

GCSE Latin

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1942**

Report on the Components

June 2007

1942/MS/R/07

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.

This report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
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

Component	Content	Page
*	Introduction	1
1942/11	Paper 1 – Language 1 (Foundation)	3
1942/12	Paper 2 – Verse Language (Foundation)	5
1942/13	Paper 3 – Language 2 (Foundation)	7
1942/14	Paper 4 – Prose Literature (Foundation)	9
1942/15	Paper 5 – Roman Life Topics (Foundation)	11
1942/21	Paper 1 – Language 1 (Higher)	13
1942/22	Paper 2 – Verse Language (Higher)	17
1942/23	Paper 3 – Language 2 (Higher)	21
1942/24	Paper 4 – Prose Literature (Higher)	25
1942/25	Paper 5 – Roman Life Topics (Higher)	27
1942/06	Coursework	29
*	Grade Thresholds	35

Introduction

This year saw a rise in the entry partly due to the transfer to OCR of the last ex-AQA Centres and partly due to the increase in the size of entry from existing centres. The addition of these centres appears to have had no overall impact on the results: these centres were well prepared for the OCR Latin GCSE. A sincere welcome is accorded to these new centres and their candidates.

This year also witnessed the implementation of a small group of changes to the Specification, all designed to reduce the burden of preparation for candidates, while maintaining the overall standard of the examination. No problems were evident as a result of these changes.

The great majority of candidates were entered for the appropriate tier, though, as in previous years, a small number entered for the Higher Tier fell through the Grade E safety net. The best principle to follow is to enter for the Foundation Tier any candidate who is securely in the grade C/D area; such candidates should only be entered for the Higher Tier if they are strong enough to have a realistic chance of their achieving a grade B.

This year a very small number candidates were unfamiliar with the format of examination papers which contained alternative sections. On the verse literature paper a few candidates attempted both texts before settling on the appropriate one; on the Roman Life paper one candidate wrote complete answers on both Topics instead of one

Examiners recommend that candidates spread out their work in order to provide Examiners with plenty of space for marking: it would also help if candidates avoided writing in the margins of the answer booklets.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

1942/11: Language 1 - Foundation Tier

General Comments

The entry was again very small. This year the overall quality of scripts was much higher than that of last year. Questions 1 and 2 were within the grasp of the great majority of candidates; only Question 3 caused any substantial difficulty.

Time pressure was not an issue for any candidates; a few even had time to write out a neat version of their translation. Most remembered to write their translations on alternate lines. The quality of English of scripts was very poor in many cases, as in the Higher Tier.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

In Question 1(a), most translated the superlative correctly; a few ignored the pluperfect tense of *expulerat*. In Question 1(b), 'planning' made its first of several appearances in the comprehension questions; many candidates seem to think that *petere*, *constituere* and even *iubere* can all be satisfactorily translated 'plan', which is not the case. In the second part of (b) few candidates recognised *ibat* or *inter*. In Question 1(c), it was not acceptable to write 'Nero's rival to the throne', since this information is to be found in the introduction to the passage, not in the Latin as the question required; many candidates made this error. Unfortunately for many, having given the wrong information in (i), they often omitted the second part of what Agrippina said in answering (ii) (that Britannicus would be a better emperor than Nero). In Question 1(d), weaker answers had 'planned' for *constituit* or omitted *statim*. In Question 1(e), *militem* was usually plural and *iussit* often unknown; the rest was done well.

Question 2

Britannicus ... consumebat: some candidates confused *cum*, or failed to bring out the force of the imperfect.

servus ... timebat: *servus* was often made plural, but there were very many more 'slaves' than 'servants'. Many took *omnem* with *servus* ('all the slaves'). *eius* was often omitted.

Britannicus ... vino erat: a few candidates did not know *accepit* or *nullum*. Here and below the various parts of *hic* were often confused with *ille* or omitted altogether.

