GCSE

Latin

Report on the Components

June 2006

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A- level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Latin (1942)

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Introduction

General Comments

This year saw another pleasing increase in candidate numbers – the third in successive years, bringing the entry almost back to the 2003 numbers. On the Foundation Tier there were fewer strong candidates than in recent years; similarly on the Higher Tier there were more very weak candidates clearly at risk of being ungraded. A larger number of candidates were entered inappropriately for the Higher Tier this year.

Full details of entry for the different Options are given in the Grade Threshold tables at the rear of this booklet. The most popular Higher Tier Option continues to be Option HA (Components 21, 22, 23 and 24) – all the language and literature components. Option HC (Components 21, 22, 24 and 25) is also very popular. At Foundation Tier the most popular Options continue to be FC (Components 11, 12, 14 and 15) – the compulsory language paper, both literature papers and Roman Life Topics - and Option FE (Components 06, 11, 12 and 14) – the compulsory language paper, both literature papers and coursework. Over half the Foundation Tier candidates for Language 2 (component 13) scored less than half-marks: some of these candidates would have been better suited to a study of Roman Life (component 15) or Coursework (component 06).

In almost all cases, candidates had sufficient time to complete each paper. Centres are asked to remind candidates of the need to set out their responses with greater clarity, in particular to leave ample spacing between responses.

1942/11: Language 1 – Foundation Tier

General Comments

The proportion of candidates entered for this Tier was again very small. The quality of scripts varied enormously, from those demonstrating almost no knowledge of Latin to those which almost certainly would have scored highly on the Higher Tier. Overall, the standard attained was lower than in recent years.

As on the Higher Tier, there was no section of the paper which proved generally more or less demanding than the others; while many candidates fared much better on the translation, there were as many more who were more comfortable with the comprehension passages; this dichotomy was even more marked than on the Higher Tier: some candidates who could produce little that made sense in Question 2 produced many correct answers on Questions 1 and 3.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1
Questions 1(a), (c i) and (d ii) were answered correctly by virtually all candidates. In 1(b) many omitted *in Aegypto*, or one or other of the two adjectives. In 1(c ii) over half the candidates confused *habebant* with *habitabant*, and wrote that many gods lived in Egypt; although the sense of this is close to the correct 'the Egyptians had many gods', such a serious error had to be penalised. In 1(d i) some candidates were fooled by *et … et* into thinking that there was a young man and a beautiful girl as well in the dream; many did not recognise *ingens.* From this point on, some candidates lost touch with the storyline of this passage. In 1(e) few candidates knew *mitteret*, while half confused *in Pontum* with *in Ponto*; half again took *amicos* to be singular. In 1(f) few included *ibi*; very few knew *quaerere*, and very few sorted out *inque*. In 1(g) few knew *maxima*; of those that did, most equated it to *magna*; hardly any candidates made an attempt at *in qua stabit*.

Question 2
The same problems beset candidates in this Tier as in the Higher Tier. More pronounced was the inability of most candidates to split up sentences into their constituent parts using clues from punctuation or conjunctions. Also even more widespread was the failure to distinguish singular from plural nouns and verbs. Virtually all the nouns in the story appeared in scripts almost randomly as singular or plural.

iuvenis … ascendit: some candidates failed to link *iuvenis* to the verbs. *Caelum* was often unknown. *Ubi* was almost always confused with *qui*. Candidates either knew *haec* or *verba*, but rarely both. Only a small minority knew *dixit*.

Ptolemaeus … deberet: because only a few candidates understood the significance of *–que*, most ran the two main clauses together into a meaningless jumble. *Sacerdotibus* was almost universally made singular, with consequences for the following section. Few identified *quid vidisset* as an indirect question. *Rogavit* was inserted at random. *Deberet* was often unknown.

responderunt … nomine: only a few candidates could handle the indirect statement correctly; many confused historic and primary with '…replied there is …'. Very many failed to recognise *in Ponto* as a unit of sense.

effigiem … esse: the most frequent error here was the omission of *hac*.

primo … nolebat: vocabulary was the cause of most candidates' downfall here: *fecit*, *nihil*, *tam* and *nolebat* were often unknown.

deinde … terribilior: the first part of this clause was generally done well, with omission of *ei* the only common error. Very few recognised the comparative in *terribilior* or made it agree with *iuvenis*. Few knew *iam.*

Alexandriam … parebis: many turned the first clause into the passive, without stating the agent; otherwise this section was done well.

Ptolemaeus … misit: most candidates struggled to make any sense of this sentence. Unknown vocabulary included *homines*, *donis*, *statim* and, almost universally, *misit*.

ibi … venissent: hardly any candidates made much of this, primarily because no candidates knew more than two or three of the words, and many knew none of the words. Most tried to make *regi* the subject.

Question 3
Although the Latin in this passage was substantially harder than that in Question 1, many candidates showed more grasp of the storyline here. More marks were lost because of omission of details than because of basic misunderstanding.

Although no questions were correctly answered by all candidates, 3(a i), (d i), (e i) and (e iii) were answered correctly by the great majority. In 3(a ii) most omitted *sciebat* but often got the rest right. In 3(b) most failed to see that the warning given by the god was in the form of an indirect command, treating it as in indirect statement instead; no candidate recognised *diutius*. 3(c) caused surprisingly many problems, mostly of a lexical nature; *civibus* was the only word known to nearly all candidates. In 3(d ii) many candidates ignored the word order and took *multos* with either the subject or *Aegyptios*, and then omitted *annos.* In 3(e ii) most candidates scored a majority of the marks because there were many points that could be made; the most common errors were with *Aegyptiam* (not taken with *navem*) and *cum effigie.* In 3(f) many failed to include that the citizens placed the statue in the temple. In 3(g) few recognised the two superlatives.

1942/12: Verse Literature – Foundation Tier

General Comments

There was a wide spread in performance, as usual, on this paper. The top 10% of candidates showed evidence of knowledge and sophistication which undoubtedly would have enabled them to score well on the Higher Tier paper, however, some candidates' knowledge of the poems, even in English, was limited. Just over half of the candidates answered Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*. Candidates did equally well irrespective of which text they had prepared. Passages for continuous translation were deliberately kept as short and accessible as possible. Many candidates ommitted these questions - making them a particularly unsatisfactory test at this level. Candidates picked up marks fairly easily on some of the straightforward questions about context and factual content, but few succeeded in doing so consistently across the paper. Candidates need much more practice in answering questions relating to the Latin text: teachers should ensure that candidates are able to identify key Latin words in the text and make simple comments about them. There was no evidence of candidates running out of time in which to finish the exam.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid IV*

Question 1
Most candidates could follow the gist of this passage, though the details of the text and of the story eluded them. With the help of the format provided for (b), many gave a good account of the simile, and other questions for which candidates produced good answers included (a)(ii), (f)(i), (g)(i) and (h). Few candidates identified the correct city for (c)(ii) and even fewer realised that anything other than a whim had caused Dido to leave her original home. Acceptable translations of (e) were rare, and questions which rested on recognition of specific Latin words, such as (a)(i) or (g)(ii), were poorly answered. In (a)(iii), for example, where Dido is said to be 'burning' with love, answers such as 'angry' or 'raging' showed only a general notion of the context.

Question 2
Most candidates were able to answer (a) and (b), although some referred to Juno or Venus when *Iuppiter* is the only god to be found in lines 4-5. Some answers to (b) contained rather prim English - but a 'decorated' chest and hair 'on fire' seemed to err too far the other way. In (c), Aeneas was generally correctly identified, but interpretations of the word *advena* tended to be implausible (e.g. 'there always seemed something strange about him') or non-existent. The first part of (d) was poorly translated. Although some candidates were able to translate the final sentence (*ite … remos!),* they were unable to count the correct number of orders for (e). The majority of candidates found three - presumably overlooking the opening *ite*. Many candidates clearly did not read (e)(ii) carefully enough as the extension of (e)(i) and therefore merely described Dido's feelings in general as 'angry' instead of focusing on the significance of her issuing multiple orders in quick succession. Most made something of Dido's introspective questioning and self-pity (*infelix Dido*), but some answers to (f) made just one or two points, and Dido's scorn for Aeneas was sometimes misconstrued as criticism of his rescuing the *penates*

and his father in the first place. Answers to (g) were generally on the right lines but few answers were sufficiently accurate to be awarded full marks. Candidates who wrote 'kill him' for both parts were only able to score 1 out of the 4 marks allocated for all the macabre details savoured by Dido in these lines. In (h), few candidates grasped the gist of line 18 and most misconstrued the tense of the Subjunctive, as if Dido were mulling over what she might still do to the disappearing Trojans rather than regretting that she had not acted against them sooner. Most candidates showed no understanding at all of this sentence.

Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 3
Candidates generally seemed familiar with the outline of the *Echo et Narcissus* story, but it was clear that many were not really sure where this section belonged within it and that they were therefore basing answers on recollections of the story in English rather than taking account of the Latin. This worked to a certain extent with content-based questions such as (d) or (e). Suggestions for (a)(ii) ranged over virtually every Latin word in line 1; the colour words in (c) were frequently muddled; and even *vale* in (h) was not always correctly identified or translated. Passage (f) was very poorly translated. In (g) few candidates understood that in line 13 Echo is copying, not speech, but the sound made by Narcissus' arms. Few candidates scored highly in Question (i), where they had an open invitation to comment on features of their own choice from the passage.

Question 4
Answers on the Ovid passage (A) were often partially successful. In (b) some candidates could not distinguish which members of the family Ovid mentions or included pets rather than the stipulated 'people', with *cara* sometimes rendered as 'care'. In their answers to (a)(ii) and (e), few candidates seemed aware of Ovid's circumstances at the time of writing, information crucial to comprehension of the passage. Responses to the Martial passage (B) were not strong. The translation of (j) - a list of Martial's favourite things - was tackled competently by few candidates, with many only able to pick out one or two correct words. Similarly, candidates found question (f) difficult. Some answers to question (h) needed more careful explanation in terms of patronage, wealth, social class, etc. (k) gave candidates a chance to use whatever ideas for an ideal life they could recall from the whole range of poetry which they had studied. Some candidates wrote very little - or offered bare lists of buildings such as baths/temples/porticoes without indicating how these might qualify as 'examples of an enjoyable life'.

1942/13: Language 2 – Foundation Tier

General Comments

More candidates took this paper than in 2005, however the quality of the work was weaker. Of the 75 candidates, over half scored fewer than half marks – the corresponding percentage in 2005 was 13%. The passage was of similar difficulty to that set in 2005. A particular weakness evident this year was the widespread lack of vocabulary knowledge. Many candidates struggled to make coherent sense of the story. It must, therefore, be stressed that candidates entered for this paper need to have a thorough knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List.

Comments on Individual Questions

In the first sentence, many did not know the meaning of *parabat* and often the plural ending of *filios* was missed, despite the introduction to the passage (in which Theoxena's son**s** were mentioned). There were some good versions of the *ne* clause – 'to avoid them falling into the hands of Philip' was a neat way of doing it and won full credit.

Basic vocabulary and grammar deficiencies were evident in the translation of the next few sentences. Among words which were regularly not known were *sed, consilium, hoc, nave, igitur, discesserunt, ventus, and tantus*. *sed Poris* was sometimes translated as 'Poris said', the superlative form of *crudelissimum* was often missed and *uxori* taken as the subject of *persuasit*. Those who did not know that *ventus* meant wind missed the idea of the wind driving them back to land; and had Poris and Theoxena setting out by ship but then deciding to drive back (by road).

Many candidates successfully translated *prima luce* but *ubi* was often not known and there were a lot of miserable or missing boats (*miserunt lembum*). Some candidates would have profited from a list of verbs which change their stem in the perfect tense – many were unsure of *conspexerunt* and *miserunt* when they might know *conspicio* and *mitto* in their present tense forms.

The ablative absolute *hoc viso* was done well by some candidates. Few recognised the present participle form of *tollens*, however, and many who did not know the meaning of *servarent* missed the straightforward point that Poris asked the gods to save him. In the next sentence, many took *ante* with *paravit* rather than *oculos* and were again hampered by lack of vocabulary – many did not know *gladium* and took it as 'gladiator'.

The imperative forms of *capite* and *bibite* caused difficulties, despite the exclamation mark at the end of the sentence. Many, perhaps understandably, took *capite* as 'head' rather than a part of *capio* – the result was a lot of beheading of gladiators. Relatively few candidates got the idea that Theoxena was offering her sons a choice of methods of suicide. *filii primo* was often taken as 'the first son', which made sense in the context but did not take account of the endings of *primo* and *nolebant*. The meanings of *appropinquo* and *interficio* were often not known.

In the last sentence, many coped well with the first clause and realised that the boys' bodies were dumped in the sea. Few, however, recognised *se iecerunt* and therefore many missed the point that Poris and Theoxena also committed suicide to avoid capture by Philip.

1942/14: Prose Literature – Foundation Tier

General Comments

Although the difficulty of this year's paper was similar to last year's, the overall standard of response was lower. There were a few scripts of a pleasingly high quality, but some candidates appeared to have little idea of what was happening in the passages and some omitted questions altogether. There was little difference in standard between the two sections, the *Cambridge Latin Anthology* and *Selections from Pliny's Letters.* Out of the two hundred candidates who answered this paper thirty chose Section B.

Candidates need to be reminded that in each question there are five marks available for knowledge of the background to the passages set. In Questions 1 and 4 this included the rivers of the underworld and the performance given by pantomime actors. In addition, they need to note that full answers should be given to questions that have three or more marks, and that the evidence they quote in support of their answers must come from the lines referred to in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Prose Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 1
(a)(i) and (ii) were generally well answered, although in (i) not everyone could give two details of where the speaker was. In (b) very few got full marks: *spiritu* was frequently translated as spirit and there were many inaccurate answers, such as 'the corpse got up'. In (c)(i) and (ii) there was some confusion between the river Lethe and the Styx and, of those who knew Lethe, very few could spell it correctly. Some candidates thought that by drinking from Lethe people obtained immortal life. (d)-(f) produced mainly correct answers. This was not the case with (g) where some did not restrict their answers to lines 11-15 as requested, or wrote generalised comments such as 'the corpse spoke slowly and in a deep voice'. Some candidates mentioned murder and adultery and included quotations to support their answers, although they were not asked for the Latin. One candidate included the phrase *addictus noxio poculo,* the victim of a poisoned chalice, and added that it indicated murder and made the reader want to read on.

Question 2
This question was not well answered. In (a)(i) only a few candidates mentioned that Pliny hoped his happiness would be everlasting and very few that it would grow from day to day. (b)(i) was generally correctly answered but in (b)(ii) *gloriam* was often translated as glory and some who ignored the line references referred to Pliny's law court speeches and his writing. Candidates found (c) and (d) challenging and few gained full marks for these. *honestum* was invariably given as honest rather than honourable. In (e) there was some confusion as to who was the mother and who was the daughter. References to sisters and friends were quite common despite the words *matrem* and *filia.* There were some good answers to (f) but, as with Question 1(g), some candidates wrote too generally or did not observe the line references.

Section B: *Selections from Pliny's Letters*

Question 3
The most common answer to (a) and the correct one was that Robustus was a Roman knight. In (b) Scauro was more common than Scaurus; candidates need to be reminded that they should give names of people and places in the nominative case. In (c) not everyone knew that Crispus disappeared in the same way as Robustus. (d)-(f) were correctly answered, although this was not the case with (g) where (i) and (ii) were often answered in reverse. Answers to (h) tended to be too short and too general.

Question 4
Answers to this question were better than those to Question 3. Ummidia's attributes were well known in (a) as were her legacies in (b) and Pliny's knowledge of her grandchildren in (c). In (d) few candidates mentioned that her grandson was good looking and avoided gossip. Sometimes this question was misunderstood when the line references were not observed. Few candidates answered (e) or (f) correctly and some attributed the grandson's behaviour to Ummidia. (g)(i) was a straightforward question but (g)(ii) required some comment on the background to Ummidia's lifestyle. (h) was well answered by some but many wrote too little to gain full marks.

1942/15: Roman Life Topics – Foundation Tier

General Comments

The standard of achievement on this paper was similar to that of last year, with the majority of candidates obtaining more than half marks. The general standard of this paper was much higher than that of Paper 14. Topic 5: Women in Roman Society and Topic 6: Roman Britain were equally popular, and Topic 4: The Structure of Roman Society was the least popular topic.

Candidates should be reminded to read the questions in Section B carefully and to avoid including irrelevant information. The best answers contain good factual details even when in an imaginative account. Some answers however were too short.

