

GCE

Latin

Advanced GCE H443

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 the [OCR website](#).

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 GCE Latin (H443)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H443/01 Unseen Translation	4
H443/02 Prose Composition or Comprehension	7
H443/03 Prose Literature	10
H443/04 Verse Literature	15

H443/01 Unseen Translation

General Comments

In this first year of the sitting of the new paper, Examiners were generally impressed by the high quality of work. Aided, perhaps, by the full introduction to both passages, very few candidates appeared to have lost the plot. It was very rare indeed for anyone to miss the metamorphosis at the end of the Ovid passage, for example. On the Livy, candidates were perhaps also helped by the fact that Livy's Latin was slightly adapted to remove unnecessary difficulties of grammar, syntax or word order. The success of candidates can be seen in the very high mean mark for the paper (73.9) and the fact that fewer than 5% of candidates achieved a mark below 50.

Question 1 (Livy)

Q.1(i): the first sentence immediately contained some difficulties for the unwary. Some candidates missed the indicative mood of *perlata est* and therefore wrongly took *ut* as introducing a purpose clause rather than a temporal clause. More of a problem was what to do with *fama* and *rei gestae*. For *fama*, something like 'news' or 'report' was needed in this context, rather than 'fame', and all that was needed for *rei gestae* was something like 'of what he had done'. Over-literal candidates sometimes tied themselves in knots with variations of 'of the matter having been waged', but were not penalised. In the new specification, there are no longer 'style' marks available for 'improvements on the literal', but candidates should be encouraged to use natural English where it makes the meaning clearer. Here, the best candidates wrote something along the lines of 'when news of what he had done reached Rome' and were fully rewarded.

In the second half of the sentence, the over-literal stuck to the grammar of the Latin (eg 'all carried Maximus to the sky with praises') but it was perfectly acceptable to say something like 'everyone praised Maximus to the heavens', which seemed to Examiners to be the natural English idiom.

Q.1(ii): the main difficulty here was the meaning of *par* (which was regularly confused with *pars*) and the sense of *apud*. For the latter, the over-literal stuck with 'at the house of', which was taken as a slight error – the sense required was 'his (ie Maximus) reputation was just as high among Hannibal and the Carthaginians'. The best candidates got the sense of *primum*: 'then for the first time they realised ...'. *primo* taken as 'at first' was marked as a slight error.

Q.1(iii): the keys to handling this difficult sentence were the meaning of *spreverant* (*sperno* not *sterno* or *spero*), the use of *et ... et*, seeing that *duces Romanos et milites* were accusative, and spotting that *vix crederent* ('they could hardly believe ...') needed to be taken before the accusative and infinitive clause that was dependent on it ('... that there was war with the same people'). The final crux was to take account of the case of *cuius* and the person of *accepissent* ('... whose terrible reputation they had received from their fathers.'). 'Accepted' for *accepissent* (as often with this word) gave the wrong sense here, as did 'senators' for *patribus*.

Q.1(iv): *dum haec geruntur* was often disappointingly rendered as 'while these things were being waged' (but not penalised) – the natural way to take it was simply 'while this was being done/while this was happening'. The number of ships (120) caused surprising problems and *oram* was sometimes confused with *os*.

Q.1(v): the main difficulty here was the meaning of *vastata* in the ablative absolute phrase – those who took it as ‘vast’ were then struggling to account for the ablative.

Q.1(vi): Livy’s original had been slightly simplified here but this section remained a stiff test. As above, ‘received from’ was needed for *acceptis ab*, since ‘accepted by’ gave the wrong sense. Some struggled to work out why *Cercinam* was accusative (‘... from those inhabiting Cercina’) and only the very vigilant took account of the *et* (which was needed for full marks): ‘so that their own land would not be ravaged as well’.

Q.1(vii): the meanings of *accessit* (‘reached’) and *exposuit* (‘settled’, ‘landed’, ‘disembarked’ vel sim.) caused problems, as did the perfect passive form *emissi* without the accompanying *sunt*.

Q.1(viii): difficulties here were the meaning of *in insidias* (‘into ambushes’), the form of *inlati* (‘having been brought into’) and the fact that the subjunctive form of *circumvenirentur* showed that *cum* needed to be taken as ‘when’ or ‘since’ not ‘with’. Many coped very well with the concise expression of the Latin, however, and produced something like ‘since those who were unaware of the geography were being surrounded by those who knew’.

Q.1(ix): here, the ablative forms of *multa caede* and *foeda fuga*, and the indicative form of *repulsi sunt*, should have led candidates to see that *cum* needed to be taken as ‘with’. Some were unfamiliar with *foedus* as an adjective meaning ‘foul’ (it was often confused with the noun *foedus*) and the use of *ad* with *mille* (‘nearly a thousand’). Rather surprisingly, some were unfamiliar with the technical term *quaestor*, with resulted in a fair amount of ‘searching’ and not a few ‘complaints’.