Britannicus ... calidum erat: the commonest error here was ignorance of *iussit*; a few had wine being added to water; some candidates thought it was Britannicus who put the water in the wine; others had the *aquam frigidam* stored in the fridge.

in hac ... venenum: this was generally translated correctly.

hoc ... posset: from this point on the gradient of difficulty seemed to rise rather more steeply. *totum* and *tam* were often omitted. Despite the gloss, *pervasit* often failed to materialise as a perfect indicative. The *ut* clause (result here), was regularly confused with a purpose clause (the clue given by *tam* having been ignored). *nihil* was sometimes unknown or confused with *nemo*.

Nero ... esse: *ceteris* caused havoc (often 'quickly'). *dixit* was often unknown. A minority failed to recognise the indirect statement. Most thought *infirmam* agreed with *Britannici*, and took *vocem* to be part of *voco*. Most of the candidates who identified the indirect statement (*vocem ... esse*) also dealt correctly with the second instance (*eum ... recepturum esse*), though there was a lot of guesswork here. Some candidates gained only the mark for *et*.

Agrippina ... accidisset: only a few candidates got this completely right. Others gave 'was intelligent' for *intellexit* and 'accident' for *accidisset*.

Question 3

Question 3(a) generally proved to be a straightforward introduction to the passage. In (ii), *iratissima* was by far the most popular choice, but *quamquam* or *tamen* were also occasionally selected for sensible reasons, and were accepted. After this question, some candidates made little further headway, until the final question. In Question 3(b), few could make sense of *ad se vocavit*, and few knew *quaesivit*. In Question 3(c), the indirect question defeated most candidates; often the only part of the answer that scored marks was the 'private army', which was glossed. In Question 3(d), the wording of the question was slightly misleading: the mark scheme was adapted to compensate for this; the negative purpose clause was rarely handled properly, while the parenthetical relative clause caused many difficulties; there were, however, a good many candidates who scored full marks on this question. In Question 3(e), the significance of *relicta* escaped most candidates, while *nesciebat* and *deberet* and the indirect question were rarely recognised. In Question 3(f), although many confused *libertus* with *liberi*, the main error was in the identification of the subject and the object (the subject was often Nero or Agrippina, and the object was often the *libertus*); once again 'planned' was not acceptable for *constituit*.

1942/12: Verse Literature - Foundation Tier

General Comments

There was a significant and welcome improvement in performance on this paper this year. Candidates for the *Cambridge Latin Anthology* selection outnumbered those for Virgil by around 3 to 2 and were generally the stronger cohort. Whilst a general familiarity with the poems studied was enough to enable candidates to respond to many of the questions dealing with context and factual content, only a minority did so consistently across the paper. Answers to questions requiring specific details of the Latin text were not always secure. Responses to the more substantial questions were sometimes limited in length or scope.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Virgil *Aeneid II*

Question 1

The generally straightforward narrative contained in this passage gave many candidates a good chance to score significant marks, though in the second half answers on details of the hunting scene were often inaccurate. For (c), *tandem* was rare, the various animals in lines 12-19 were often swapped around at random, and (j)(ii) produced very few correct responses - *montes* in (g) being one of the Latin words in the passage that everyone seemed to recognise. Questions less dependant on specific Latin, such as (a) and (e), were answered better, though there were some contorted endings to the hunt – such as Iulus being eaten by a lion, or going into a cave with Dido.

Question 2

The answers given to this question would indicate that candidates generally found this passage harder, though many were able to grasp the gist of what was required. Few candidates made specific Latin references. Typical mistakes were: (a)(iv), *terminus* regularly interpreted as either the end of a journey or a terminal illness; (c) *inhumatus* rendered as 'inhumane'; and (d) *externam* coming out as 'extreme'. The translation exercise (e) was often omitted in its entirety, many candidates made partially successful attempts and some gave perfect versions. In their responses to (b) and (g) some candidates did not keep within the lines specified. Most found something to highlight for (g) – the 'pairs of words' in lines 17-18 and the widespread instances of alliteration being the most common - however, some candidates only referred to stylistic features and made no reference to the 'bitterness' of what Dido is actually saying.