Comments on Individual Questions

Topic 4: The Structure of Roman Society

Section A
Candidates produced some reasonably good answers to questions 1 and 2, as most candidates knew about the patron, the client and the *salutatio.* Candidates were less sure about particular areas of work in which the patron supported his clients or what the advantages of patronage were for the patron and this showed in their answers to questions 3 and 4. Some candidates confused freedmen and clients. Answers to questions 5-8 revealed a widespread lack of knowledge of the *cursus honorum* and the different social classes.

Section B
Question 9 was slightly more popular than Question 10. In Question 9 some candidates wrote quite well on the role of freedmen and what it meant to be a member of the emperor's council, but the best answers were to Question 10. In (a) candidates described the part played by the emperor in running the empire. There were references to his legal and military responsibilities, as well as to his role in the provinces where he appointed people he trusted to carry out his orders, but made all the key decisions himself. In 10(b) candidates had no difficulty in naming jobs done by slaves in the public domain, although they found it more difficult to say why each of these jobs was important. The best candidates explained the need for slaves to serve as gladiators to provide entertainment for the citizens and for slaves to work on the many new public buildings as the Roman empire expanded.

Topic 5: Women in Roman Society

Section A
In Question 1 some candidates gave details of a Roman wedding instead of the engagement ceremony. Questions 2-3 were generally well answered, but Question 4, which asked for different types of evidence was often misunderstood. In Question 5 a number of candidates knew *univira,* even if few could spell it correctly. In Question 6 most mentioned her role at a Roman wedding, but could not make a second point. Question 7 and Question 8 were both well answered.

Section B
Question 9 was twice as popular as question 10. Candidates producd some good answers to question 9(a). Candidates found it relatively easy to list five customs of Roman weddings and to give their modern counterparts. (b) caused problems for a few who misread the question and discussed the freedom of Roman women compared to that of women today instead of compared to the freedom enjoyed by Roman men. Satisfactory answers were written to question 10(a), apart from the few which confused the two types of Roman marriage. 10(b) was also quite well answered except where candidates included information which was outside women's private life.

Topic 6: Roman Britain

Section A
Candidates generally produced accurate answers to questions 1-3, although in Question 1 some of the information given was too vague. It was not enough simply to write 'location' or 'surroundings' without saying what precisely the owner would have been looking for in the location or the surroundings. Question 4 was not well answered although one or two candidates did give very good descriptions of the *groma*. The diagrams in Question 5 varied considerably in size and shape, but most had the main features correctly labelled. Many candidates gained full marks for Question 6. In Question 7 candidates found difficulty in citing more than one danger or difficulty. Some mentioned among other problems that poor road surfaces caused not only crashes but also damage to carts.

Section B
The answers to question 8(a) were of mixed quality. Some candidates wrote an account of Bath instead of focusing on the question, which asked them what they would have seen and done there. In answers to 8(b) there was often too little factual information and some candidates chose quite inappropriate names for their correspondents. There were, however, one or two excellent answers which gave full details of the final battle between Boudica and the Romans, based on Tacitus' account. Question 9 proved a slightly more popular question than Question 8. There were some good detailed answers to 9(a) describing the attractive features of Fishbourne palace, but also a number which contained too much information which applied to villas in general rather than to Fishbourne. Candidates answering Question 9(b) produced some reasonable responses describing how life improved for the Britons under Roman rule. Some candidates mentioned improvements to housing, better communications and trade and the fact that their lives became more settled and peaceful, although few mentioned access to education and the Latin language.

1942/21: Language 1 – Higher Tier

General Comments

This paper was judged to be of an appropriate level of difficulty, perhaps slightly more challenging than last year's paper. The quality of responses this year ranged very widely, from the small number of scripts scoring 100% to the rather larger number of scripts which revealed a lack of preparation for the linguistic demands of this Tier. Weaknesses in vocabulary, grammar and syntax were all equally in evidence, each just as likely as the others to be responsible for a low score. It was evident this year rather more candidates would have been better entered for the Foundation Tier.

Most candidates managed to follow the basic storyline through to the end, though some candidates failed to grasp that Sinope was a town, not a person. A few candidates were reluctant to entertain the idea that the god's statue was capable of independent action, insisting on making passive the verbs of which *effigies* was the subject.

Many candidates answered all of Question 1 correctly. Question 3 proved more testing than last year's equivalent. While many found the translation harder than the comprehension questions, there were just as many who found the opposite to be the case; this suggests that candidates differed in the amount of practice they had devoted to the two formats.

No candidates appeared to have been short of time. There were once again many candidates who ignored the rubric to write their translation on alternate lines. Centres are strongly urged to insist on the use of alternate lines when practice translation exercises are done.

Some general points emerged from this year's marking. It is suggested that teachers use the following check list to assist candidates.

- candidates should be able to distinguish between singular and plural nouns and verbs;
- revision of passive verbs is recommended;
- candidates need to use common sense when selecting an appropriate meaning for the many Latin words that are given several meanings in the DVL;
- candidates need to reflect on the sense of their translation, to make sure that what they write is plausible within the storyline;
- candidates need to improve the quality of their English in both the translation and answers to the comprehension; in particular, most cannot express correctly a main clause with a subordinate clause in parenthesis (e.g. 'The young man, as soon as …, *he* was raised…');
- revision of the ablative absolute is recommended;
- comparatives and irregular superlatives need revision;
- candidates need to know how to translate *se* in an indirect statement;
- principal parts of verbs, particularly those of the 3rd conjugation, should be revised;
- *hic* and *ille* are often considered interchangeable by candidates;
- candidates need to be more confident in recognising proper names in their oblique cases and must use them in nominative form in their translations;
- neuter plural endings need revision;
- candidates should be encouraged to look to the end of a Latin clause or sentence for the verb;
- If candidates find they have time left at the end of the examination, they should be encouraged to check endings or the sense of translations.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1
Questions 1(a), (b) and (d) were answered correctly by virtually all candidates. In 1(c) *solebant* was mostly unknown and usually just ignored; *multa* was frequently ignored. In 1(e) some candidates thought that *mitteret* meant 'send for'; the same candidates then confused *in Pontum* with *in Ponto*; many ignored the plural ending of *transportarent*; candidates had to be careful with *suam*: those who turned *imperavit* into the passive (acceptable in itself) often, perhaps unwittingly, made 'his own statue' refer to the king's rather than the young man's. In 1(f), many failed to connect *urbs* with *maxima notissimaque erit*, thinking, despite the clearly feminine endings, that it was Ptolemaeus who was being described; few recognised *maxima* as a superlative.

Question 2
iuvenis … sublatus est: there were few problems with *simulatque* as nearly all candidates translated this clause correctly. *in caelum* was regularly confused with *in caelo*. Many failed to recognise the case of *igne*. Few attempted to bring out the superlative force of *plurimo. Sublatus est* was not recognised by the majority of candidates, who failed to link it to *tollere.*

Ptolemaeus … significaret: because of the following parenthesis, many left Ptolemaeus hanging in mid-air with no predicate. *Tam* was very frequently confused with *adeo*. Many took *sacerdotibus* to be singular, causing knock-on effects in subsequent clauses. Many candidates failed to make use of *–que* to separate out the two main clauses, jumbling them along the lines of 'and he asked them to say what he saw meant'.

illi … sciebant: this was generally translated correctly; the most frequent error was continuing, despite all the evidence, to insist that there was only one priest.

aliis … nomine: few candidates could handle the ablative absolute: those who attempted to turn it into a main clause nearly always failed to link it appropriately to the following main clause. At this level a literal rendering is acceptable. Most candidates confused *aliis* with *quibusdam* or *ceteris*; many thought *hominibus* was singular. *Cognovit* was often taken as plural with *hominibus* as its subject. Some candidates did not recognise the indirect statement. It was decided not to accept '*the* city' for *urbem* here, because this was completely inappropriate to the context of the story. *Esse* often disappeared, being presumably not recognised; or it was combined with *nomine* to give 'a city was called'. Despite the word order and punctuation, many candidates thought that *Sinopen nomine* referred to *hominibus*.

in hac urbe … dei: this was generally handled well, the most common error being to confuse *magnum* with *ingens*; it is expected that these two adjectives will be properly distinguished.

primo … misit: it was decided to insist on 'at first' for *primo* here, because 'first' or 'firstly' were inappropriate to the context. Most knew *nolebat* and *neminem*.