Q.1(x): the key to the last sentence was to deduce from the feminine forms of *soluta* and *tradita est* that *classis* was nominative singular and the subject of the whole sentence. Seeing the agreement of *litoribus* with *plenis* was also important: ‘the fleet, having set sail from the shores that were full of the enemy, held its course to Sicily ...’.

Question 2 (Ovid)

Q.2(i): those who knew the meaning of *gratus* (‘pleasant’ not ‘grateful’) realised that the stag was the subject of *gratus erat*. The unwary missed the vocative endings of *pulcherrime* and *Cyparisse*.

Q.2(ii): this section was mostly handled well. Difficulties were the case and meaning of *liquidus* (an adjective meaning ‘clear’), the cases of *fontis* and *undam*, the sense of *modo*, and the meaning of *cornua* (intelligent but incorrect guesses included ‘garlands’, ‘hearts’, ‘trumpets’ and even ‘cornflowers’).

Q.2(iii): there were a number of acceptable ways to handle Ovid’s *aestus erat mediusque dies*: eg ‘it was hot and the middle of the day’. *solis* was predictably confused with *solus* and *soleo*.

Q.2(iv): this section was set as part of the scansion question in the hope that it would alert candidates to the ablative forms of *herbosā* and *terrā* (‘the stag laid his body on the grassy ground’). *frigus* was often wrongly taken as an adjective meaning ‘cold’ (*frigidus*) and some of those who realised that it was a noun wrongly took it as the *subject* of *ducebat* and were then forced to ignore the *ab* (eg ‘the cold let it to the shade of a tree’). Only the best saw that *frigus*, a neuter noun, might be accusative (‘he drew coolness from the shadow of a tree’).

Q.2(v): the juxtaposition of *hunc* and *puer* sadly misled many into taking them together as ‘this boy’. *fixit* was often taken as ‘fixed’, without it being quite clear what the candidate thought the boy had done with his sharp javelin. Some missed *ut* with the indicative (‘when ...’) and *saevo morientem vulnere vidit* was sometimes paraphrased very loosely in a way that suggested guesswork. As noted above, candidates are encouraged to write idiomatic English if an over-literal version might obscure the meaning, but when the Latin can be taken literally (‘when he saw it dying from a savage wound’) there is no need to paraphrase. *statuit* (‘he decided’) was often taken as a part of *sto* (eg ‘he stood’), which then made it difficult for the candidate to account for the infinitive *velle*.

Q.2(vi): this, along with the last sentence, was the hardest section of the Ovid. Not everyone realised that Apollo was sympathetic to Cyparissus: the point was not that Apollo spoke no comfort but rather ‘what comfort did Apollo not speak?’. In the following sentence, *hunc* could be taken as referring either to the stag or the boy, and there were two ways to take the *ut*: either as an exclamation (‘how he advised him to grieve for the stag lightly and proportionately!’) or introducing the indirect command after *admonuit* (‘he advised him to grieve ...’).

Q.2(vii): most got the idea of the boy making a request to the gods. The sense required of *hoc munus supremum* was ‘this final gift’.

Q.2(viii): good candidates saw that *fletus* was a noun agreeing with *immensos* (‘through immense weeping’) and that *egesto sanguine* was an ablative absolute. Almost everyone understood that it was at this point that the boy began to turn into the green colour of a tree.

Q.2(ix): the final test, apart from taking *tristis* as nominative agreeing with *deus*, was to account for the form of *lugebere* (‘you will be mourned’), to take *alios* as the object of *lugebis* (‘you will mourn for others’) and to grasp the sense of *aderis lugentibus* (‘you will be there for those mourning’). Centres who set this passage as a mock paper or classroom exercise might like to congratulate any students who get the last sentence correct: only around 10% of candidates scored 5 on this section in June.

Q.2(x): the scansion question was mostly well done. If candidates went wrong, it was almost always on the first half of the second line. Interestingly, a number tried to scan the lines as pentameters - it is worth Centres advising students that if the passage set is from the *Metamorphoses* it will be in hexameters, and that elegiac couplets (ie hexameter + pentameter) can be spotted by the fact that the pentameter line is always printed as indented.