Section B : Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 3

General familiarity with the Baucis and Philemon story and of the context of this particular passage was enough to give a good score on this section. Some candidates lost marks through careless reading of questions – for example, by quoting *timidus* from line 4 for (b), or in (g)(i) anticipating the coming flood, whereas in lines 11-13 the gods only speak in vague terms of 'well-deserved punishment'. Many supplied only two points for (h) – glossing over the first of the two instructions given in line 14. Examples supplied for (i)-(k) were regularly well chosen and

justified, most readily by those who took fullest advantage of the fact that (j) and (k) between them allowed access to material from the whole story.

Question 4

This passage from Horace was a demanding one, and marks for this question were lower than those for question 4. (a) was well answered, with plenty of oats/grain and dried grapes mentioned by candidates, though with fewer chickpeas and quite a lot of extraneous cheese. There was an error on the question paper here with Ovid being printed instead of Horace. Examiners ensured that candidates were not penalised if they did refer to Ovid. Question (b) gave opportunities for candidates to cover very familiar ground. Thereafter, however, where questions required details of Latin to be cited, many candidates scored only an occasional mark or two, and the only questions to be answered with widespread success were (f) and (j). Question (i) did not yield the responses that examiners were expecting, perhaps because some candidates failed to understand these particular lines and therefore included a random selection of points from the meal as a whole.

1942/13: Language 2 - Foundation Tier

General Comments

The entry was higher again this year but the quality of the work rather better. There were fewer really weak scripts demonstrating little knowledge of vocabulary or grammar, and a higher proportion of scripts that scored in the 30s out of 40.

Comments on Individual Questions

In the first sentence, as on the Higher Tier passage, *rebus* was often not connected with *res* which meant that *omnibus* was mistaken as 'everyone'. Translations such as 'in all ways' or 'in everything he did' were accepted. *cognoverunt* in the next sentence was sometimes confused with other verbs beginning with 'c' - of those who knew its meaning, some saw that the infinitive *parare* was dependent on it in an accusative and infinitive clause. In even very good scripts, candidates often took *consilia* as singular, however. The verb *iusserunt* was well-known and most took *ut* correctly as introducing a purpose clause.

In the next sentence, the perfect participle *monitus* was not confidently handled, either because the form was not recognised or the verb confused with *manere*. The indirect statement after *intellexit* caused few problems to those who knew the meaning of the verb. The next sentence was also well done, though *quod* was sometimes wrongly taken as a relative going with *templum* and *tutum* was sometimes taken with *loco* rather than Pausanias.

Generous glossing helped candidates to make sense of the last part of the story and almost all did. Some took *convenerunt* as *circumvenerunt* ('they surrounded the temple') but still gained some marks as it made good sense in the context. *lapidibus* was glossed and the Examiners had hoped that candidates would spot the *-ibus* ending as a plural: many did not (the same was true at Higher Tier level). Not everyone knew *ecce!* ('hooray!', wrote some, as if they thought that Pausanias deserved his punishment). Not everyone knew *posuit* but most produced something that fitted the context and thus won some credit. The phrase *multis post diebus* caused unexpected problems, perhaps because of the word order, but the *qui* clause was done well and those who knew *tam* often correctly took the following *ut* as a result clause. In the last sentence, there were some good translations of *hoc modo* (e.g. 'this was how ...') but some candidates were misled by the English introduction to the story and assumed that *tristi morte* must have meant 'with a slow death'. The word *ducem* should have been underlined on the question paper as it was glossed. Many took it correctly as 'leader'; those who connected it with *ducere* were not penalised for doing so.