deinde … apparuit: some candidates did not confuse *postquam* with *post* or *postea*. The most common error here was the omission of *eadem*, presumably because few candidates recognised it. Many also omitted *ei*

iam … deleturum esse: few noted the comparative. Many misplaced *ac.* Only a few candidates recognised *minans* as a present participle; the rest turned it unsuccessfully into a finite verb. *Se* proved impossible for most candidates. Because English does not require a future infinitive here, *deleturum esse* caused relatively few problems.

rex … ferentes: very few candidates knew the appropriate meaning of *legatos*: the almost universal 'commanders' was not acceptable here. Half the candidates, in spite of having

translated *rex* correctly everywhere else, thought *regem* meant 'kingdom'. Many did not recognise *ferentes* as a present participle; a few confused it with *ferrum.*

qui … venissent: most candidates failed to handle the connecting relative correctly: 'who when…' was unacceptable. Weaker candidates made *Sinopen* the subject, despite the gloss and the plural ending of the verb. Similar candidates also made *regi* the subject of *nuntiaverunt.*

Question 3
Questions 3(a i) and (d ii) were generally answered correctly. In 3(a ii) many thought *dona* was singular; *sibi* was often omitted or confused with *ipse*; the passive infinitive *auferri* was rarely recognised, and the verb itself was often unknown. In 3(b) 'offered' was not acceptable for *promisso*; the ablative absolute, because formal translation was not required, was not a problem; the main difficulty was with *maiore*, since few candidates recognised the meaning or the comparative; 'offered his weight in gold' was the most common rendering. The only difficulty in 3(c) was the comparative *diutius.* In 3(d) many made the ablative absolute *templo circumdato* dependent on *coeperunt* and then took *custodire* as expressing purpose. In 3(e) *dicitur* was rarely recognised and often omitted or confused with *ducitur*; an unexpected problem was that very few candidates seemed familiar with the English verbs 'board' and 'embark on' given as glosses for *conscendisse*: 'was boarded on' was the commonest version, which was not acceptable, if only because it failed to bring out the autonomous action of the god/statue; few recognised the superlative *celerrime*. 3(f) was generally handled well, with most candidates finding a few of the points; only a few managed to bring out the purpose implicit in *ad effigiem accipiendam*; many missed the superlatives at the end.

1942/22: Verse Literature – Higher Tier

General Comments

Following the trend of the last few years, slightly more candidates chose Virgil than the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*. The best scripts for both options, however, were as impressive as ever, showing evidence of personal engagement with the author(s) studied and real scholarship going well beyond the rehearsal of a set text. The majority had also been well prepared for the test by their teachers, and so were able to approach their task in an effective manner. Allowance was made on this occasion for candidates from a small handful of centres which had obviously not used the prescribed Virgil edition: centres are advised that they should use the prescribed edition as listed on the Notice to Centres.

There was no evidence of candidates running out of time in which to finish the exam: many had sufficient time at the end to continue expanding their answers. Some, however, might profitably have focused better and more briefly on the specific requirements of the questions, rather than responding to every question with a lengthy piece of translated text. Examiners also commented on the low quality of English and presentation in some scripts - not just spelling and handwriting, but loose expression and imprecise jargon (e.g. references to 'stuff'). Candidates should also be reminded to write their translation on alternate lines and to avoid squeezing additional comments into the margins of the answer booklet. Finally, this year there appeared to be an increase in the proportion of candidates whose knowledge seemed to consist of a memorised English version and who demonstrated little understanding of the Latin text itself.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Virgil, *Aeneid IV*

Question 1
Straightforward context questions such as (a), (e), and (h) rarely caused candidates any problems, though (c) was less satisfactory, with many not understanding what 'Sidonian wealth' might be or unaware that Dido had any reason for leaving her original city other than an impulse to start a new one (see lines 20-21). The simile in (b) was generally analysed in a methodical manner, with both its literal and metaphorical significance spelt out: some answers failed to balance the two sides, or occasionally even tried to interpret this in terms of last year's simile. There were many excellent answers to (d), which between them covered all the ideas listed in the mark scheme and more, and especially heartening to find so many candidates able to apply a sound knowledge of metrical principles (e.g. to the double elisions in line 16). Some candidates tended to talk vaguely about alliteration without specifying where it occurred, or cited appropriate examples but without any explanation for their choice. It is also worth underlining that the wording of this and other questions of this type is deliberately tailored to the passage used: so in this instance answers relating to the author's choice of particular vocabulary were not relevant. The translation (g) - like other translation sections on the paper - seemed often to be reeled off by heart, give or take the occasional slip or omission such as *coeptae* or one of *pendent/interrupta.* It is apparently innocuous questions such as (a)(ii) which are most likely to expose those whose understanding of the Latin text is weak. Here some candidates resorted to wild stabs (e.g. *tota*, *sagitta*) or supplied translations which obviously related to a different Latin word, whilst even some sensible choices of Latin were accompanied by English renderings

which were inappropriate to this context (e.g. 'angry' for *furens*, 'unlucky' for *infelix*). In (f), on the other hand, examiners were frequently impressed by subtle character-sketches based on precise analysis of the text: weaker candidates either failed to spot useful cues in the lines specified or simply précised the passage without making any attempt to relate their information to the question.

Question 2
Candidates generally seemed to find this section a sterner test than Q.1, but many candidates clearly knew the text inside-out and showed maturity and sophistication in their handling of this linguistically and conceptually demanding piece of Latin. This was evident in some finely-tuned responses to (h), whereas some candidates would simply pick at one or two items without relating them properly to the question of Dido's state of mind. Answers to (f) were also generally good, with many candidates keen to go much further than was strictly necessary into the overtones of Medea or Thyestes. Translations of (c) tended to be marred by confusion regarding the Subject of the verbs in the second sentence, with *alii* often overlooked. It is worth noting the rigorous marking criteria applied to these prepared translations, according to which the omission of a single important word - *hic*, *ait*, *advena*, and *citi* were frequent offences here - lowers a candidate's score to 4 instead of 5. The selection of Latin words for (b)(ii) caused less trouble than for Q.1(a), but again there were plenty of candidates unable to tell which one meant 'lovely' and which 'golden'. Answers to (d) were much less impressive than those for Q.1(d), and some of the most striking possibilities were oddly neglected (e.g. the contrast between *nunc* and *tum*, or the dramatic exclamation *en*). Too many relied on generalisations - e.g. about the use of questions and imperatives - without making specific reference to any Latin in their answers, and a few ignored the line parameters altogether. Answers to (e) were not always successful, with Dido's sarcasm (especially *aiunt*) frequently either not appreciated or misinterpreted as rudeness towards Anchises rather than a snub to Aeneas' much-vaunted *pietas*. It was certainly possible to answer (g) with a precise translation, being careful to bring out the force of the Pluperfect Subjunctive: 'would have been doubtful' rather than 'was doubtful'; candidates who explained the quotation in their own words, however, were more likely to answer accurately; on the other hand, those who had not really thought about the significance of this sentence before tended to ignore the Subjunctive altogether and interpret Dido's words as a threat to attack the Trojans now.

Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 3
Questions (a) to (e) were well answered, but marks were frequently lost through omissions – candidates may need to be reminded to refer to the Latin on the paper rather than relying on memory. In (c), for example, it was essential for candidates to base their response on Echo's feelings as described in line 3 rather than generalising over the entire Ovid passage; likewise in (e), the request for points contained in lines 10-11 should have excluded simply saying that Narcissus was thirsty or that the spring was secluded and clear (given in the English preamble). Answers to (d) were usually reliable, but often couched in stilted English as candidates struggled to provide a literal translation. There were some poor as well as plenty of excellent translations of (f). Common errors included *dum* (then), *sedare* (sit), *cupit* (begin) *correptus* (corrupt) and *quod* (because), and - in spite of the extensive glossing provided in the *Anthology* - some candidates found the phrases *visae ... formae* and *vultu ... haeret* difficult to translate. Some candidates did not stop at the stipulated place but translated a further two lines. For (g), nearly everyone mentioned marble but not all thought in terms of a statue or the relevance of its stillness, while *Pario* led to some highly amusing variations on Parisian, Peruvian, or the Trojan Paris - none of which, however, was held against the value of a candidate's answer to the

question. The focus of answers to (h) was often restricted entirely to content (eyes like stars, godlike hair, ivory neck, red mouth), with few attempts to follow the lead of the question and make observations about the 'sound, choice or position of words' in the Latin. Appropriate examples were not hard to find either for (i), but many explanations of effectiveness went no further than stating that Ovid uses first the active, then the passive of the same verb (*mirabilis*?); only a few candidates analysed what each of Ovid's verbal tricks contributes to his portrayal of Narcissus' predicament.

