OCR

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

LATIN

H443

For first teaching in 2016

H443/03 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 3 series overview

This year's prose texts continued to assess candidates' knowledge and understanding of texts from Cicero, Tacitus, and Livy. Performance was by and large very pleasing. Centres have become more aware of the need for developed analysis in 15-mark response questions: quoting a meaningful portion of Latin, then translating and discussing it in order to answer the question. Twenty-mark responses were done well, with candidates showing good analysis skills focused on the question set and not simply listing facts. Fewer candidates seemed to run out of time in the 20-mark responses than in previous years. Overall, Cicero and Tacitus were the most popular texts, but once again Livy proved to have a substantial number of entries.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
- accurately translated the portions of the texts in 5-mark questions - produced insightful responses to 15-mark questions by providing relevant evidence from the Latin texts and detailed discussion of relevant literary devices 15-mark responses were focused on the question being asked, e.g. how the passage is 'dramatic', etc. - had an excellent knowledge of the set texts (including the ability to translate the Latin accurately) - responded to 20-mark essay questions with sustained arguments leading to convincing conclusions based on a detailed knowledge of the texts.	- lacked sufficient knowledge of the texts and were unable to translate the 5-mark portions accurately - produced undeveloped analysis in 15-mark responses, often retelling the narrative with English paraphrases, or picking out isolated words with obvious English derivations but which did not show knowledge of their context in the passage - had very curtailed answers in 20-mark responses with a limited knowledge of the texts, or very unstructured arguments.

Section A overview

Both Cicero and Tacitus were equally popular options, and both questions produced excellent levels of understanding and analysis.

Question 1 (a)*

1　Read the following passages and answer the questions.

(a)* How does Cicero make this a dramatic account of events?

　　　You should refer **both** to the content **and** to the language of the passage.　　　**[15]**

Candidates had a good knowledge of the narrative here. The most successful responses were able to capture the drama in this scene rather than simply narrating what happened in a linear progression through the passage. For example, successful responses saw candidates reference the feeling of anticipation after Aulus Aurius' threat to Oppianicus, a threat which was then realised after the dramatic announcement that Dinaea's son had been killed. A large number of candidates confused (*nomen*) *del<u>a</u>turum* (report, denounce) with *del<u>e</u>turum*, resulting in many statements that Aurius would destroy Oppianicus.

Exemplar 1

		Cicero then describes the reaction to his death:
		"non solum propinquorum, sed etiam omnium
		larinatium odio Oppianico, et illius adulescentis
		misericordia commoventur" (not only the relatives
		but also all of the people of Larinum were

		strongly moved by hatred of Oppianicus and
		by pity for that young man). The adversative
		particles "non solum" and "sed etiam" (not only,
		but also) create an overwhelming sense of
		the number of people affected; and the passive
		verb "commoventur" (strongly moved) suggests
		they were overcome with emotion. This creates
		a dramatic image of an outpouring of anger
		and grief.

> This candidate has produced an excellent point. A meaningful clause in Latin has been produced as evidence of the dramatic nature of the passage, and an accurate translation is given. The evidence is carefully directed to showing the drama in the passage. Relevant literary features are identified, and their effect is noted.

Question 1 (b)

(b) In lines 1–2 (*acervatim … perveniam*), what does Cicero state he is now going to do? **[2]**

> This was generally well done, but some candidates merged the two points together by saying something to the effect that Cicero intended now to cover quickly the rest of the points more relevant to Cluentius, and thus not distinguishing what Cicero is going to do clearly enough.

Question 1 (c)

(c) *vos … damnatum* (lines 2–6): according to Cicero, what are his intentions in this case? **[3]**

> Responses generally displayed the points listed on the mark scheme, although some candidates did not explain the second point with enough accuracy, i.e. that Cicero is trying to show that jurors in the previous trial in 74 BC were not bribed by Cluentius. Some vaguer responses merely stated that the jury was not corrupted, without any clear indication of what trial this was and by whom this corruption was alleged to have been perpetrated.

Question 1 (d)

(d) Translate *qui uxori … mortua est* (lines 6–9). **[5]**

> A very accessible passage which candidates comfortably translated.