Last year's report on this paper stressed that candidates entered for this language paper should have a good knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List as, without it, they are unlikely to make much coherent sense of passages set. It was pleasing to note that this year's candidates seemed to have been well-prepared by their Centres and the best work was a pleasure to mark.

1942/14: Prose Literature – Foundation Tier

General Comments

Although the level of difficulty of this paper was judged appropriate, the overall standard of answers appeared to be slightly lower than last year and some candidates had an inadequate grasp of the set texts. However, a number of candidates produced answers of a pleasingly high standard and could probably have been entered for the Higher Tier. There was little difference in standard between the answers to the two Sections, the *Cambridge Latin Anthology* and *Selections from Pliny's Letters*. Out of about three hundred candidates, seventeen chose Pliny.

Candidates should be reminded that they must always observe the line references given, copy Latin words carefully if they are asked to quote them and write legibly if they wish to avoid losing marks.

Spelling of proper nouns such as Stabiae, Vesuvius and even Pliny was poor.

Comments on Individual Questions

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

Question 1

In (a)(i) and (ii) candidates had to give answers from the sentence *Pompeianus erat Stabiis diremptus sinu medio* rather than give the description of the curved shore that followed or comments on the debris from the volcano. In (b) several candidates thought that he was approaching danger rather than that the danger was not yet approaching (him). (c)(i) and (ii) were quite well answered. Few were able to give all three points in their answers to (d) and there was some confusion between *hortatur* and *hortus* which resulted in Pomponianus being led into the garden. Line references were often not observed in (d) and (e). (f) gave the best candidates a chance to show their knowledge and it was pleasing to see that many quoted the Latin to support their points even though this had not been requested. They referred to *latissimae flammae* for the extent of the flames and commented on Pliny's uncle's heroic behaviour. Some candidates referred to material outside lines 8-13, for which they were awarded no marks.

Question 2

(a) and (b) were generally well answered. In (c)(i) a few candidates reversed the characters and wrote about the accusations 'he made about her', although the question clearly stated that the accusations were about Caelius. The majority however scored well. (c)(ii) was generally well answered, but some struggled for the right word in English to describe Caelius' private life. In (d) *invita* caused problems and Clodia had many invitations. (e) proved a challenging question with few correct answers. Some took *crimini* as crimes. Candidates found (f) easier and there were many correct answers. One or two however included information from outside the lines quoted, such as Caelius'his wealth and his youth. In (g) few candidates scored more than one or two marks. This suggested that they lacked awareness of the context as well as the content of the passage. Some candidates however contrasted Clodia's conduct with her noble birth and pointed out that Cicero was trying to blacken Clodia's character to enable him to win the case for Caelius. More than one candidate wrote that Cicero depicted her as a woman who liked a toyboy.

Section B: Selections from Pliny's Letters

Question 3

(a) was well answered but in (b) many candidates had forgotten the meaning of *ambigui* and wrote that Regulus' son was ambiguous. Most candidates gained one mark for (c) because they knew that Regulus sold his son for financial gain, but then omitted to say that the son could inherit from his mother. The most common response to (d) was that Pliny showed Regulus was not acting as a father should to his son or, in other words, was an example of bad parenting. (e) was a straightforward question, although many candidates failed to gain four marks because they only mentioned ponies and dogs. In (f)(i) Regulus slaughtered the animals around the pyre: he did not burn them on it, at least initially. (f)(ii) was generally well answered. In (g) there were plenty of general comments about Regulus' insincerity and love of attention, but few examples taken from the passage. Better answers could have included a reference to his failure to show genuine grief at his son's funeral, and the fact that his friends swarmed around him, pretending to show affection.