Question 4
This poem seemed generally more familiar and enjoyable to the majority of candidates. Questions (a) to (c) were well answered, though in an unhelpful 'translationese' style of English. However, answers to (c)(iii) showed that many candidates were unable to locate the appropriate Latin words to suit a well-learnt English version. The passage for translation here (d) was both shorter and more straightforward than that for Q.3, and there were many stylish versions - the main difficulty was how to incorporate the phrase *defessa ... iacebant* properly and the absence of any rendering of *iucunde*, which resulted in the deduction of 1 out of 5 marks. In (e) Catullus' threat to invoke the *vemens dea* Nemesis and the hyperbole with which he embellishes it were identified by most candidates, though not all mentioned what he wants Licinius to do in response to the 'warning'. Everyone had a good chance in (f) to show whatever ingredients for an ideal life they could recall from the range of poetry which they had studied during the course. Some recalled a huge amount of detail from the whole spread of their reading, others insufficient to go beyond the example given on the paper, and it was not enough to make catalogues of items mentioned in the poems, such as porticoes or the Campus, with no explanation of how these might contribute to an enjoyable life. Ironically - as one or two of the finest responses here pointed out - whilst some authors choose to portray themselves as pro-city and others pro-country, their views show considerable unanimity as anti-work/business, anti-patronage/class, and pro-leisure.

1924/23: Language 2 – Higher Tier

General Comments

This was a testing paper, though perhaps marginally easier than in 2005. Section A was generally well done. As ever, those who knew the meanings of the words from the Defined Vocabulary List were able to make good sense of the passage even if they had a less confident grasp of grammar. As in previous years, standards of English in the translation were variable: though there were many very fluent translations, a sizeable minority of candidates produced sentences without main verbs or made basic spelling errors.

This paper is designed as an alternative to the Prose Literature paper, the Roman Life paper or coursework and is not an easy option. Candidates need to have had adequate practice on passages of a consistent level of difficulty, containing the variety of grammatical constructions listed in the specification. A number of candidates did not have sufficient knowledge or skills to cope successfully with a paper of this sort. However, the large majority of the candidates made good sense of the story and were duly rewarded.

There was an increase in the number of candidates answering Section B (English into Latin sentences) this year and these candidates had clearly prepared very successfully: their work was a pleasure to mark.

Comments on the Individual Questions

Section A: Translation

On Section A, despite the help given to them in the introduction and the glossary, some were did not notice that Theoxena was a woman and Poris her husband (rather than *vice versa*). The first sentence also posed a challenge to those with a less confident grasp of grammar: most made sense of the ablative absolute *consilio ... cognito* but many ignored the *se* after *dixit* (this is a very regular failing of GCSE candidates) and did not recognise *filios* as accusative. Thus they tended to write 'Theoxena said to her sons'. Most made some sense of the future infinitive *interfecturam* esse (even if they wrongly took it as passive) but many were less successful with the *ne* clause ('so that they did not come into the power of the king').

The next sentence was mostly well done, though many did not take account of the accusative case of *Athenas* and there were frequent problems with the meaning of *liberis* (e.g. taken as *liberti*) and *discessit*. A few candidates knew *ortus est* or were able to make a suitable guess, but many struggled with the balance of *non solum ... sed etiam.* Some teachers get their pupils to produce lists of easily confused words – perhaps *solum/sol/soleo* could usefully be added. As last year, some appeared to use their knowledge of French to help them with unfamiliar Latin. This was not always successful, as in the case of the candidate who knew *tante* but not *tantus* and took it to refer to an aunt with wind.

In the next sentence, *portum* was often confused with *portam*, and *miserunt* was not infrequently taken as 'they were miserable', as if from *miser*. Candidates should be able to distinguish verb endings from noun/adjective endings. As in previous years, the simple gerundive of purpose (*ad eos capiendos*) caused fewer problems than might have been expected, though *eos*, like other pronouns, was sometimes not known.

At the start of the second half of the passage, *veritus ne omnes necarentur* caused problems and few appeared to recognise the present participle form of *tollens*. The *ut* after *precabatur* was very often taken as a purpose clause ('so that') – centres might usefully help candidates to distinguish between types of clause containing *ut*, if they do not already do so. Many candidates failed to spot the plural form of *manus* – for some, it was the only mark they dropped on the paper.

In the next sentence, *gladium eduxit* caused unexpected problems; many thought that Theoxena brought the boys out to the sword, or took *gladium* with *paravit* (which made it difficult to do anything meaningful with *eduxit*). The better candidates saw that *gladium* had to be the object of *eduxit* and wrote something like 'she produced'. Vocabulary difficulties were evident in the next section; *sola, liberi* and *aut* were often not known or were confused. For *gladium capite,* 'decapitate yourselves with the sword' was not uncommon. One examiner wondered if candidates might have paused to consider the practical difficulties of self decapitation. A pleasing number spotted *parerent* ('obey') but many predictably took it as from *parare*.

The phrase *alii alio modo se occiderunt* was perhaps the most testing in the passage. Most scored at least some marks on it but only a few realised that it referred to the two different methods of suicide offered by Theoxena (e.g. 'they killed themselves, each by a different method'). Lack of knowledge of vocabulary and case endings was often exposed at the end of the passage: many had problems with the phrase *maritum comitem mortis complexa*.

Section B: English into Latin Sentences

On Section B, a range of grammatical constructions was tested. Those who had clearly had practice translating English into Latin coped very well and scored highly. Problems included the superlative form of *celer*, the use and formation of the subjunctive in a result clause, the future tense of *sum*, the tense of the verb after *dum*, and the principal parts of verbs like *dare* and *iacio*.

1924/24: Prose Literature – Higher Tier

General Comments

Once again the standard of achievement on this paper was high. Candidates had been well prepared and gave clear and thoughtful answers which reflected their enjoyment and appreciation of what they had read. This year there were some very weak candidates who should have been entered for the Foundation Tier.

More centres chose to answer Section A (Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*) than Section B (*Selections from Pliny's Letters*)*.* However, the number remains fairly constant and may even have increased slightly. Some examiners thought that the standard was marginally higher in scripts answering Section B, but the difference was not marked.

There was evidence that a few candidates had run out of time this year. The questions, however, were not thought to be longer or more demanding than previously. Centres should remind candidates not to write long answers to questions which only carry one or two marks, but to leave time for the final part of each question which generally requires Latin quotations or supporting examples from the passage or text as a whole. The majority of candidates, including those who scored highest, finished the paper without problems.

Candidates need to be reminded that in each Section ten marks are allocated for background knowledge arising from the passages set in the examination. In Questions 1 and 4 this included the rivers of the underworld and the performance given by pantomime actors.

Presentation and spelling seemed to have improved a little this year, which is encouraging. If examiners can not read an answer, points can not been awarded.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Prose Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 1
(a)(i) was well answered, although a few candidates mistook *pone* for *prope.* In (a)(ii) candidates generally copied the Latin correctly and gave two words as requested. Candidates produced good answers to (b). Occasional mistakes were the omission of chest, and *spiritu* translated as spirit. In (c)(i) Lethe was often misspelled and *pocula* omitted altogether. (c)(ii) was generally answered correctly, but in (c)(iii) some candidates missed the point and gave answers like 'to impress the crowd' or 'he has already drunk from them' without further elaboration. However, there were some very thoughtful answers alluding to the corpse's surprise at finding himself alive again, when he thought he was dead. (d)(i) and (d)(ii) were correctly answered. Answers to (e)(i) were mostly correct, but a number of candidates missed the reference to lines 6-7 and included *oro* in their answer. Candidates occasionally omitted the Latin in (e)(ii) but most made at least two points. In (f) some candidates did not keep to lines 8-15 and included points from earlier in the passage. A few answers were too vague with comments like 'we finally found out how he was killed', when the fact that keeps the reader's interest is that the corpse was killed with a poisoned chalice. There were references to adultery and murder which lacked the precise details. Some candidates concentrated on rhetorical devices especially alliteration. Any stylistic features mentioned must have examples to support them. On the whole, however, most were able to score three marks, and many scored full marks without difficulty.