Question 1 (e)

(e) *et ad hanc … fuerunt* (lines 9–11): what makes Cicero so certain that Cluentia was murdered? **[2]**

> This question was well answered.

Question 2 (a)*

2 Read the following passages and answer the questions.

(a)* How does Tacitus make this a vivid account of the first steps in Sejanus' plot?

You should refer **both** to the content **and** to the language of the passage.   **[15]**

Candidates produced many excellent responses which highlighted the vivid nature of Sejanus' scheming. In a notable number of responses, *pellexit* ('he enticed') was mistranslated as 'he drove' Livia to adultery. The passage was rich in style points and candidates were able to explain these very well.

Exemplar 2

> Next we move on to a discussion of Sejanus' choice of target: Drusus. We are told that he 'ferebatur' (was carried) against Sejanus 'recenti ira' (by a recent rage). This vividly captures the tensions within the imperial household and Sejanus and sets the scene for further drama. Moreover, the chiastic arrangement of 'impatiens aemuli' (impatient of a rival) and 'animo commotior' (more agitated in spirit) emphasises Drusus' rashness and hatred against Sejanus. Stylistically, 'verberaverat' (struck) is a strong word choice and not commonly used by Tacitus. Together with the chiasmus and description of the quarrel above, this vividly portrays Drusus' hostility, giving a good reason for Sejanus to begin with Drusus.

The candidate has succeeded in tailoring a piece of evidence towards directly answering the question about how vivid the passage is. There is ample quotation of Latin which is embedded in the context of the overall narrative. The candidate has identified relevant stylistic features and given some development of their effect. The development (especially when explaining a chiasmus) could have been improved by explaining why the coming together of the two B words (or alternatively the separation of the A words) helps make the animosity of Drusus more vivid.

Question 2 (b)

(b) What prompted Tiberius to write this letter?   **[1]**

There were almost no problems here.

Question 2 (c)

(c) Translate *ad ea … derigenda* (lines 1–5). **[5]**

A relatively demanding passage, as expected from Tacitus. Translations of parts were quite rightly free and not literal (especially of the *in eo stare consilia* clause), and assessors credited a wide range of possible ways to render the meaning here. Omissions of some words (e.g. *modice* and *tamquam*) resulted in marks being lost.

Translating all the words

Candidates should double-check that they have translated all the words in the passage for 5-mark responses. As the mark scheme states, **omission of words is generally a major error** (though omission of connectives that do not significantly alter the sense of the translation are only slight errors).

Question 2 (d)

(d) In lines 5–7 (*ideo … consilia*), what easy answers did Tiberius say he would not give? **[2]**

Candidates performed well here.

Question 2 (e)

(e) *simplicius … coniugio* (lines 7–11): what concerns did Tiberius say he had? **[4]**

This question was generally well answered.

Section B overview

While Cicero and Tacitus remained the overall favourites here, there was a substantial number of responses offering Livy. Broadly speaking, the questions were tackled very well and equally well across the three options.

Question 3 (a)*

3   Read the following passage and answer the questions.

(a)* *quod hoc portentum … cogitaret* (lines 1–11): in this passage, how does Cicero provoke outrage against Sassia?

You should refer **both** to the content **and** to the language of the passage.   **[15]**

The key word 'outrage' triggered many focused responses as candidates enjoyed exploring the invective against Sassia which was geared towards provoking such outrage.

Assessment for learning

For 15-mark questions, candidates should be encouraged to quote and translate whole Latin phrases. Fragmentary approaches which zone in on isolated words are unlikely to be given marks.

Literary features can then be further analysed, and their relevance carefully explained.

Both content and use of language should be linked to the original question, e.g. how is a passage emotional, or vivid, or interesting?

A range of points should be taken from the whole passage. Sometimes, candidates offer perhaps two or three points of analysis on the same Latin quotation, which restricts the attention they can give to other parts of the passage.