Question 4

(a) (i) and (ii) were reasonably well answered, as was (b) (i), since everyone knew that Quadratus was Quadratilla's grandson. Most candidates were able to give part of the answer to (b) (ii), but few could give *primum* as the answer to (b) (iii). (c) (i) produced a few correct answers, but (c) (ii) was a challenging question. In (d) most candidates noted that the audience applauded and in (e) some knew that they copied Quadratilla's gestures, but very few gained full marks for these relatively straightforward questions. (f) (i) was not particularly well answered but in (f) (ii) some knew that Quadratilla's supporters would get a legacy for the encouragement they gave to her actors.

1942/15: Roman Life Topics – Foundation Tier

General Comments

The standard of achievement on this paper remains fairly constant, with about half of the candidates gaining at least half of the marks. The overall standard was once again higher than that of Paper 14, and most candidates showed some knowledge of their chosen topic. There were however very few excellent answers.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society, which was answered by about two thirds of the candidates, was more popular than Topic 6: Roman Britain. There was little difference in the standard of answers given on each topic.

In Section B many essays were too short. Candidates should use the guidelines given, but not become so carried away by imagination that they give insufficient factual information or include irrelevant material. This year marking by level descriptors was introduced for Section B, which rewarded candidates according to how far they answered the question as well as for the content of their answers.

Candidates need to be reminded to observe the rubric, as a few candidates answered both topics. In Section B where there is a choice of essay questions some wrote both essays and a few wrote only part (a) or part (b). There was no sign that candidates failed to finish the paper even where they had answered more questions than necessary. Handwriting was often illegible and the spelling, particularly of Latin words such as *triclinium*, *impluvium*, *tepidarium*, *caldarium* and *frigidarium* was poor. Other words commonly misspelled included mosaics, tiered, couch, dining, amphitheatre and tragedy.

Comments on Individual Questions

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

Section A

A number of candidates thought that A referred to the *atrium*. A pleasing number of candidates knew the Latin word *impluvium* but not all were able to spell it correctly. The best answers to Question 2 contained clear descriptions. Some candidates wrote 'they were decorated' without specifying whether 'they' referred to the walls or the floor. One or two omitted to mention floors altogether. There were some reasonable answers to Question 3, although many candidates thought that the *peristylum* was reached directly from the *atrium*. In Question 4 some answers lacked precision. The furniture would have included a strong box for valuables, not a chest of drawers or a cupboard. In Question 5 most candidates were able to score one mark for the reception of guests, but very few commented on the use of the *atrium* by the family. Many candidates did not have the vocabulary to describe the seating in the photograph of the theatre in Question 6 and there were long circumlocutions. Although some did mention awnings and scented water in answers to Question 7, candidates thought up many different ways to stay cool in the theatre, from fans, drinks and cool clothing to fresh air. In answers to Question 8 many candidates were unable to distinguish between comedy and farce. Pantomime was the most quoted type of play and the most common detail given was masks.

Section B

Question 9 was more popular than Question 10. In 9 (a) some candidates used their reading to good effect and wrote letters from Caecilius to Barbillus or Macro to Cato. This was preferable to those who used English names, as the question stated 'Imagine you are a Roman'. Good answers included examples of shops such as bakers and snack bars, and details of election campaigns and temples. There were some good answers to 9 (b), although too many candidates scarcely mentioned the food or gave a list of dishes with no attempt to divide it into three courses. Many essays lacked the detail needed for this topic. In 10 (a) only the best answers mentioned the office they were seeking or what their job would entail. 10 (b) revealed confusion over the sequence of events in the baths, and it was a pity that those candidates who knew all the Latin names for the different rooms were unable to spell them.

Topic 6: Roman Britain

Section A

Questions 1 and 2 were generally well answered, although in 2 the forum did not count as a building. In Question 3 there were few good examples of evidence and candidates found it difficult to explain what that evidence told us. There were many vague references to inscriptions and writings. Question 5 was well answered but answers to Question 6 contained some guesswork. There was also some confusion between what the Romans imported and what they introduced to Britain. In Question 7 geographical details varied considerably, although most knew which metals were mined in Britain.