Question 2

This question was not as well answered as Question 1. In (a) most candidates knew the earlier part of the letter well. (b) was not always well answered, as many candidates appeared to have problems with the meaning of individual Latin words and phrases. Some candidates put *dies* with *futuram* and translated the phrase as future days. Some omitted *in dies* altogether, and the superlative *certissimam* was also often missed. Candidates did not always provide an example of word order and the relevant Latin for each point. A few candidates, however, produced some excellent answers, including the way that *perpetuam* and *concordiam* enclosed *maiorem … in dies futuram.* Most answers to (c)(i) and (ii) were correct, and (d) was well answered on the whole, although some candidates commented on the fact that in a Roman marriage a wife stayed at home or devoted her life to her husband. Many candidates found (d)(ii) difficult and this question did differentiate candidates. Many missed the point about being happy together or that, to Pliny at any rate, it was an equal relationship. (e) was very well answered and provided good differentiation. Most agreed that Pliny was praising Hispulla more than Calpurnia, but added that by praising Hispulla he was also praising Calpurnia, because she had brought her up so well. There were some pleasing references to the Latin even though these were not strictly required. A very few candidates failed to finish this question or appeared to have rushed through it.

Section B: *Selections from Pliny's Letters*

Question 3

Question (a) was well answered but in (b) Ocriculum was often misspelled and there were some instances of Scauro instead of Scaurus. Candidates should be encouraged to write the names of people and places in the nominative case. (c) and (d)(i) produced mainly correct answers. In (d)(ii) some did not recognise *quadraginta milia* and thought it was four hundred thousand sesterces. In (d)(iii) most candidates answered that Crispus was a fellow townsman or friend. (e) and (f)(i) were generally correctly answered, but not everyone could say in (f)(ii) how the disappearances of Crispus and Robustus were similar. (g) provided effective differentiation. Many candidates took *honestissimis* to mean honest and put it with Robustus' son rather than his prayers. Some candidates did not quote the correct Latin words to support their comments, mixing up *pietate* and *sagacitate* for example. However, there were many excellent answers from candidates who picked out the chiasmus of *pietate mira mira sagacitate* and the repetition of *mira* to show how Pliny emphasises his admiration for Robustus' son.

Question 4

In (a) there was some doubt about Ummidia's age; she was a little short of her eightieth year and this was all candidates needed to say. In fact she was 78 years old. (b) and (c) were well answered, although in (c) a few candidates gave *singularem* as part of Pliny's evidence. There was sometimes a lack of precision over 'he was loved as a relative' and some candidates wrote 'he was loved by friends and relatives alike'. In (d)(i) most candidates gave 23 or 24 for Quadratus' age, but did not understand what was meant by 'in his twenty fourth year'. In (d)(ii) a few candidates quoted the Lex Julia, saying that Quadratus could not inherit under this law unless he was married by the age of twenty five. A few candidates referred 'producing three children'. In (e) some candidates did not obtain full marks because they did not give an example of word order, or did not notice that the reference ended with *obsequentissime* and references to the actors were therefore not allowed. This question gave candidates opportunity to display their knowledge of the Latin. The answers to (f) were often vague and not many knew details of the sort of performance given by a *pantomimus.* (g) was answered well by the majority of candidates, who showed very good knowledge of the rest of the letter and supported their answers with appropriate examples. Many gave a good, balanced account of Ummidia's qualities, commenting on Pliny's approval of her will, which he called *honestissimo,* the family affection she displayed, and the way in which she sent her grandson away to study whenever she watched her actors. They went on to point out that Pliny felt she spoilt her actors more than befitted a lady of her status, but explained this by saying that as a woman of her class she had too much leisure.

1942/25: Roman Life Topics – Higher Tier

General Comments

Candidates reached a very good standard on this paper with few candidates scoring less than half marks. Candidates were well prepared and showed sound knowledge of the material as well as enjoyment of the topics they had studied. There was evidence from the answers to the questions in Section B of each topic that candidates were using a wide range of sources. This helped some candidates to boost their scores. Most candidates scored well on Section A and in Section B the (b) questions provided clear differentiation.

Topic 5: Women in Roman Society was the most popular topic and candidates answering this section produced some of the best scripts for the paper. Topic 6: Roman Britain was also popular and generally well answered. The least popular topic was Topic 4: The Structure of Roman Society, and was the one where candidates were least sure of their facts.

All candidates appeared to have had enough time to finish the paper although, a handful of candidates did not attempt Section B at all. A few still write too much for Section A and write answers for Section B which are not well-planned. Candidates should be trained to focus carefully on the specific requirements of the question and to answer concisely. Handwriting was sometimes very difficult to read and, although they were asked to write in continuous prose in section B, one or two candidates used bullet points: these candidates lost marks for 'Quality of Written Communication'.

Some candidates were unsure of the distinction between public life, which refers to the state, and private life, which refers to the family, and this sometimes resulted in misinterpretation.

Comments on Individual Questions

Topic 4: The Structure of Roman Society

Section A
Question 1 was a straightforward question, but not all candidates mentioned both sides of the relationship; the clients performed services for their patrons who gave them gifts and advice in return. Question 2 was well answered and candidates were able to give four details of the *salutatio.* In Question 3 not all the candidates noticed that they were being asked about specific areas of work although some mentioned help with a political career or with a business venture. Some candidates equated clients with freedmen. Question 4 was generally well answered. Some candidates did not show understanding of the earlier stages of the *cursus honorum* in Questions 5 and 6. Question 7 proved quite a challenging question. Very few candidates knew what a *legatus* or *proconsul* was and mentioned that Quadratus had served as the governor of three provinces and under several emperors. Most candidates simply copied information from the inscription, but some candidates also drew some conclusions from the information, if only to say that the very fact he had this inscription put up in his honour showed a successful career. Question 8 was generally well answered although there was some confusion about the purple stripe. Senators in general wore it on their tunics; senior magistrates wore it on the toga.

Section B

Question 9 was a very popular question with many high scores. Answers to Question 9(a) contained good examples of the areas of Roman life where freedmen had a chance to influence events, but some candidates wrote down all they knew about freedmen, including the manumission ceremony, rather than focusing on the question. A few candidates referred to Epaphroditus and the role of the emperor's freedmen. Question 9(b) acted as a good discriminator. There were some excellent answers from candidates who considered among the disadvantages of the *cursus honorum* the time factor, the relatively small pool of entrants each year and the fact that the number of posts decreased as they climbed the ladder. Question 10 was not as popular as Question 9 but candidates produced good answers in (a) where precise details were given to illustrate the emperor's different roles. In their answers to (b) most candidates were able to give examples of jobs done by slaves in public life. They found it more difficult however to give a reason for the large number of slaves needed.

Topic 5: Women in Roman Society

Section A

Question 1 was a straightforward question with plenty of possible answers. Some candidates gave details of a Roman wedding instead of the engagement ceremony but otherwise there were no problems. Questions 2 and 3 were both well answered. Question 4 was misinterpreted by some candidates who gave examples of women who displayed different qualities instead of giving types of evidence. There were however plenty of excellent answers which referred to literature and tombstones and then went on to give examples of women like Arria and Calpurnia. Most candidates knew *univira* in Question 5, although some could not spell the Latin correctly. In Question 6 virtually everyone mentioned that *univirae* could undress the bride on the wedding night (but not during the wedding ceremony) and a few candidates referred to the temple of Chastity. Questions 7 and 8 were universally well answered.

Section B

Question 9 was more popular than question 10. More candidates scored full marks for Question 9(a) than on some other questions. There were many possible answers and the topic had been well prepared, with many candidates giving precise details of the vows made by a Roman couple and the dress of a Roman bride. Marks were not given for vague statements such as 'they exchanged rings'. Question 9(b) was also well answered, although there was some confusion over what rights and freedom entailed. A few candidates mentioned the lack of freedom for women in a marriage *cum manu* and some commented on the restrictions imposed on women's drinking at dinner parties. Question 10(a) was well answered. Most candidates knew the details of the two types of marriage and thus obtained full marks. *cum manu* and *sine manu* were rarely confused this year. In Question 10(b) a few candidates failed to read the question carefully and included women's public as well as private life in their answers. Some candidates either did not discuss women's lives today or failed to mention how modern women's leisure has increased with the use of such things as electrical gadgets, domestic help and childcare.