Question 3 (b)

(b)   *quae primum … armaret* (lines 12–15): according to Cicero, in what ways did Sassia behave dreadfully towards Cluentius?   **[3]**

Generally, this was answered well. Some credit was lost by over-literal references to, for example, 'confirming' Oppianicus as an accuser. Likewise, some candidates did not properly explain what was meant by the fact that Sassia 'armed' Oppianicus, i.e. furnished him with ways in which to accuse Cluentius.

Question 3 (c)

(c) Translate *hinc enim illae sollicitationes … Larini quaestiones* (lines 15–19).   **[5]**

This was largely well translated. A few candidates missed the first sentence, possibly thrown off by the repeated *hinc* words. Omission of *aliquando* was seen relatively frequently.

Question 3 (d)

(d) In lines 19–20 (*eiusdem amentiae … linguae*), of what crimes does Cicero accuse Sassia, **and** what do you think was the motive for each of them?   **[4]**

The question was generally well answered so long as candidates knew the two main crimes. Sometimes the explanation of a motive was very vague, but any reasonable interpretation was given credit.

Question 3 (e)

(e) *atque … commorata* (lines 21–23): why did Sassia stay in Larinum?   **[1]**

This question was well answered.

Question 4 (a)

4   Read the following passage and answer the questions.

(a) Translate *properata … circumspectabantur* (lines 1–5).   **[5]**

This translation was mostly well done. Some candidates confused *properata* with 'prepared' or some other such word, missing the sense of hastening the accusation. The word *alias* challenged a few candidates who took it as 'other'.

Question 4 (b)*

(b)* *sed Caesar … recludant* (lines 6–17): what makes this a dramatic passage?

You should refer **both** to the content **and** to the language of the passage.   **[15]**

This was another rich passage from Tacitus which allowed candidates ample scope to explore the drama of the scene as Sabinus is rapidly condemned and dragged off screaming. The juxtaposition of the solemn occasion and the tyrannical treatment of Sabinus was particularly well explored.

Question 4 (c)

(c) In lines 18–21 (*secutae … intendi*), why did Tiberius still think that his life was in danger? **[2]**

This was a well-answered question.

Question 4 (d)

(d) *ni … habuere* (lines 22–24): in what way does Tacitus say the plan of his book prevents him from doing what he would have liked to do at this point? **[2]**

Most candidates had no difficulty here.

Question 4 (e)

(e) *Tiberio, qui … adflixit* (lines 25–27): what comments does Tacitus make here about Tiberius? **[4]**

Most candidates answered this well. Sometimes *satiatus* was not properly explained – saying that Tiberius was 'satisfied' on its own does not really convey the idea that he was glutted and fed up with his existing criminal agents.

Misconception

?   Centres should encourage candidates to show comprehension and understanding in low-tariff questions. Literal translations are not needed and are sometimes misleading. Candidates should answer the question and unpack the nuance of a word to answer the question rather than simply giving a translation.

Question 5 (a)

5 Read the following passages and answer the questions.

(a) *nec … offecisset* (lines 1–2): what does Livy say about Tarquin's military reputation? **[3]**

This question was generally well done.

Question 5 (b)

(b) *is primus … cepit* (lines 2–4): what success did Tarquin have in the war against the Volsci?   **[1]**

Most candidates got this correct, with a very small number thinking *Suessa* and *Pometia* were two different places.

Question 5 (c)

(c) Translate *ubi cum … seposuit* (lines 4–8).   **[5]**

Mostly well done. Many candidates omitted *ubi* or did not show that it indicated a place (e.g. 'there' as most correct translations rendered this). Capturing the gerundive in *dividenda* caused a few problems with several translating this as 'having been divided'.

Question 5 (d)

(d) In lines 8–11 (*excepit … adgressus est*), what does Livy say that is critical of Tarquin?   **[4]**

It was good to see most candidates able to discern what was critical of Tarquin in this portion of the Livy text.

Question 5 (e)*

(e)* What makes this an emotional passage?

You should refer **both** to the content **and** to the language of the passage.   **[15]**

There was plenty to discuss in this passage and those who opted for the Livy produced a standard of analysis equal to those opting for Cicero or Tacitus. Candidates were able to identify a range of emotions from outrage to sorrow and indignation, all of which were explained with well-selected evidence.