Section B

Questions 8 and 9 proved equally popular, but the answers to 9 (a) on the Roman villa were better. In 8 (a) the details of the journey and the method of transport were very sketchy. Many candidates mentioned the problems of wayside inns and thieves, but there was little mention of road surfaces, apart from a few irrelevant descriptions of how a road was constructed. One or two candidates however wrote gripping accounts of how they saved their precious cargo by outwitting roadside thieves with their cunning plans. In 8 (b) most knew that the bailiff's job was to look after the slaves but only some candidates mentioned care of buildings and tools. The most commonly cited jobs for household slaves were cleaning and cooking. Few mentioned more the specialised jobs done by secretaries or accountants. On the farm jobs such as ploughing, harvesting crops and tending the animals were generally mentioned. A few candidates simply described the villa. Answers to 9 (a) were good. Most candidates were able to describe the decoration, the spacious accommodation and the garden in some detail. Some candidates commented on the central heating and their suite of baths. Some had clearly revised Fishbourne palace and used many of the details in their essays, not all of which were relevant. There were however many good answers to this question. In contrast 9 (b) was generally not well answered. Roman taxes and laws were rarely mentioned and there were few details of the harsh treatment meted out by Roman soldiers.

1942/21: Language 1 - Higher Tier

General Comments

There was a wide variety in the quality of responses. As in past years, it was clear that a small proportion of candidates should have been entered for the Foundation Tier.

Very few candidates ran out of time. Of the rest, a few, with time in hand, used it sensibly to read through their scripts to iron out anomalies. A widespread impression formed by many Examiners was that a majority of candidates showed a distinct lack of understanding of sentence structure in either Latin or English. Centres should note that translations of complex sentences which contain syntactical errors in the English will not receive full marks. Handwriting was often very poor, with many words bordering on the illegible; particularly difficult was determining the presence or absence of a terminal –s to denote plural nouns.

There were many entirely correct responses to Question 1. Question 2, although it contained a few pitfalls which ensnared most candidates, generally was superbly done. Question 3 proved a greater challenge than its counterparts in recent years, setting a more appropriate gradient of difficulty across the three questions; many candidates who scored very highly on the translation made surprisingly little headway here.

Even high-scoring candidates are among the many who fail to write good sense; for example, in Q3 (c), “leading in front of the hands of soldiers” should have prompted candidates to wonder whether there might at least be a more meaningful interpretation.

In their answers to Questions 1 and 3 some candidates based their responses on opinions rather than on the Latin passage. Many did not read the questions carefully enough to work out exactly which Latin phrases or sentences contained the answers they needed.

There was often an unfortunate adherence to the concept that Latin word A = English word A. So, as examples, *quod* was almost always ‘because’, *debere* ‘owe’, *inter* ‘between’, and for *ut cibum consumeret* ‘to eat food’ was sometimes even crossed out and replaced with ‘so that ...’ in inferior English. The writing of good sense seems to take second place in the minds of some to showing that they know the vocabulary book meaning of each word or the text book rendering of the syntax. However, there were also many exceptions to this, which deserve commendation.

There were a very small number of candidates who did not follow the rubric and translated passages 1 and 3 instead of answering the comprehension questions set on the passages: marks can only be awarded for answers to the question set on the exam paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

Q1 (a i) was done well, with only a few candidates neglecting the superlative. In Q1 (a ii), ‘began’ was sometimes missed or mistranslated. Q1 (b i) was handled well, except by a minority who thought that Britannicus was the father of Claudius. One particular error appeared frequently in Q1 (b ii): many thought *non filius meus* was in apposition to *ille*; some candidates didn’t know *debere*. Q1 (c) and (d) caused no problems. In Q1 (e), about 90% of candidates believed that *militi* was plural. Some candidates didn’t realise the *iuvenis* was Britannicus.