H443/02 Prose Composition or Comprehension

Section A: Comprehension and Grammar

At least 2 out of 3 candidates selected this section, including many of the most able. To many of these the opening questions at least probably seemed quite straightforward: even so, very few mastered the entire story, and those who rushed into writing down answers without taking time to work it out properly often introduced errors right from the start. In a Comprehension exercise such as this, unlike a translation paper, a response is either right or it is wrong: answers which are close, even including many of the correct words, do not show *comprehension* of the passage and therefore do not count for marks. In Q.1, for example, the word *ceterorum* was vital: so, not just 'the [singular] army' or even 'the armies' but 'the rest of the armies' or 'the other armies'. In Q.2, Nero crosses *into* the gardens, rather than crossing some gardens; he dispatches faithful freedmen [plural] to Ostia rather than a freedman called Ostia; he urged the officers of the Praetorian Guard 'to be his allies in flight', rather than to flee to the allies – and so on. In Q.3 there was much sending of a suppliant to the Parthians, and doubt regarding whose *animos* (spirits, or minds?) were to be changed and whether the governorship of Egypt was to be granted to or by Nero or to be taken away from him. It was also striking what poor use some candidates made of the information supplied in the glossary of Names – eg that Ostia is the name a port, not a person, and that the Parthians were Rome's enemies rather than the *socii* of line 5. All this preliminary working-out takes time, but the Examiners feel that time should be on the side of the candidates who choose this option, so there should be no urgency to start writing down any answers for perhaps the first 20 minutes or so of the examination – which, for even the slowest writer, takes little time once the content of the passage has been mastered.

The first half of the translation section (Q.4) posed severe grammatical hurdles to many, especially the ablative absolute and indirect statement. These were exacerbated by serious vocabulary weaknesses, including *posterum*, *fere* (often omitted, sometimes associated with wild beasts), *excitatus* (confused with *exercitus*), *prosiluit* and *cognovit*. The phrases *cogitatione ... dilata* and *stationem militum* had been expected to be testing but deducible from the context, but if the rest was already a shambles, anything must have seemed possible. The vital thing, *in extremis*, is to hold onto what you know and make the rest fit grammatically round that, rather than resorting to haphazard stringing together of vocabulary around what is known to be improbable. The second half contained fewer major grammatical challenges, but 'he sent friendly slaves to his friends' (very common) was a travesty of work at this level, as was rough stabbing at *quoquam*, *renuntiabatur*, *complures* and *domus eorum* [NB both plural].

As said above, in a Comprehension test such as this it is vital to have formed a reasonable grasp of the passage as a whole before committing ideas to paper. This becomes especially important in a question such as Q.5, worth 10 marks, which asked candidates to select relevant points from a long part of the passage rather than individual sentences. The question 'How does Suetonius describe ... ?' was expected to promote exploration of the content – ie how Nero's behaviour illustrates his growing frustration and despair – but credit was also considered appropriate for responses which either considered Suetonius' method of delivering that effect though his style of writing or developed deeper psychological interpretations of the bare facts. Results to this large question were generally good, with few failing to include many of the relevant points, but were frequently flawed in places by faulty (probably too hasty?) reading of the Latin. Common errors were to assume that it was Nero rather than the escaping guards who tore the sheets and removed the box of poison, that Spiculus or anyone did not reply because he was dead, and that Nero actually does jump into the river at the end.

The grammar questions proved easy for some, a game of chance for others! The crucial thing about questions such as Q.6 is to read the individual words in context, not in isolation. If a translation is offered (and many did), to be sure of obtaining the mark it needs to match rather than contradict the grammatical explanation accompanying it. Too many candidates did not follow the instructions for Q.7, where an infinitive was clearly required rather than the first person of the present tense, and future candidates should be prepared to supply any of the common parts of the verb. There was the usual even split between Gerund and Gerundive for Q.8(a), and while 'subjunctive' and 'future participle' usually appeared for (b) and (c) they were sometimes marred by the wrong subjunctive tense or the invention of a future *passive* participle! Q.9(a) was an almost universal winner, though some translations given suggested doubt about how an ablative absolute actually works. Q.9(b), focusing on two tricky features within a single inseparable phrase, often elicited the instrumental ablative, the genitive of the relative pronoun, and an imperfect subjunctive, but only a minority could either explain why the subjunctive was there (purpose clause) or supply a satisfactory rendering of the phrase as a whole.

Section B: Prose Composition

The passage seems to have been very accessible to those who were well practised at this kind of thing, with only a few sections begging for more expert manipulation. Most candidates wisely aimed at clarity and correctness, though a surprisingly large number of those who tackled this option seemed to lack an adequate grasp of basic grammar or familiarity with common idioms and vocabulary. The reduction in the proportion of 'bonus' marks allocated to Latinate style in the new specification offered a fairer deal to the majority of candidates than the equivalent on the old F364 paper, putting more weight on basic correctness and allowing many more to qualify for the maximum available (now 5). The more experienced saw opportunities to incorporate some choice phrasing – *quippe qui* in (v) for example, *non dubitabat quin* in (ix), or the various possibilities for subordination offered in (viii) – but taking risks sometimes led to unnecessary errors or blind-alleys, and totally convincing versions were rare.

Common faults in individual sections included the following.

