

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

LATIN

H443

For first teaching in 2016

H443/02 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Introduction3

Paper 2 series overview4

Section A (Comprehension and grammar) overview5

 Question 16

 Question 2 (a)6

 Question 2 (b)6

 Question 2 (c)6

 Question 36

 Question 47

 Question 57

 Question 67

 Question 78

 Question 8 (a), (b), (c) and (d).....8

 Question 9 (a) and (b)9

 Question 10 (a) and (b)9

 Question 11 (a), (b) and (c)9

Section B (Prose Composition) overview10

 Question 1210

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 2 series overview

The alternative sections of the paper seemed to even out in terms of difficulty, but both evidently posed a challenge to candidates of all abilities. Approximately 70% selected Comprehension and Grammar, and there was a much wider range of performance here than among the Prose Composition candidates, but some impressive performances were seen on both. Marks approaching 50, however, on either section were rare and there was a disturbingly large number of very weak performances, perhaps explained partially by the residual effect of the many interruptions to learning and practice over the last three years.

Section A (Comprehension and grammar) overview

As in previous years, most candidates answered this section. Only a minority of these, however, really seemed to get to grips with the passage as a whole. The sections of Latin used in the questions were mostly quite long and candidates who attempted to pick out answers without taking time to digest the whole of each section soon found themselves in deep trouble.

In a Comprehension exercise such as this, unlike a Translation paper, a response is either right or it is wrong: responses which are close, even including some of the correct words, do not show *comprehension* of what is being read and therefore do not count. The time allowed should be generous enough to allow for a thorough reading of the passage *before* responses are committed to paper – exactly as recommended in the heading for this section.

Many produced responses to the Grammar questions which were at variance with their responses earlier to the same parts of the passage. Candidates should be able to make use of the Grammar questions as an opportunity to revisit their responses to the Comprehension questions, rather than viewing them as something detached from the main part of the exercise.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • had a wide and firm knowledge of vocabulary acquired from reading a range of Latin authors • were able to make plausible guesses at the meaning in context of unfamiliar words • had a robust knowledge of standard accidence and syntax • digested the text and questions thoroughly before starting to write down responses to any questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not know the meanings of common words, e.g. those listed on the AS vocabulary list • lacked sufficient experience/flexibility to make plausible shots at unfamiliar words • lacked a sufficiently robust knowledge of basic accidence and syntax • did not study the text as a whole, focusing piecemeal on individual questions.

Question 1

- 1 *Pompeius ... iunxerat* (line 1): what are we told about those who fled with Pompey? [1]

This question was not as straightforward as it could have been if candidates had paid less attention to word-order and more to grammar. Some candidates wanted to have fortune joined either to Pompey or by Pompey.

Question 2 (a)

- 2 *aliis suadentibus ... Alexandriae* (lines 1–4):
 (a) why did some urge Pompey to go to Africa? [2]

This question was often well answered, much more regularly than Question 1.

Question 2 (b)

- (b) why did Pompey choose to go to Egypt? [2]

Although many candidates grasped the idea of kindness being remembered, not all were clear who had done the kindness to whom, and there was frequent confusion between *pater* and *patria*.

Question 2 (c)

- (c) how is King Ptolemy described? [2]

Responses to this question were often successful, although some reversed the comparison ('closer to a young man than a boy').

Question 3

- 3 *sed quis ... gratiam* (lines 4–5): in what **two** ways does Velleius account for Ptolemy's behaviour towards Pompey? [4]

Only the most successful responses achieved full marks here. Many got one pair right, but not the other. Some had difficulties with *in adversis* ('enemies' or similar) or mistook the true meaning of *miseris* (e.g. 'miserable' or 'sad').

Question 4

4 *legati ... transcenderet* (lines 5–7): describe how Pompey was tricked.

[3]

Although many candidates were given all 3 marks, many did not read *hortabantur* as deponent and, for *suam*, had Pompey illogically transferring from the merchant vessel into **his own** ship.

Question 5

5 *quod cum fecisset ... ipsius* (lines 7–11): what details in these lines show sympathy for Pompey?

