

GCE

Latin

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H043**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on [Interchange](#).

Further support from OCR



Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

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:

In this the second year of the new AS specification, candidates again performed well and generally showed good understanding of the Latin. Centres are to be congratulated on the careful preparation of their candidates. As last year, advice to candidates should be to think about the story line and make connections with different sections, assuming that the passage should make sense when considered overall. Students who succeed in learning the whole of the DVL obviously fare better but still need to consider alternative meanings given for Latin words and choose the most appropriate in the context. Detailed knowledge of common pronouns is also very important.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

In this compulsory translation passage from Caesar, candidates were able to follow the storyline for the most part but there were some trickier sections. Those who carefully read the introduction and kept it in mind were able to steer their way through more successfully. Students should also study the glossed words carefully before they begin. Detailed comments on each section follow:

(i) *cum Caesar totam Galliam iam quietam esse cogitaret, in Illyricum profectus est,*

This section posed few problems and most gained 5 marks. Some did not know *cogitaret* and guessed 'knew' rather than the required 'thought', missing the point that was stressed in the introduction.

(ii) *quod hanc terram videre et populum eius cognoscere volebat. subito tamen bellum in Gallia ortum est.*

Again, the majority handled this well and scored full marks. Some had to guess the meaning of *cognoscere*, here 'get to know' and many were confused about the *eius* which clearly meant 'its people' referring to *terram* rather than Caesar (but this only counted as a slight error). The rendering of *ortum est* had to suggest that war '**began**' suddenly rather than 'was waged'.

(iii) *causa eius belli fuit haec. Publius Crassus adolescens cum legione septima prope oram maritimam hiemabat.*

Here problems began for many in working out *causa eius belli fuit haec* 'the cause of this war was this'. Some did not realise that *haec* agreed with *causa* and some tried to take *causa* as 'for the sake of' which then destroyed any sense. Vagueness about the cases of pronouns is a major issue for some candidates as is the requirement to consider which form of the word given in the DVL is appropriate. The second sentence was more straightforward (apart from Crassus being described as a 'teenager' rather than young man) as both *maritimam* and *hiemabat* were glossed. Predictably some translated *cum legione septima* as 'with seven legions' but this was taken as a single major error.

- (iv) *ut in his locis inopia cibi erat, Crassus tribunos quosdam in proximas civitates frumenti colligendi causa miserat;*

Generally the gist of this section was understood and mostly accurately translated. Almost all saw that *ut* here meant ‘as’ but many did not appreciate that *his locis* was plural and a small number had to guess *quosdam*. Most realised that this second appearance of *causa* here did mean ‘for the sake of’ and connected it with *colligendi*, the meaning of which was glossed. Here it was necessary to choose the most appropriate meaning for *civitates* which needed to be ‘tribes’ or ‘peoples’ or ‘states’.

- (v) *quo in numero Quintus Velanius cum Tito Silio in Venetos missus est. sed Veneti Silium Velaniumque in carcerem coniecerunt,*

The only issue with this section was *quo in numero* which was almost universally misunderstood. Students clearly were not familiar with this use of the relative pronoun. The literal ‘in which number’ counted as a slight error as it makes little sense in English which requires ‘in **this** group/number’ relating back to the tribunes but ignorance of the whole phrase counted as a single major error.

- (vi) *quod sperabant se eo modo obsides, quos Crasso dedissent, recuperatos esse.*

Although ‘they hoped’ was clearly introducing an indirect statement, many were confused by the *se* as the subject but could mostly work out what was going on; some did not know *eo modo* and omitted the phrase and those who did not know *obsides* meant ‘hostages’ and had to guess were disadvantaged.

- (vii) *deinde finitimi, exemplo horum adducti, alios tribunos retinuerunt et, nuntiis inter se missis,*

The glossing of three words in this section enabled most to get the sense of what was happening but *horum* was frequently not recognised as genitive plural and occasionally translated as ‘hour’ which destroyed any sense; some did not recognise or guess *retinuerunt* and *alios* as ‘kept back **other** tribunes’. The ablative, although simple in itself, was often misunderstood because of the phrase *inter se* in the middle, again showing lack of awareness of pronouns.

- (viii) *promittebant se nihil nisi consilio omnium acturos esse omnesque eandem fortunam laturos esse.*

This was a challenging section and only the best candidates scored full marks here. Many took *nihil* as the object of *promittebant* rather than *acturos* and did not recognise *se* as the subject of an indirect statement with future infinitives meaning ‘they promised that **they** would do nothing’. The phrase *nisi consilio omnium* ‘unless with the advice of everyone’ confused many and even those who recognised *eandem fortunam* and knew that *laturos* came from *ferre* were happy to translate as ‘they would **bring** the same fortune’ which clearly made little sense rather than think of alternative meanings and render it as ‘they would **bear** or **suffer** the same fate or fortune’ implying that all the tribes would stick together.