- (i) the declension of *iter*
'long' frequently not agreeing properly with *itinere*
- (ii) the accusative of *corpus* was given as *corpum* by over half the candidates – easily the most common mistake in the whole passage
movere used without sensing the need for *se*
- (iii) *magna cum difficultate*: this idiomatic phrase was not nearly as well-known as had been expected: instead many candidates resorted to something bizarre, such as *molto difficillime* 'and was pulled out': the need here for a subjunctive verb, continuing the result clause from (ii), was often not recognised

- (iv) *nulli medici* (commonly offered) was not quite the same as 'none of the doctors'
medicus: not as familiar as had been expected: many simply tried *doctor*, and there were some ingenious circumlocutions (of which *ei qui artem medicinae sciebant* was one of the better examples); as usual, the error was only penalised once, however many times it was repeated in the passage
'except one' offered a choice of route between *praeter unum* and *nisi unus*: unfortunately the two were frequently muddled
'had been warned': the pluperfect was frequently ignored
- (v) 'to beware': many did not know *cavere*, or did not sense the need for the subjunctive in this indirect command construction
'of this man' predictably led to a large crop of genitives
only a minority recognised that 'because he had been bribed' is a subordinate clause inside indirect speech and therefore needs another subjunctive
- (vi) the phrase 'to meet certain death' lent itself to a variety of approaches: it was good to see awareness of the phrases *mortem obire* or *morti obviam ire*, though a pity that the accusative/dative constructions were frequently muddled
'would be better' normally requires *esse* rather than *fore* but both were accepted: *melius*, however, caused considerable trouble
'his help': often omitting whose help it was or unsure about the appropriate person (which might be *auxilium eius* or *ab eo*, but hardly *suum*)
- (vii) 'medicine which': frequently *quem* or *quod*
good to see many reversing the clauses here in order to present them in the order of events (*medicinam, quam ... obtulit, bibere coepit*), or using a participle (*medicinam, sibi a medico oblatam, bibere coepit*)
'him', as it refers back to the subject (Alexander), should strictly be *sibi*: however, as *sibi* is itself ambiguous, *ei* was equally acceptable
- (viii) *simul* and *eodem tempore* were equally acceptable, though the first is ambiguous
'handed the doctor' frequently lacked the dative, and many could only find *dare*
lots of scope here for neat subordination using participles (eg *vultum eius eam legentis spectabat*), but sorting out the right agreement often tied candidates in knots, and there were some improbable versions of 'his face' such as *suam faciem*
use of *dum* conventionally requires the present tense, but the (rarer, but attested) imperfect was also allowed
- (ix) *certus erat* was a safe way of handling 'he was sure' – but many then spoiled this by continuing with *ut* + subjunctive rather than accusative + infinitive; a tiny few seized the chance of a lifetime to use *non dubitabat quin*, and *pro certo habebat* was another pleasing turn of phrase that occasionally appeared
perhaps the second most striking error in the passage (after *corpum* – see above), made even by many otherwise very competent candidates, was to fail to supply the dative with *credere*.

H443/03 Prose Literature

General Comments

Centres are to be congratulated on preparing candidates to produce much work that was very impressive in the light of the challenging new specification. This year, candidates were asked to give responses on four set texts in one exam series. In addition, the new format of the paper meant that there was an emphasis on the understanding and analysis of literature, seeing that unseen translation skills were not examined in H443/03 (as they were previously in F364). The most popular combination of set texts was a mixture of Cicero and Tacitus, though a significant number of Centres opted to stay with the same author for the two years of the course. Candidates choosing Seneca were in the minority, perhaps less than 10%.

Low-tariff questions were answered well on the whole, though some of the questions which required some background knowledge beyond the mere translation of the text posed a number of challenges. Candidates should be attentive to the number of marks credited for such questions as an indication that some analysis or essential background information is required above and beyond a translation.

15-mark responses were usually well produced as this style of question is familiar to Centres. In general, candidates are advised to avoid vague, generalising introductions and repetitive conclusions, which are unlikely to attract any credit. Additionally, candidates should ensure that appropriate Latin quotations with accurate translations are provided, and that literary features are clearly explained rather than identified as being emphatic with no deeper analysis. Points should be taken across the whole of any given passage, and a simple narrative re-telling of the lemma is to be discouraged. Ellipsis is also to be discouraged, as Examiners need to see that quotations are being accurately translated, particularly if some literary device is referred to in the quotation.