Topic 6: Roman Britain

Section A

Question 1, with a variety of possible answers, gave candidates a good start to this topic. Some candidates ignored the word 'comfortable' in question 2 and this meant that they did not obtain marks for answers about mosaics or painted walls. Answers to Question 3 were good, describing the bailiff's organisation of the slaves and the farm work, as well as his role in running the economy of the villa. Question 4 was not always well answered, although some candidates described in excellent detail how the *groma* was used by those surveying the route for the roads. The diagrams of a section through a Roman road drawn in response to question 5 were mostly very good and candidates labelled the different features with accuracy, the exception being the *agger.* Questions 6 and 7 were universally well answered.

Section B

Questions 8 and 9 appeared to be equally popular. In Question 8(a) many candidates knew Bath quite well and were able to give examples to match the points they made, even if these were not always in an obvious sequence. There were plenty of really good answers here. Some candidates produced thoughtful answers to Question 8(b), whereas others failed to answer precisely. Some gave a list of the products of the villa, or details of Claudius' invasion. The most commonly mentioned benefits to Rome of the occupation of Britain were taxes, the acquisition of metals, and trade. Question 9(a) required an answer focusing on the evidence that showed Fishbourne palace belonged to someone important. Some candidates included a long preamble on the history of the palace or spent too much time on the temple dedication inscription. Others, however, gave an impressive amount of detail about the palace, describing the use for the rooms of all four wings, the fine quality of all the decoration and the formal, Italian style gardens. Some candidates were unable to give precise examples in their answers to 9(b), but most answered this question well. Candidates made reference to the road system, the subsequent expansion of trade, villas built in Roman style, improvements to agriculture and the introduction of new crops. Few candidates, however, mentioned the learning of Latin.

1942/06: Coursework

General Comments

The coursework submitted covered a range of titles on the prescribed topics. The competence of the work presented and the thoroughness of the marking both indicate that coursework is a valued option that gives candidates the opportunity to explore particular aspects of Roman life through their own research and selection and handling of primary sources. There was a small number of outstanding pieces and a very small number of pieces with very little factual content and little or no primary source material, and in between a high proportion of pieces that reflected knowledge of the topic and an understanding of the importance of primary source material for our knowledge of the Roman world.

Success in this component depends largely on three major aspects of the work assessed under Assessment Criteria (AC) and considered in more detail below. First, there is the choice of title and selection of material appropriate to the title. Titles for coursework on literature give rise to particular problems and will be dealt with separately below. Second, there is the relationship between factual content and primary source material (assessed under AC1 and 2). Third, understanding and evaluation (assessed under AC4) are intrinsic to the selection, use and interpretation of material, but are also shown explicitly in the course of the work and in the conclusion. The combination of carefully chosen title, well selected material that is properly referenced, and evidence of the candidate's own understanding and evaluation is the basis of good practice that is evident in the best work. This good practice is in turn the surest way of avoiding the improper use of websites and other sources of information that can give rise to suspicion of malpractice (see further below).

Choice of Title and Selection of Material
Most candidates submitted coursework on the prescribed Roman Life topics, and there were fewer candidates this year who wrote on historical topics that are not central to Roman life. Among the most popular topics were the Roman army, women and gladiatorial games. Many titles take the form of questions. A question can be a guide, and checking that the question has been answered is also a way of ensuring that the material has been covered. However, questions do not automatically result in clearly-structured, focused coursework, and there are many examples of exhaustive treatments of topics such as the Roman army without sufficient **selection** of relevant material. Centres should encourage candidates to select their material, and marks should be deducted under AC1 for irrelevant facts.

Candidates can and should show their understanding of their chosen title by their selection of material, not by reproducing all the information they find. For example, a study of reasons for the popularity of the gladiatorial games will probably lead a candidate to detailed information about the different kinds of gladiators who competed. The *fact* of the variety, set out with just a few well-chosen examples and a reference to the source of detailed information, will itself constitute a reason for the popularity of the games without the need to include in the coursework minute descriptions of each kind of gladiator.

When the reduced limit of 2000 words is introduced in 2007, it will be especially important to select titles that enable candidates to produce focused coursework that will nonetheless score on all the criteria. Centres are reminded that OCR can be consulted about the suitability of titles, and will give advice on the scope of titles and the scale of coursework under consideration by candidates, as well as on the appropriateness of titles to the Roman Life topics in the specification. A Coursework Enquiry form is available from the OCR website **www.ocr.org.uk**.

Titles of Literary Coursework

Literary coursework titles present a particular problem. Centres should bear in mind that the coursework component is an alternative to the Roman Life Topics paper, and should avoid titles that will result in overlaps with the Verse or Prose Literature papers. Extensive overlap between coursework and the literature papers, with little or no attempt to address an aspect or aspects of Roman life, will be penalised. Coursework on Virgil for instance is unlikely to present many opportunities for the exploration of Roman life, and where such opportunities do exist, candidates may be rightly cautious about distorting their literary study by concentrating on a peripheral aspect of the book just because it offers the only possibility for exploring Roman life. Shorter poems, ostensibly dealing with such central topics as food and drink, social life etc. still need to be handled with care in view of the conventions of the genre, poetic effect and exaggeration etc.

Prose literature is often more promising, and work of a high standard has resulted from a study of Pliny's Letters: what we can deduce from his letters about the nature and responsibilities of Roman public life, for example. But again, the dominance of the literature's own quality can be unhelpful: looking at Pompeii AD79 from the point of view of a slave or other 'minor' character can expose the candidate to the temptation of reproducing the essence of Pliny's narrative in a different first person. Such possibilities are worth pursuing, however, and it is to be hoped that Centres will continue with this option. In the case of literary coursework, the offer of advice on coursework titles, as mentioned above, becomes a strong recommendation to consult OCR at an early stage.

Factual Content (AC1 12 marks) and Use of Primary Source Material (AC2 8 marks)

These two criteria are considered together, as the expectation in this component is that factual content will be derived in the first instance from primary source material, which will thereby be integrated into the content of the coursework. Marks for primary source material therefore reflect not only its use *per se*, but also the extent to which it supplies factual content.

Teachers' comments on the candidates' work reveal that Centres are well aware of the importance of primary source material, and there are candidates who have successfully derived factual content from primary source material, presenting archaeological evidence from Pompeii for example, with information they have drawn from it, or assessing Pliny's letters as evidence for attitudes towards women. However, the following problems are common.

- Too little primary source material. There is no simple correlation between the number of pieces of primary source material used and marks awarded, because everything depends on the *use* of the material, perhaps of just a few substantial pieces. However, a couple of passing references or quotations without further analysis or discussion is not sufficient to gain a reasonable score on AC2.
- References are not always given, or are not complete: for example 'Pliny's letters', not 'Pliny Letters 6.16'. The importance of proper referencing and clear indication of primary source material is still underestimated by many candidates and Centres.
- Primary source material, whether textual nor visual, is often used purely as illustration, its potential for providing factual content untapped or its relevance unclear.
- Pictures of reconstructions, for instance of armour or battle tactics, are sometimes credited under AC2. If they are suitably labelled and explained, they can be credited under AC1 but they are not primary.

The importance of primary source material as a source of factual content notwithstanding, it is expected that secondary sources will be used to locate primary sources, corroborate evidence and help to provide a wider picture. According to their Bibliographies, candidates consult a range of secondary sources. But while some candidates do give references to books or websites in the course of the text, as well as including them in the bibliography, little of the coursework submitted shows evidence of selected, referenced use of secondary material. Direct quotes must be indicated by quotation marks and references, as well as the sources of information listed in the bibliography, as laid down in the Specification (7.2 p.33). As with primary source material, secondary source material should be integrated, and its contribution to the candidate's argument made clear.

From the observations above, it appears that Centres are encouraging their candidates to be if anything over-ambitious in the quantity of secondary source used, and under-ambitious in their use of primary source material. Candidates who start from primary sources, and use them as the basis of their work and make deductions accordingly about aspects of Roman life tend to produce work of a high quality, and furthermore have the satisfaction of direct contact with the texts and artefacts of the Roman world, as well as developing their skills in handling texts and 'reading' pictures.

AC3 Organisation (4 marks)
Many candidates produce well-organised work, structured around questions, particular texts or sections. Most candidates include a bibliography, but do not always give full details, and they should be aware, as indicated above, that the bibliography is not a substitute for references to sources in the body of the coursework.

The most common reason for deducting marks under this criterion is excessive length. This year, most candidates met the requirement to include a word-count, but some candidates wrote well in excess of the word-limit, in both Type A and Type B coursework. Candidates with this tendency who are taking the examination in 2007 when the lower word-limit comes in will have to be particularly vigilant to ensure they do not exceed the limit.