Question 2

Britannicus ... consumeret: this was handled well by almost all candidates, the commonest error being neglect of the continuous imperfect in *sedebat ut* was sometimes rendered as 'as'. Only a few thought *cum* here meant 'when'.

quod ... data sunt: the first half of this was generally done well. Many did not recognise the idiom *unus ex*; among these the most frequent mistranslation was 'one ex-slave'; others managed to retain most of the sense with 'one slave'. The case of *omnem* ('all the slaves') was the commonest error. It should be noted that 'servant' is not an acceptable rendering of *servus*, since Roman slaves officially received no pay.

ubi poculum ... addere: this differentiated successfully, with only a few making *datum est* the verb of the *ubi* clause, and even fewer translated *nimis calidi* by constructing a relative clause. The most frequent version was: 'When the cup was too hot ..., it was given to Britannicus'. *quod* was mostly 'because', making nonsense of the preceding *in*. *positum* was often unknown and simply omitted ('in which there was no wine'). A number of candidates made the wine too hot **because** there was [no] poison in it; many of the same candidates ignored or did not understand *nullum*.

in hac aqua ... antea: this was mostly handled successfully, with a few candidates making *quam* relative or treating *antea* as a conjunction; *hac* was sometimes omitted.

quod ... raperentur: few candidates translated *quod* correctly: half thought it meant 'because' again, while nearly all the rest were content with 'which', ignoring its use as a connecting relative; only 'it' or 'this' was acceptable here (unless the semi-colon was replaced by a comma). Many candidates made 'so' mean 'therefore' and put it first in the sentence; just as many joined it to *ut* to mean 'so that' (often making it look like the introduction to a purpose clause). Some candidates did not know *totum*. It was acceptable to turn *raperentur* into the active here, as many candidates did.

omnes ... locuturum esse: some candidates mistook the case of *Neronem* as nominative and did not know *pati*, which explains how Britannicus' father made a frequent appearance here. Surprisingly many did not recognise *dixit*. Most, however, recognised that *locuturum* was some sort of future and the idea of Britannicus being about to join ["be placed with"] his father was the result in a number of weaker scripts. Some candidates had no difficulty with the two indirect statements.

ceteris ... mori: common to the great majority of scripts was the poor treatment of the ablative absolute, *reversis* most frequently being a main verb followed by a comma, which was penalised. Some candidates made all sorts of errors, failing to make the ablatives agree, mistranslating the verb and many not even translating *ad* correctly. Some got the wrong sense of *sola*, or of *bene*, or of both. Others had *bene* as an adjective describing *filium* and/or *intellexit* as an adjective describing either Britannicus or Agrippina. *mori* was only given its proper tense in the best few scripts.

Question 3

Q3 (a i) and (a ii) were generally answered well, except that occasionally *donis* was singular or 'things'. In Q (a iii), many candidates quoted *nullis*, which they proceeded to mistranslate, or even not translate or otherwise justify at all. In Q3 (b), *petere* was frequently mistranslated and weaker candidates thought Agrippina was giving money away. Q3 (c) and (d) were excellent discriminators: the word *manus* caused confusion. Some candidates got the right meaning, but made it singular; others started distorting elements in order to make sense of 'hands', instead of applying the techniques which worked so well for them in Q2. The final expression *pro se* foxed many of those who had worked their way successfully through the rest of this bit, 'in front of

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

her/them' or 'against Nero' being common. In (d), *ne* caused the most confusion: many candidates could not link it with *visitaret*. Some ignored *ne* and others produced attempts like 'not with a crowd ...'. Very many jumbled up the various elements and often the result was nonsense. Most candidates dropped marks on *sua* with 'her house', despite the logical absurdity that that caused. Q3 (e i) provided easy marks for many, but some candidates couldn't render *relicta* as passive or *ab* as "by" and others were locked into the word A = word B mode and insisted on 'left behind'. Q3 (e ii) was usually well done by all, although some were still thinking about the money in (b) and only knew *debere* as 'owe'. In Q3 (f), the gerundive was seldom picked up. *libertus* was variously 'willingly' or 'her child(ren)'. Agrippina was the accuser in a number of weaker scripts.