The focus on literature included a 20-mark essay question, which produced some very detailed and impressive responses. While Centres are to be applauded for such preparation, many candidates did not produce the detail and depth of analysis required to access the top levels of marks. Furthermore, Centres need to be aware that the specification requires candidates to write these essays based on the Group Two texts (both the prescribed Latin sections and the reading prescribed in English). For more detailed comments, please see Section C below.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- Q.1(a) The question was answered well by the majority of candidates. Marks were lost when candidates translated “Roma” as “to Rome” and not “from Rome”.
- Q.1(b) Translations were mostly excellent, with omissions of words (eg *iam*, *quidem*) being the main problem.
- Q.1(c) This four-mark question was looking for four clear comparisons between Clodius and Milo. Most candidates had no problems here, though a few wasted some time with lengthy stylistic analyses, which were not required. Candidates would have been better advised to make the four comparisons more explicit, as Examiners often had to dig around to find the exact comparisons.
- Q.1(d) Candidates are reminded to check carefully the lemma to be analysed, as many candidates disregarded the fact that the passage for analysis begins with *statim*. The

best responses produced Latin quotations with accurate translations, which were carefully chosen to demonstrate how these show the encounter to be exciting. Candidates achieving lower levels of marks tended to simply repeat the narrative without explaining how the content is exciting. In some cases, such candidates listed stylistic features with no explanation of how they make the passage exciting. The best responses avoided a narrative-style re-telling of the passage by identifying appropriate stylistic features or by analysing content with insight.

Q.2(a) Most candidates were able to state that this is a reference to the lunar eclipse, while fewer candidates were able to explain the *inclinatio*, namely the negative effect the eclipse had on the mutineers.

Q.2(b) This question was answered very well.

Q.2(c) This question was also answered very well.

Q.2(d) This translation was carried out very accurately.

Q.2(e) The passage was analysed well by most candidates. It was pleasing to see accurate translations of Latin quotations, which showed Drusus and the soldiers in an unfavourable light, though in some cases many Latin quotations were utilised but left untranslated or even without a paraphrase. Some candidate gave too much emphasis to discussions on either Drusus or the soldiers instead of giving more equal weight to both parts of the question.

Section B

Q.3(a) Almost all candidates knew that Milo freed his slaves, and most were able to explain how this meant they would not have to be compelled to give evidence.

Q.3(b) This question required the knowledge that Appius now owned the slaves, and furthermore demanded and insisted on them being interrogated, a fact, which Cicero claims, is not going to lead to reliable evidence. Few candidates achieved full marks in this question either because they did not know Appius inherited the slaves, or because they were unaware, that such essential background information was required to answer the question fully.

Q.3(c) Very few candidates achieved full marks on this question. Most recalled the Bona Dea incident and how this brought Clodius near to the gods for one mark but were unable to explain the idea that a master's slaves were only used for evidence relating to him in cases where religious rites were violated, a fact which in the current situation makes Clodius look like a god! Again, this question required a knowledge of the background necessary to understand the text. A simple translation of the lines is not enough to explain the humour. This was a challenging question, which helped to differentiate candidates at the higher levels.

Q.3(d) Generally this translation was carried out accurately, though marks were lost through omissions of words, especially *de servo* or *in reum* in the last sentence, and with *dominis* often being taken as a genitive. Often the comparative form of *tristius* was missed.

- Q.3(e) The passage offered much scope for explaining how it is stirring. Some weaker responses were focussed on recounting much of the passage in English with little reference to the Latin. In a very few cases, candidates thought that Milo and Titus Annius were different people. The passage to be analysed here (p7 of the exam) was from *pro Milone* 77. A few candidates seemed to think that the passage on the previous page (*pro Milone* 58–59) could also be analysed. Candidates should be attentive to restricting their responses to the required passage or lemma.
- Q.4(a) Most candidates were able to gain two marks here simply by translating the relevant lines. The best responses were able to translate the content and then explain exactly how such comments from Haterius and offended Tiberius, eg that Tiberius was eager to exercise authority but wanted to maintain the charade that he was not doing so. This question was a good differentiator at the highest levels.
- Q.4(b) The translation was completed very accurately by most candidates. The most common error was to take *expostulatione* as being in the dative case.
- Q.4(c) The clear majority of candidates knew this was Livia.
- Q.4(d) Many candidates knew this was a reference to the suppression of the other mutiny in Germany, though quite a few confused this with the one in Pannonia.
- Q.4(e) Most responses here were excellent.
- Q.4(f) Most candidates answered this very well. Weaker responses were not attentive to explaining how stylistic features serve to make the passage more vivid and were content to stockpile features with little analysis in their responses. Other weaker responses again were limited to a mere re-telling of the narrative.
- Q.5(a) Most candidates answered this very well, with the best responses bringing to the fore the analytical conclusion that Baiae was disreputable or for reprobates, and not simply translating the relevant lines.
- Q.5(b) Most candidates translated this very well indeed. The most common error was with regard to *in unam noctem* (“for one night” and not “in one night”).
- Q.5(c) Most candidates were able to explain Alexander’s comments, but fewer went on to make the precise comparison to philosophy’s demand for time, and the fact that philosophy gives spare time rather than receives it.
- Q.5(d) Most responses to this question were impressive. Weaker responses tended not to directly answer the question about how the passage is made vivid by Seneca.