Section C overview

The standard of essays this year was very pleasing, with strong structured responses being a key highlight as candidates were able to group their arguments into clear logical units backed up with sound knowledge of the texts.

Question 6*

6*   What makes Cicero's speech *Pro Cluentio* such a successful defence of his client?   **[20]**

Responses tended to group around the key approaches of ethos, logos, and pathos. The most successful responses had a good balance of showing how Cicero exploited the jurors' shared worldview to besmirch the characters of Sassia and Oppianicus, thus throwing wool over their eyes and making Cluentius look innocent in contrast. There was also an acknowledgement of some attempts at logical argument by Cicero (e.g. the discussions over which form of poison to use, as well as the ridiculous nature of asking Marcus Asellius to assist with the poisoning). Less successful responses tended to focus too much on producing as many infamous facts about Sassia and Oppianicus as possible.

Exemplar 3

The final part of cicero's defense is to ~~scapeg~~ use sassia as a scapegoat, which is hugely successful. cluentius has been continuously presented as angelic, a man who would never have accused oppianicus if he had not been forced to by the threat to his own life, and who notably opposed him [oppianicus] over the case of the priests of Mars. If he is a good man, and obviously innocent, cicero must explain why he is in court at all, and he does so by making sassia, cluentius' mother, as the main villian of the speech. He describes her as 'a cruel and utterly selfish woman', prejudicing the jury against her by describing how she had an affair with, and later married, her daughter's husband, Aulus Aurius Melinus, who was also her nephew. As he [cicero] did with oppianicus, this then sets up the jury to believe that ~~it~~ sassia is capable of devising and working up the entire charge' against cluentius. cicero accuses her of the brutal torture of three slaves in her bid to get them to say that cluentius paid them to poison oppianicus, of producing a false account of those inquires, and bribing witnesses to testify against cluentius, and even goes as far as to

---

This is a very good response from one of the Cicero essays. The candidate analyses why Cicero made a successful defence of Cluentius – by using Sassia as the evil opposite to the 'angelic' Cluentius. The argument is backed up by detailed evidence: Cluentius is a good man who defended the *Martiales* in their dispute, whereas Sassia is a villain who seduced her son-in-law. It is the combination of detailed evidence from the texts and clear arguments which is the hallmark of an excellent essay.

Question 7*

7* From your reading of *Annals* IV and V, do you agree with the view that Tacitus is more a dramatist than a serious historian? **[20]**

This was a very well-answered question which provoked a wide range of views from candidates which was a pleasure to read. Most candidates went for a middle line, while a large amount of others tended to emphasis the dramatic elements in Tacitus. There were excellent discussions of how Tacitus uses dramatic licence in creating scenes, as well as interesting discussions on the role of rumour, bias, and authorial opinions. Tacitus' credentials as an historian were also defended well, e.g. in his reference to his source materials.

Question 8*

8* 'Fraud and deceit were the only foundations on which Rome developed.'

Is this a fair assessment of what you have read in Livy's *History of Rome* Book I? **[20]**

This essay enabled candidates to present a wide range of balanced essays. All candidates were able to exemplify the role of fraud and deceit, e.g. in the capture of Gabii or in Sextus' fraudulent masquerade as a guest in Lucretia's home. More successful responses were then able to detect other factors which could be called foundations of Rome's development, e.g. the courage of Brutus and Collatinus, the honour of Lucretia, or simply the military might and building activities of the Roman state.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website **Teach Cambridge** to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can forward them this link to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website.

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our website.

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, sign up here.

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is a free test-building platform, providing unlimited users exclusively for staff at OCR centres with an Interchange account.

Choose from a large bank of questions to build personalised tests and custom mark schemes, with the option to add custom cover pages to simulate real examinations. You can also edit and download complete past papers.

Find out more.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

Find out more.

You will need an Interchange account to access our digital products. If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit
☐ **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**
◉ **ocr.org.uk**
❶ **facebook.com/ocrexams**
🐦 **twitter.com/ocrexams**
◎ **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**
🔗 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**
▶ **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.

👍 **I like this**   👎 **I dislike this**

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.