[8]

This question was usually successfully answered in part, but few candidates were given the 8 available marks and 4 or 5 marks was common. Common responses were 'a leading Roman' (or similar), 'killed by an Egyptian slave' (although the full force of *iugulatus* was not always highlighted), *sanctissimi*, *praeclarissimi* + *tres consulatus* (for those who knew what a consulship was). There was widespread misunderstanding over *duodesexagesimum* (26 or 62 being the most common), *pridie natalem* was generally ignored, and *totidem* usually treated as no different from *tantas* or *tot*.

Question 6

6 *tam varia ... sepulturam* (lines 11–12): explain in your own words why Velleius feels that fortune was inconsistent towards Pompey.

[3]

Candidates were often either given 0 or 1 marks (for a correct bit here or there). Even those who picked up the meaning of *sepulturam* (and they were a minority) often did not work out how the glossed verb *deesse* fitted into the structure, thus losing the balance and irony between the two halves of Velleius' comment.

Question 7

7 Translate *non fuit ... morte* (lines 13–16).

Please write your translation on alternate lines.

[10]

This question stretched candidates' understanding, with only a few given full marks. Most were able to gain some marks for isolated phrases, but many ended up producing nonsense for the passage as a whole. Crucial to success was to realise that the loyalty mentioned was not just the king's but of *eorum ... regebatur*. Candidates also needed to know *uterque* and recognise that *utrique* is its dative, with the Egyptians paying the penalty (not 'giving a penalty') to two Roman commanders (not the other way round) and to grasp the contrast in *alteri mortuo, alteri superstiti*.

Grammar questions: '... using a translation if you think it is helpful'

Sometimes a question asks candidates to state **and explain** the case of each example. The option of providing a translation is recognised as sometimes the most effective way of showing understanding of the case used, especially for those bewildered by the range of grammatical terms found in books, but the translation must make clear **why** the case is appropriate. This will usually entail providing a little extra context within which to set the word concerned, not simply a bare translation of the word itself.

Question 8 (d) below provides a good example of what is expected. Here 'to whom', while a grammatically correct rendering of a dative, does not illustrate **why** a dative is required, and so would not be given marks. What examiners were looking for was 'to /for whom land had been lacking'.

Candidates should take care that a translation, if offered *in addition* to a grammatical explanation, matches the explanation. Conflicting attempts to have two tries at the same question are liable to be discounted altogether (see the general instructions at the start of the mark scheme). Sensible advice is to offer **either** a grammatical explanation **or** a translation which covers the same ground, but not both.

Question 8 (a), (b), (c) and (d)

8 State and explain the case of the following, using a translation if you think it is helpful:

- (a) *aliis* (line 1) [2]
- (b) *Alexandriae* (line 4) [2]
- (c) *agentis* (line 11) [2]
- (d) *cui* (line 11) [2]

Some candidates knew the Locative in Question 8 (b), but other cases were generally recognised correctly. Explanations, however, were less assured. The ablative absolute in Question 8 (a) was a clear winner, the agreement of *agentis* with *illius viri* rarely worked out, and the dative *cui* not often linked to *defuerat*.

Question 9 (a) and (b)

9 Which part of the verb are the following:

(a) *deberi* (line 5)? [1]

(b) *vincendum* (line 12)? [1]

Candidates generally gave successful responses to Question 9 (a), while Question 9 (b) offered a fairly even split between gerund (correct) and gerundive (which should be avoidable, if candidates consider how it fits into the sentence as a whole, not just *vincendum* in isolation).

Question 10 (a) and (b)

10 Give the present active infinitive of the following:

(a) *contulerat* (line 3) [1]

(b) *dederunt* (line 16) [1]

Candidates often gave successful responses to both parts of Question 10, but some carelessly wrote *confere* and a surprising number (for such a common GCSE verb) put *dedere*. There are still a few who, despite the clear instruction, continue to offer the first person, present tense.

