few picked up on the use of the subjunctive but there were some nice comments on the use of '*asiduus*'.
- 4c) This was very well answered, with omissions such as '*pomosis*' or '*ruber*' the most common mistakes.
- 4d) Generally this was well answered. A few went into great detail explaining the comparisons to the gods, but then forgot to explain how this showed Ovid's outrage. There were some very nice comments on polyptoton and the word order of '*haec tibi ... tecum*'. There was surprisingly little discussion of the chiasmus of '*cupido ... viro*'.
- 4e) Generally answered correctly.
- 4f) Generally answered correctly, although there was some confusion over the eclipse of the moon.

- 4g) Candidates who knew their poems had plenty to say on this question, and had the opportunity to express a personal view. The best answers showed awareness of the poets' other works. Ovid was the most popular choice for extended reading.

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 2017