Section C

General Observations

This was a new type of question to which there was nothing similar on the legacy paper for prose literature. Many superb responses impressed Examiners, yet many marks were in Level 3 and this indicates that these questions are an area of development for most Centres. Even many otherwise excellent candidates produced responses, which were below what was expected. In most cases, this may be due to Centres being not yet familiar with the level of response required, although in a sizeable number it was clear that candidates who spent excessive amounts of time answering 15-mark questions did not have enough time left to dedicate to the 20-mark question.

The questions in Section C should be answered on the basis of the Group 2 texts studied both in Latin and in English. A few candidates attempted to complete a question based on the Group 1 text, which they had studied. While some use of the Group 1 texts can be permitted on the grounds that it shows wider historical and background knowledge, such candidates nevertheless tended to show only some knowledge of the required texts and achieved marks in Level 3. Some candidates, while answering a question based on the Group 2 Latin texts, did not show evidence of reading the prescribed English texts. Such candidates thus tended to show detailed but not very detailed knowledge and so achieved marks in Level 4. Centres should carefully explain to candidates the groups of texts on which they need to base their responses.

Examiners were looking for a very detailed knowledge of the prescribed set texts and for excellent analysis in which appropriate facts were selected to answer the specific question. The best candidates offered analyses of key terms and the parameters of their discussion eg clear demarcations of what evidence is being used to show passion and what to show prejudice in Q.6, or what constitutes failure in Q.7.

Marks were granted to candidates who could produce evidence from the social, cultural, and historical context where relevant. For example, discussion about Cicero's exile instigated by Clodius was relevant to explain why Cicero may be prejudiced against Milo, as were points about Tacitus' bias towards exposing failure due to his own experience of Domitian's reign, or about Seneca's activities during Nero's reign. It should be stressed however that this is a literature paper, and extended displays of historical knowledge cannot compensate for a lack of knowledge of the prescribed literature. It is also worth noting that many candidates achieving the highest levels did not necessarily introduce such historical background. A few candidates also introduced quotations from scholars they had read in secondary literature. Such quotations may gain credit if they introduce relevant historical background, but it should be stressed that quotations from scholars is not a requirement in Latin Prose Literature papers.

Q.6 Many responses to this question were excellent and it was pleasing to see candidates marshalling evidence from the set texts to show the politics and prejudice in the speech as well as the reasoned arguments. The best candidates carefully collected evidence to show the political background of the case (eg the political rivalry between Clodius and Milo, the role of Pompey) and the role of prejudice (eg Cicero's incessant blackening of Clodius's name and recalling his involvement in the Bona Dea affair) as well as the reasoned arguments (eg the location and timing of the attack). Weaker responses tended to deal excessively on the nature of the attack on the Appian Way, or indeed to go into excessive historical accounts about Milo, Clodius, and Cicero, which displayed little knowledge of the speech as a work of Latin literature.

Q.7 Many responses were excellent here. Candidates at the top level were able to deal with the successes or failures of Augustus, Tiberius, Livia, Drusus, Germanicus, the senators etc. Candidates achieving lower levels tended to focus too much on one area eg Tiberius in the Senate, almost as if the essay were asking for an analysis of Tiberius's character. Higher levels of analysis, as well as selecting very appropriate content to answer the question, debated what failure meant – eg the success of Livia and Tiberius in gaining power was simultaneously a failure of Republican ideals or of the Senate to challenge Tiberius. Moreover, candidates at the higher levels displayed a very detailed knowledge of the required English texts dealing with Germanicus and the German mutiny, whereas lower ability candidates were content with stating that Germanicus successfully or unsuccessfully managed the whole affair.

- Q.8 Most responses were very impressive. Candidates displayed a perceptive knowledge of the character of Seneca eg his care to foster philosophy, his self-deprecating humour, his admirable death scene in Tacitus or perhaps even the less likeable self-publicising there. Many candidates explored the complexity of his character as showing much to like but also dislike. Most candidates had no problems using the evidence of the prescribed reading from Tacitus to answer the question, as well as drawing on relevant context eg Seneca's wealth and how this may contradict his Stoicism. Candidates could have improved responses to this question by giving clearer expositions of Seneca's philosophical tenets rather than simply stating that he tried to make philosophy accessible or foster its relevance without giving specific examples of his teachings.

H443/04 Verse Literature

General Comments

Consistent with recent years and the previous specification, there were many good candidates for this paper, performing well across the range of questions and texts.

The most popular choice of texts was Virgil, both in Group 3 and in Group 4. However, many Centres chose to combine a study of elegy in Group 3 with Virgil in Group 4. A smaller number of Centres chose to study Ovid's *Heroides*, mostly in combination with Virgil Book VIII in Group 3. Overall performance and outcomes across the range of choices were very similar.