Question 11 (a), (b) and (c)

11 Explain why the following verbs need to be subjunctive, using a translation if you think it is helpful:

(a) *manerent* (line 2) [1]

(b) *exciperent* (line 6) [1]

(c) *deesset* (line 12) [1]

Success here was in reverse order: the textbook result/consecutive clause in (c) being almost always correct, the purpose/final clause in (b) recognised by most, but *manerent* seemingly a mystery to some, who could only make hopeful stabs, such as 'subjunctive after *ubi*' or 'indirect command'.

Section B (Prose Composition) overview

Candidates who did well on this section generally:	Candidates who did less well on this section generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> had a wide and firm knowledge of vocabulary acquired from reading a range of Latin authors had a robust knowledge of standard accidence and syntax aimed at producing a straightforward, accurate version, without taking unnecessary risks with grammar or vocabulary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not know the meanings of common words, e.g. those listed on the AS vocabulary list lacked a sufficiently robust knowledge of basic accidence and syntax lacked sufficient experience/flexibility to turn English idioms into plausible Latin tried to use complex constructions or exotic vocabulary unnecessarily in place of standard alternatives.

The unusual setting may have surprised candidates initially, but many found that the story (itself drawn from a medieval original) fell comfortably into Latin. For those equipped with the skills necessary for this kind of exercise the passage seemed well within their scope and there were many serviceable attempts, although a smaller than usual number of really polished versions. At the lower end of the range, however, an increasing number of candidates seemed to lack either the detailed knowledge or sufficient practice for constructing, as distinct from reading, Latin successfully.

The most successful responses are always those who concentrate on getting the standard grammar and vocabulary right rather than experimenting with unsure alternatives, especially if these are no real improvements on the basics or are gratuitous additions uncalled for by the original English. Opportunities for more stylish writing: idiomatic phrases for example, the use of the ablative absolute, or the choice or positioning of particular words were fairly easy to find. Most responses were given at least 2 or 3, and many were given all of the 5 marks available.

Question 12

12 Translate this passage into Latin prose.

You are reminded that marks will be awarded for the style of your translation.

Please write your translation on alternate lines.

[50]

(i) *After defeating the duke, the king, eager to meet his beautiful wife Igraine ...*

Many saw an early chance to be given 2 style marks, for promotion of the subject and for a textbook ablative absolute. Problems developed soon after, however, regarding what to use for 'his' (*sua* being regrettably common) and especially with 'eager to meet'. Here many, commendably, were ready with the phrase *obviam ire* or the verb *convenire*, which they tried to fit in, unaware that either requires a dative as object. This was often made worse by attempts to try a gerund or gerundive which they couldn't quite pull off.

This was a pity when there were other, much simpler, ways of tackling this phrase (see the mark scheme for one).

(ii) *asked Merlin how he could reach her. 'In order to obtain your desire,' the magician replied,*

Most candidates provided the obligatory subjunctive for the indirect question, but some decided (wrongly) that *posset* could be dispensed with. The phrase 'obtain your desire' needed more thinking about than most realised. Only the most successful responses used the idiomatic relative clause, many unthinkingly gave the third person imperfect subjunctive for 'obtain' and there was even considerable carelessness with *respondit*.

(iii) *'you must use a daring method. By my skill I will make you so like her husband ...*

Here the problems mounted up: the obligatory ablative after *utor*, forming its infinitive if *debeo* or *necesse est* was used, or risking attempts at a gerundive, many of which (e.g. *modum utendum*) were far from workable. The gender of *ars* tended to go by the wayside, also the ablative of *audax*, and there were errors with the case of *similem* and *marito/-i* and even with forming the future of *facio*.

(iv) *that you will be able to approach his castle safely and thus gain admission to the lady's bedroom.*

This was one of the more successful sections generally although as in (ii) the 2nd person present subjunctive caused problems, and not all saw the need for *ad* or dative with *appropinquo*. Most, however, were aware that trying to render 'gain admission' literally was unwise and found an acceptable substitute.

(v) *Handing command of the camp to his officers, within a short time he was changed by Merlin into the appearance of the duke.*

This was another generally successful section, and another chance to be given a style mark for a very typical ablative absolute, although some of these were spoilt by errors. Common mistakes were using an unidiomatic present participle *tradens* for 'handing over', misforming *castrorum*, not finding a suitable word for 'officers' (lots of *militibus* or worse), and misforming the common phrase *brevi tempore*.