- (ix) *reliquas civitates quoque hortabantur ut eam libertatem, quam a maioribus accepissent, defenderent*

This was also a challenging section and most errors arose from lack of knowledge of vocabulary. Those who did not know *reliquas* sometimes made it a verb as ‘the states left behind’. Weaker candidates ignored the case of *reliquas* and made *civitates* the subject and *hortabantur* as a passive verb rather than deponent ‘the states were encouraged’ but this was counted only as a slight error. The greatest area of confusion however, was with the many who took *libertatem* as a verb ‘to free them’ which left them unable to handle the actual verb *defenderent* which they simply tacked on as ‘they defended’ with no object. Those who did take *libertatem* as a noun handled this section well.

- (x) *potius quam servi Romanorum fierent. tandem omnes gentes maritimae legatos ad Crassum miserunt;*

This was handled well and most scored full marks. Weaker candidates assumed *potius* came from the verb *posse* and some did not take *maritimae* as a simple adjective agreeing with *gentes* and rendered ‘tribes of the maritime’, even though the gloss clearly shows the word as an adjective.

- (xi) *eum monebant ut, si tribunos servare vellet, obsides statim liberaret.*

This final section posed few problems and most scored full marks. Lack of knowledge of *obsides* was not penalised again.

Question 2

This optional comprehension question on a passage from Cicero was chosen by the great majority of candidates who generally handled it well, at least until the last three questions, and found the passage much more accessible than last year’s. Again candidates should be advised not simply to translate literally and leave it at that but to think of what is actually happening and try to express this in their own words so that it makes **sense**.

- 2(a)(i) All gained the first mark here, recognising that he went to Marcellus’ house nearly every candidate lost the second mark by saying ‘he **ate** the whole day with him’ without considering the unlikely nature of this and then going to alternative meanings for *consumpsi* provided in the DVL which gives ‘consume’ and ‘spend’ as well as ‘eat’.

- 2(a)(ii) All gained two marks here.

- 2(b)(i) Again this proved straightforward and nearly all gained two marks.

- 2(b)(ii) The majority scored five for details of the attack on Marcellus but many did not gain the last mark which had to specify that Magius killed **himself** (*se ipsum*).

- 2(c)(i) All realised that it happened at dawn.

- 2(c)(ii) The vast majority gained the mark here though some did not know *arcessivi* and had to guess.

- 2(d) All saw that Marcellus had died but many did not realise that a boy met him and told him the news and some misplaced the *paulo ante* and said ‘the boy met him a little earlier’.

- 2(e) The last two questions were more challenging and weaker candidates did not gain many marks. There were four marks available for this question where it was emphasised that 'a (very) distinguished man' (and many did not know the meaning of *clarus*) met 'a (very) cruel death' caused by 'a (very) bad man' (and many did not know *pessimo*). The fourth mark was for an accurate rendering of two superlatives.
- 2(f) This was the most difficult question but, as happened last year, more candidates could have gained marks if they had thought about what was happening and expressed it simply in their own words. As it was, many had Marcellus saving his enemies, ignoring the case of *inimici*, and not expressing clearly the irony that it was a friend who killed him (no need to say 'offered death') though his enemies had spared him.

Question 3

This question is the alternative to Question 2 and requires the translation of five sentences from English to Latin. Only a small number chose this option and most did well and showed careful preparation. Those who scored a low mark on this question would almost certainly have fared much better with Question 2. Students should not be advised to attempt Question 3 unless they have thoroughly prepared for this and can remember verb and noun endings.

- 3(a) This straightforward sentence required knowledge of indirect statement and was generally well handled. Common errors were not choosing a suitable verb for 'found out' (*cognoverunt* was required) and not making *incensum* agree with *pontem*.
- 3(b) This sentence required the expression of a purpose clause; *ut* and the subjunctive was the obvious construction and was well handled (a very good candidate chose *ad templa nova videnda*). The only vocabulary issue here was a poor choice for 'took' (where *duxit* was required rather than *portavit* or *cepit*).
- 3(c) Weaker candidates found the first person main verb harder to handle but the sentence was generally well done. Those who chose the ablative absolute for 'after my mother died' often did not make *mea* or *mortua* agree but using *postquam* was a more popular choice and generally correct.
- 3(d) This was a more challenging sentence but mostly done well. Difficulties occurred with the correct rendering of 'faster' (where *celerius* was required) and the accurate spelling of both *cucurrissent* and *effugissent*.
- 3(e) This was probably the most difficult question for those who found it hard to remember endings. Most knew that an imperative was required for the main verb followed by an indirect question but many struggled with the agreement of 'your' whether they chose *tuum* or more rarely *vestrum*. The indirect question needed to be introduced by *num* but many chose *utrum* or *si*. The required subjunctive present tense *velit* also caused spelling problems and was clearly not well known.

H043/02 Literature

General Comments:

Examiners felt candidates had performed very well in the Literature component this year. Understanding of the set texts was impressive all round, and the questions on Cicero and love poetry in particular were well answered.