It was encouraging to see a good overall standard of responses to 15-mark commentary questions. Knowledge of the texts was generally strong. The majority of candidates still favour a chronological approach in their answer, but those who took a thematic approach generally demonstrated an insightful overall understanding of the passage and how it created its effects. Encouragingly, very few candidates took an entirely narrative approach in their answer. However, some candidates did not help themselves by quoting huge chunks of text verbatim, revealing good, basic knowledge, but distracting themselves from focusing on the key skill of analysis. Others used ellipses to refer to a large section they wished to discuss, but thus did not demonstrate that they could identify and demonstrate the precise details that made or consolidated their point. Not all candidates translated the Latin which they had quoted or simply paraphrased it, a risky strategy that works only if their evaluation can still demonstrate a clear understanding of how the effect is made. In construction of arguments, many candidates wasted time by repeating the question (or its key terms) at the end of every paragraph (in both these 15-mark questions and in the essay), apparently believing that they needed to 'link back to the question'. This is not only not necessary but can in fact disadvantage candidates: by saying 'thus creating sympathy for Pallas' every few lines, for example, the candidates not only waste time but, worse, often are lulled into the mistaken belief that this is sufficient in itself to develop or evaluate the point that they have made, without them adding anything further to demonstrate precisely *how* the text they have quoted achieves this. Good evaluation of the meaning of the Latin is key to achieving marks of the highest level. It was encouraging to see less reliance on alliteration in answers, except, of course, where it was genuinely appropriate in an answer. There is, however, still a tendency in lower ability scripts to find an excessive reliance on technical terms, with students sometimes making claims for a technical device that are completely unrealistic, eg 'Virgil uses chiasmus, which tells us that he is really angry at this point'. A useful maxim for candidates would be 'Style is the handmaiden of content', ie that words convey the majority of meaning and that most stylistic devices add little more than emphasis (*important* emphasis, but the effect of it should be argued as such). There are certain devices on which excessive reliance is still apparent in lower ability scripts: some candidates are still identifying hyperbaton more often than appropriate, and likewise overusing 'mimetic word order' and 'tricolon'. Many candidates are also misusing the word 'caesura', unaware that this term applies simply whenever there is a break between words within a foot, a frequent and normal occurrence; references to a significant caesura may, of course, sometimes be relevant, but they will need to be articulated more carefully. Likewise, candidates should not refer to 'commas', as punctuation is a modern editorial addition and not original to the Latin text. To conclude, however, there were very few very lower ability scripts and some candidates packed their answers full of really solid analysis.

A minor, but important point on the topic of presentation: some candidates are creating extreme difficulty for markers with handwriting that is virtually illegible, even though Examiners have half an idea that words to expect. Sometimes it is beautifully neat, but still illegible, sometimes not so! Similarly, a few scripts with multiple continuation booklets were hopelessly jumbled, relying on the alertness and goodwill of the Examiner. Avoidance of these issues is in the interests of both Examiners and candidates alike: however hard Examiners try, some marks will be lost if words cannot be read.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

- Q.1(a) Generally well answered
- Q.1(b)(i) Generally well answered; marks were lost mainly due to candidates putting 'grandfather' rather than 'great-grandfather'
- Q.1(b)(ii) Generally well answered
- Q.1(c) Marks were mainly lost by omission of words, eg *per artem*. Candidates should always check that they have translated everything.
- Q.1(d) Generally well answered, but a number of candidates did not make it clear that the Rutulians threatened both the Trojans AND the Arcadians, *gens eadem quae te... insequitur*.
- Q.1(e) Candidates generally engaged well with this question. Many candidates made the discerning remark that Evander references himself both as a king and as a father in lines 2–3, showing respectively how far from his own exalted position he is prepared to abase himself and the precise reason for his desperation. A few candidates also made the very nice observation that the love Evander feels for his son causes him to lose sight of the fact that he opened his prayer with an address to the gods (and later Fortune), instead switching at the end of his speech exclusively to his address of Pallas himself (lines 10–12), a clear sign of his distress. The most common weaknesses in candidates' answers related to lines 3–5, which were frequently glossed over with little more than 'there is a tricolon of *si* clauses', and line 9, *dum ... dum curae ... futuri*, where candidates either glossed over the clauses with the simple citation of a tricolon or did not always understand Evander's point. For the top marks, candidates need to comment on the whole passage, including the effect of Evander's collapse at the end.

Question 2

- Q.2(a) Generally well answered.
- Q.2(b) Generally well answered.
- Q.2(c) Most candidates correctly referred to 'good deeds'. The most common mistake was mistranslating it as 'things done well', which was not appropriate to the context.
- Q.2(d) Most candidates answered well, recognising the importance of the reference to 'slow Amor'.
- Q.2(e) Generally well answered.
- Q.2(f) Candidates generally engaged fairly well with this question. Many candidates referred to Ovid's repeated use of rhetorical questions, but not so many discussed the unspoken answers each assumed and thus stopped short of fully demonstrating precisely *how* the frustration was communicated. Encouragingly, only a very few candidates showed a poor knowledge of the domains of each of the gods mentioned in lines 3–8. Disappointingly, however, an equally small number of candidates observed that in each couplet one of the gods is described in terms of love/fertility/poetry, whereas the other is described with clear martial overtones (eg *pharetratae virginis*), thus reinforcing the analogy to Ovid's situation with Cupid forcing him to abandon epic in favour of love elegy. Significant numbers of candidates mistranslated *ambitiose* in line 10 as an adverb, whereas the metre dictates it must be vocative.