(vi) *The castle guards, thinking that their master and his companions were returning home victorious ...*

Candidates encountered some traps here, for example what to do for 'their' and 'his', and particularly the idiom 'victorious', which prompted some unlikely stopgaps. The most successful responses earned a style mark for using *rati* in preference to a present participle. There were many tense errors and malformations of *redire*, even some diversions into *ut* + subjunctive, and much variance with the (surely very standard?) *domum* (*ad/in domum, domi...* etc).

(vii) *joyfully opened the gates and allowed the men to enter inside the walls.*

Candidates used some impressive ablative absolutes and very appropriate use of *gaudentes* or even *gavisī*: less impressive was the frequent confusion between the differing constructions needed with either *permitto* or *sino*. Smaller faults included the frequent misspelling of *aperuerunt* by those who proceeded word by word, reducing 'enter inside' to simply 'enter' and the wrong declension for *moenia* (although this was a good choice of vocabulary, qualifying for an extra mark).

(viii) *That night the king stayed with Igraine, and nine months later she gave birth to Arthur*

'That night' proved unexpectedly wobbly (e.g. *ille nocte, ille nox, illa nox*), also the number nine and the accusative plural of *mensis*. Many candidates did not denote the change of subject at the end of the sentence and thus had the king giving birth. A few knew *peperit*; those who didn't sometimes quite sensibly turned things round so that they had Arthur being born, although not everyone completed the sentence with something like *ab illa*.

(ix) *whose remarkable deeds made him famous over the whole world.*

There were some successful relative clauses linking this with the previous section, although care was needed if that had ended with the queen rather than her son. More successful responses were given a style mark for switching the subject of this section from the (abstract) deeds to the more idiomatic (personal) Arthur, which involves corresponding changes from *eum/hunc* to *se* and from *fecerunt* to *fecit*. Snags included producing a serviceable version of 'remarkable deeds' (lots of *facinores, facti*) or the (fairly standard?) phrase *orbem terrarum*, and the ending needed for 'remarkable' (usually *mirabilia*.)

The following exemplars are provided to illustrate the differences in approach and performance between two versions of Sections (i) and (ii), as well as the application of the marking grid by examiners.

Exemplar 1

Sed rex, duce victo, cupidus
 obriam lundii mulieris pulchrae
 Igeriae, ~~ago~~ Merlinum rogavit
 quomodo se ad eam ~~adire~~ adire
 posset. Magus ei respondit
 tui ~~magis~~ respondit,
 'ad adipiscendam tuam libidinam,

Exemplar 1 was given 4 marks and 4 marks ('mostly correct'), with 3 style marks – for the ablative absolute *duce victo*, the commendable attempt at *cupidus* + gerund (though the following phrase needed to be wholly in the dative), and the impressive use of the gerundive phrase *ad adipiscendam tuam libidinem*. Here, however, the inappropriate expression *tuam libidinem* was not acceptable, which, together with the unwanted *se*, brought the overall mark for the section down to 4.

Exemplar 2

Duce superato, volans spectare eum uxorem

Pulchram Igernam, rex rogavit Merlinum quis posset

petere eam. 'ut recipias vos cupidum' Magnus

respondit, 'tu putes audacem nam.' MEO

Exemplar 2 was given 3 marks ('more than half right') and 2 marks ('less than half right'), with 1 style mark. (for the neat ablative absolute *duce superato*). The first section, though the structure was more or less correct, contained a misformed present participle of *volo*, an inadequate choice of verb for 'to meet', and 'his' rendered in the accusative. In the second section, despite two pleasing subjunctive clauses, much of the meaning was forfeited by unsatisfactory vocabulary, such as *quis* for 'how', *eam petere* for 'reach her', *recipias* for 'obtain' and the incomprehensible *vos cupidum* for 'your wish'.

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

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. 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 CPD 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 the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

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.

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.

[Find out more](#).

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**

 **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.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 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 operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.