Candidates must make sure to divide their time carefully among the various aspects of the examination and to apply their knowledge carefully to the question at hand. There were a number of examples of candidates mismanaging time but on the whole what was expected within the time allowed seemed reasonable and accessible.

Some answers included many extra points or huge amounts of information in 6 and 8 mark questions. This was often unnecessary and detracted from the quality of the most important points. This may also have resulted in losing good marks later on through running out of time.

There was a general problem with answering the specific question given, as opposed to providing observations which are tangentially related. The best responses sensitively engaged with the precise terms of the question, and did not try and cover too much ground.

Types of Question

1. Translation:

Translations were very well answered by the majority of candidates. Candidates should be careful with tense errors in particular.

2. Content/style questions:

Well answered overall. However, many candidates received one point where they could have received two as they did not link their point back to the question. Candidates must also ensure to use quotation intelligently: one word quotes were generally not credited, and information from over-long quotes was usually undigested. Latin quotations should also always be translated to English. Finally, candidates must explain how each of their observations answers the question on the page.

3. 10-mark essays:

These were generally well answered, and showed a real understanding and wider knowledge of the texts. However with certain questions, many candidates tended to list details instead of providing a relevant answer to the question. This was more of a problem with authors like Tacitus, where lower ability candidates simply provided historical points on the conditions of soldiers in Ancient Rome, and less of a problem overall in the poetry.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Cicero:

- 1(a) Generally very well answered, however some were careless in their paraphrasing and omitted one or more details in these lines.
- 1(b) Generally answered correctly.
- 1(c) Generally well answered. Some candidates merely listed negative things said about Clodius, without explaining how Cicero 'adds force' to these criticisms.
- 1(d) Generally translated correctly, but there was some confusion in distinguishing past tenses.
- 1(e) Generally very well answered.
- 1(f) Not very well answered. Many thought Clodius would wait 'in front of his house', for example. Many more also only mentioned the point about his house, without mentioning the 'place to which he would come that night'.
- 1(g) Generally answered well, with candidates ascribing these contrasts to Cicero's attempts at character assassination.
- 1(h) Generally answered correctly. An impressive number were aware of Asconius' account, the death of Cyrus, and references to Clodius in other speeches of Cicero. The best answers did well in distinguishing the difference between motivations and actions.

Tacitus:

- 2(a) Very well answered. Few remarked on the description of the soldiers as '*obniti*'.
- 2(b) Well answered overall, particularly from '*nihil*'. There was some confusion about the meanings of several verbs.
- 2(c) Generally answered correctly.
- 2(d) Very well answered, with a nice spread of points across the board. The best responses focused in on what seemed most affecting, rather than providing a narrative of the speech as a whole.
- 2(e) Generally answered correctly.
- 2(f) Generally very well answered. There was a nice balance of points discussing their physical violence as well as their intimidating behaviour. The strongest responses discussed both the intimidation and aggression in equal measure.
- 2(g) Generally answered correctly. Some candidates missed out on the detail that it was a night that could have 'broken out into violence'.

- 2(h) Relatively well answered with some common errors. Many candidates simply described the life of a Roman soldier in the first century, instead of engaging with sections of the text. There could have also been more discussion of the forces that governed these lives, and a more critical approach, as many assumed the innocence of the mutineers.

Virgil:

- 3(a) Generally translated accurately.
- 3(b) Well answered overall. Some were tripped up by the word '*protinus*', and so lost the sense of the passage.
- 3(c) Well answered. There was a tendency to offer very brief comment on '*mirabar*' which was rarely credited more than one mark. One of the stronger 8 mark questions on this paper
- 3(d) Very well answered.
- 3(e) Not as well answered as 3c. Some of the points here tended to be repetitive, with candidates spending the majority of their response discussing the speed of Cacus. More diversity of points and material here received the best marks.
- 3(f) Very well answered.
- 3(g) Very well answered.
- 3(h) A very well answered essay. The best responses identified key trends within the book, as opposed to giving a chronological run-through of peace and optimism. The relation of the story of Cacus to this question was impressive, as was the candidates' understanding of Virgil's foreshadowing to the Augustan regime.

Love poetry:

- 4(a) Very well answered.
- 4(b) Generally translated correctly. A number read '*patiemur*' as a jussive subjunctive.
- 4(c) Generally well answered. Many candidates noted his repetition, his tendency to speak directly to the reader, and his reliance on personal experience as a deterrent.
- 4(d)(i) Generally answered correctly.
- 4(d)(ii) There was some confusion here, as some candidates provided answers that were not taken from within the line reference.
- 4(e)(i) Very well answered.
- 4(e)(ii) Very well answered.

- 4(f) Generally well answered. Some responses focused on the intensity of the poetry itself eg saying that the girls kisses could even bowl over Jupiter, without relating this back to Ovid's emotions. Most recognised this crucial distinction.
- 4(g) A very well answered essay. The best responses grouped the poetry thematically, rather than by author, and discussed these poets' attitudes to the gods, love, tradition, and poetry itself with impressive skill.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018