Question 3

- Q.3(a) This question produced some really higher ability answers, with the best candidates commenting on the descriptions of Pallas as he weakens and the proud arrogance of Turnus, the impact of the anaphora of *tot ... totiens*, of the plosive sound of *pectus perforat*, of the description of the ground as *hostilem*. Some candidates interpreted Turnus's rather ambiguous words, *qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto*, as a show of kindness by returning the body, whereas the majority understood them to be cruelly sarcastic. A disappointing number of candidates considered the impact of Turnus's closing remark, *haud illi stabunt Aeneia parvo/ hospitia*, which reveals poignantly that Turnus killed Pallas as payback for an act perceived not as Pallas's crime, but Evander's, and yet an act which would normally be considered virtuous.
- Q.3(b)(i) Generally answered well.
- Q.3(b)(ii) Most explanations for this were reasonable.
- Q.3(c) *potitus* was a frequent omission, as was *magno*, which some candidates tried to apply to *Turno*. The middle two lines, *nesciasecundis!*, caused the most problems.
- Q.3(d) Most candidates answered this well.

Question 4

- Q.4(a) Almost all candidates answered correctly.
- Q.4(b) Disappointingly, there were a number of content-based answers with little focussed on style. Some candidates also seemed to misunderstand the points Tibullus is trying to make. However, equally there were some very discerning answers, making reference to the negative effects of the advent of navigation, of overseas trade and of the greed motivating both. Good answers also referred to the greater sense of security in the previous age and of the natural bounty gained without effort or cares. Most candidates rightly stressed the freedom from war emphasised in line 11, though not many discussed the impact of line 12 and its clear allusion to the Iron Age.

The final two lines were not part of the *lemma*. However, many candidates made good points using these lines. No candidate was disadvantaged by not referring to these lines, but credit was given when they were used effectively.

- Q.4(c) Generally well answered.
- Q.4(d) Many candidates gave literal translations, for which credit was given. However, it was pleasing that some candidates took the time to consider the question as asked.
- Q.4(e) Well answered.

Question 5

- Q.5(a) Generally well answered.
- Q.5(b) The most common error was a mistranslation of '*forem*'. Most candidates showed some awareness of Medea's reputation, but not in any great detail, which was disappointing.
- Q.5(c) Disappointingly, many candidates seemed not to get to the heart of the passage and again, there seemed to be a general lack of awareness of the 'Medea' tradition and its significance in this passage.
- Q.5(d) Generally answered well. A minority of candidates seemed to reveal rote learning of a translation without awareness of its correlation with the text, by translating beyond the requirement to the end of line 6.
- Q.5(e) Mostly well answered.
- Q.5(f) Very few candidates showed adequate knowledge of the mythological background and the involvement of Cronos in Jupiter's history in Crete.

Essay 6

The strongest responses demonstrated the candidates' awareness of the historical and/or literary contexts and that the issue in question is addressed by the gods, by some of the characters and by Virgil himself, as per the mark scheme. However, weaker responses resembled too closely the 'endless catalogue of slaughter' essay, without any real reflection on the 'glorification' of war. A surprising number of answers contained many factual misrepresentations of the text, eg who killed who, etc.

Essay 7

There was a broad spectrum in the quality of answers, ranging from those who misunderstood what 'sincere' means - interpreting it as an invitation to discuss fidelity and faithfulness - to those with a good awareness that some poets may provide an window into their own heart, whereas others keep the reader emotionally at arm's length, adopting a literary persona and/or playing with literary conventions. The best answers recognised that the reality is rarely black and white, but shows shades of grey, namely that each of the poets in question show some variation in their presentation of themselves. Candidates who misunderstood the meaning of 'sincere' were given credit for their knowledge of the texts and for as much evaluation as could be deemed relevant.

Essay 8

The best responses mentioned something about the social context and the expectations of women in the ancient world or made mention of the fact that the text is entirely told from a woman's point of view but written by a man. Weaker essays took a very narrative rather than evaluative approach or did not give a balanced and in-depth analysis of both women and men. A disappointing number of responses did not include sufficient detail to support arguments.

Conclusion

The Examiners wish to congratulate both candidates and teachers on the depth of their preparation for this new specification. Particularly impressive was the widespread knowledge of the prescribed texts. Many an essay/analysis also showed an impressive engagement with the texts, which suggests that Centres are successfully passing on the preservation of the classical world into many safe sets of hands.

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