AC4 Understanding and Evaluation (14 marks)
As suggested above, understanding and evaluation are intrinsic in the choice of title, selection of material, use of sources, and incidental comment, not just in a conclusion (though a conclusion is desirable). Some of the liveliest examples of understanding and evaluation are to be found in empathetic pieces, for example the views of a Roman soldier on being in an army of occupation in Britain, or interviews with ancient visitors to Aquae Sulis. Candidates are ingenious in indicating their sources and the primary source material they have used, with notes, references, passing off ancient artefacts as family photos etc. Although such work is not marked as creative writing, there were many examples of good writing, owing to skilful use of sources and a high degree of understanding and evaluation.

However, empathy writing is not the only way to achieve high marks on understanding and evaluation. Candidates scored well on this criterion, expressing personal opinions and more generally entering into subjects they were clearly passionate about, such as law or religion. Modern comparisons are often used helpfully to show understanding and evaluation, and this year, there were fewer instances of the modern part of the comparison becoming too dominant. This could be because the comparative element did not appear in many actual titles. It is preferable to use comparisons as they come to mind as evidence of understanding and evaluation; if they are pursued slavishly, they can detract from the main purpose of investigating *Roman* life.

At this level, opinions expressed in the first person are not penalised, as a detached impersonal style is not obligatory. There should be more depth to personal comment than for example 'I think the gladiatorial games were cruel' (not an actual example) but most candidates achieved far more sophisticated understanding and evaluation than that.

Quality of Written Communication (2 marks)
Almost all candidates gained both marks on this criterion, which is common to all coursework specifications.

Oral Coursework
Only two Centres submitted oral coursework (Type B) this year, a smaller entry than last year. It was more successful in cases where candidates read literature that was familiar to them and within their grasp, and a high standard was reached. The candidate's statement about choice and rendering of the chosen passage does provide an opportunity for the literary aspects of the passage to be addressed, but candidates did not in all cases then turn their attention to Roman life topics in the other piece of their coursework.

This is the last year in which the option will be offered, but in view of its more literary scope, it is perhaps those Centres that have offered or have considered offering oral coursework because of its literary aspect who need to take note of the observations above about tackling literary coursework.

Marking
Marking was generally of a very high standard, teachers' comments both on the coursework itself and on the coversheets indicating considerable thoroughness, appreciation of individual candidates' strengths and weaknesses and a sound understanding of the criteria. It was clear from the comments of almost all teachers how marks had been awarded. The marking and moderation of Type B coursework need to be handled with care, to ensure that the marks awarded over both pieces of work under the different criteria accurately reflect the candidate's overall performance in this component.

Few major adjustments to marking have been suggested by moderators. The most common reason for adjustment is that marking is over-generous on AC1 and AC2: some teachers could be more strict in marking work where there is poor selection of facts and non-existent or incomplete referencing (under AC1), and insufficient, poorly used or poorly integrated primary source material (under AC2). In some cases, as indicated above, marks are adjusted where coursework is written on topics not central to Roman life.

Coursework Guidance
Some Centres have sent in the guidance they give to candidates, which is in most cases clear, helpful and designed to enable candidates to carry out their own study and write their coursework accordingly. The coursework from a few Centres shows such slight differentiation that it appears that Centres have given too much guidance, leaving candidates little scope to show their own strengths and weakness across the criteria. While coursework is a learning exercise, teachers are required to ensure that it is also an examination, and that the work is supervised in such a way that candidates' own skills can be assessed.

Suspected malpractice
In accordance with increasing concern about plagiarism and coursework, there has been greater emphasis this year on the signing and return of the Centre Authentication Form by Centres, whereby they accept responsibility for the supervising and marking of coursework. Most Centres have complied well. However, it is clear that some Centres are still inexperienced in ensuring that the work candidates submit is in fact their own. Candidates at a number of Centres, and in some cases more than one candidate from a Centre, are being investigated for suspected

malpractice because sections of their work have been found to be copied, without indication of direct quotation or proper referencing and acknowledgment of their sources.

Candidates *must* to be warned that they must not copy. It is not assumed that all candidates who copy are deliberately cheating, but they need to understand that if they do copy, they are laying themselves open to the charge of plagiarism. But more positively, they also need to be aware from the outset that the intention of coursework is not simply to reproduce chunks of undigested facts on a topic. As suggested in the course of this Report, good practice needs to be established at the outset, so that candidates appreciate that coursework is an exercise in handling material from primary sources, and selecting content from these and other acknowledged and referenced sources, so that they can use it to meet the aims and objectives of their own work. The fact that the majority of candidates do tackle coursework in this spirit, and produce work that on its own merits scores well across all the criteria is heartening, and should increase confidence in the value of coursework as a stimulating and rewarding assignment, and a means of assessing skills that are not at present so well assessed in written examinations.

Conclusion
Compared with last year, there are perhaps fewer really outstanding pieces, but also fewer with very low marks. The latter is perhaps more significant, suggesting that the proportion of sound, well-supervised and marked work is higher. The teachers' comments reinforce the impression of thorough teaching and understanding of the criteria. They are also a great help to moderators in carrying out their work, and the insights they provide into the whole coursework process much appreciated.

The issues highlighted in this report are interrelated: (i) the limited use of primary source material by many candidates and (ii) the appearance of long chunks of unacknowledged secondary source material, poorly selected in relation to the title. If (i) is addressed, then (ii) is likely to be less of a problem. The key to progress in these areas may lie in the reduction in the length of coursework which takes effect next year in 2007. It is hoped that the shorter word-limit will encourage more careful choice of focused titles that will in turn result in more rigorous and creative selection of facts derived in the first instance from primary source material rather than secondary material, and will therefore lessen the temptation to import unaltered or barely altered chunks of material from websites or other secondary sources.

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Latin (1942)
June 2006 Assessment Series

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
06/86 Coursework	40	32	28	24	20	16	12	8
11 Paper 1 (Foundation)	60	n/a	n/a	38	32	26	20	14
12 Paper 2 (Foundation)	60	n/a	n/a	31	26	21	16	11
13 Paper 3 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	26	20	14	9	4
14 Paper 4 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	23	20	17	14	11
15 Paper 5 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	23	19	16	13	10
21 Paper 1 (Higher)	60	46	40	34	26	n/a	n/a	n/a
22 Paper 2 (Higher)	60	45	37	30	24	n/a	n/a	n/a
23 Paper 3 (Higher)	40	30	26	23	19	n/a	n/a	n/a
24 Paper 4 (Higher)	40	29	25	22	18	n/a	n/a	n/a
25 Paper 5 (Higher)	40	30	26	22	18	n/a	n/a	n/a

Syllabus Options

Foundation Tier

Option FA (11, 12, 13, 14)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	110	93	76	59	42
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	48.8	72.1	81.4	90.7	100

The total entry for the examination was 43

Option FB (11, 12, 13, 15)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	104	88	73	58	43
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	33.3	66.7	80	93.3	93.3

The total entry for the examination was 15

Option FC (11, 12, 14, 15)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	110	94	78	63	48
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	36.5	60.4	78.1	93.8	99

The total entry for the examination was 98

Option FD (06, 11, 12, 13)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	107	90	73	57	41
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	31.6	63.2	84.2	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 19

Option FE (06, 11, 12, 14)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	106	91	76	62	48
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	42.6	72.1	86.9	95.1	96.7

The total entry for the examination was 61

Higher Tier

Option HA (21, 22, 23, 24)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	171	150	129	109	87	76	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		52.5	80.9	92.2	97.1	99.1	99.5	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 2983

Option HB (21, 22, 23, 25)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	168	148	128	109	87	76	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		37	64.2	80.6	90.4	96.5	98.6	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 429

Option HC (21, 22, 24, 25)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	149	128	108	86	75	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		37.9	65.3	82.2	92.2	97.2	98.7	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 2382

Option HD (06, 21, 22, 23)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	174	153	132	111	89	78	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		28.3	62	78.6	89.1	96.7	98.6	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 276

Option HE (06, 21, 22, 24)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	150	130	110	88	77	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		26.4	54.3	72.5	86.0	94.7	96.6	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 1171

Option HG (21, 22, 24, 86)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	150	130	110	88	77	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		0	100	100	100	100	100	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 1

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	40.3	67.6	81.8	91.3	96.5	98.1	98.5	98.7

The total entry for the examination was 7478