1942/22: Verse Literature - Higher Tier

General Comments

The proportions answering on Virgil and the *Cambridge Anthology* remained much as last year, being slightly in Virgil's favour. A large number of candidates for both options performed at a very high level, showing evidence of personal engagement with the author(s) studied and real scholarship. Other candidates, relying on recall of an English version, were challenged by questions which depended on reference to specific details in the Latin.

The majority of candidates had clearly been well taught and prepared for the test. Some general advice for candidates is given below.

- (i) It is helpful to candidates if they are familiar with the standard wording used for questions of similar type and with the overall layout of the paper. Some candidates tried first one section, then the other: These candidates may not have been aware that the question paper offers a choice of section.
- (ii) Many candidates write too much, even for questions where there are only 1 or 2 marks available. Answers to the wider questions do not usually benefit from being long. The essential is to focus on the specific requirements of each question: extended descriptions of large parts of the story are not required.
- (iii) In the initial study and subsequent revision, candidates need to focus as much as possible on details of the Latin. Recalling the English version may help with some background and context questions, but this approach falls down entirely in dealing with questions dependant on recognition of specific Latin words.
- (iv) For the literary analysis questions, technical terms are not essential. It is better to give a precise citation of a Latin example, accompanied by a clear explanation in the candidate's own words of why he/she considers it worth quoting. Again, those who have not made any study of metre should avoid vague assertions about the flow of the rhythm. There are always plenty of other features to mention under the headings of the choice or position of vocabulary or prominent sound effects.
- (v) Latin quotations, in all questions where these are required, should correspond precisely to the accompanying comment in English. There were some examples of inadequate quotation this year, see 3 (f) and 4 (g) below.
- (vi) Please encourage candidates to use alternate lines when writing out their translations and to write their answers clearly with space in between.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Virgil, *Aeneid II*

Question 1

The majority of candidates found little difficulty with any of the shorter questions here, but there was some careless reading of questions. 'Morning' on its own was not sufficiently precise for (a), and confusion over the phrase *odora canum vis* led to some bizarre references to smelly dogs. A woman taking her time to get ready to impress a new boyfriend seemed to many the most natural response to (c)(ii), and popular and convincing suggestions for (c)(iii) included the emphatic position of *reginam*, the use of the suggestive *thalamo*, and the onomatopoeic depiction of the spirited horse. Many candidates had enough metrical knowledge to appreciate the contrast between the ponderous rhythm of lines 5-6 and the impatient feel of line 7. In (d) Dido was frequently and appropriately compared with a supermodel – though examiners wondered how many of these would regard an embroidered border on a cloak as contributing glamour. The translation of (f) was handled fluently – recurrent minor errors being the omission of *ipse*, *socium* or *hibernam*, uncertainty as to whether *choros* denoted dancing or singing, and failure to recognise the deliberate use of the present tense in the simile. The most successful responses to (g) were those in which Apollo and Aeneas were succinctly matched point-by-point: some wrote at enormous length here, summarising the entire description of Apollo without really addressing the question of how it relates to Aeneas, or getting carried away on tangents such as Aeneas' own divine parentage.

Question 2

This question proved more challenging than Question 1, but again there were many very good responses. In (b) some candidates overlooked the limitations of the question, suggesting reasons for Dido's prayer (e.g. Juno's patronage of Carthage) beyond the ones which she gives herself in lines 1-2. Here and in (c) there was also some confusion regarding who Juno, Hecate and Elissa were, as well as a tendency to paraphrase the text instead of explaining how it suggests a sinister feeling. The first two parts of (d) were straightforward, but (c) and (d) exposed considerable haziness regarding specific Latin words for some who assumed that both *fata Iovis* and *terminus* must refer to Aeneas' end. This type of question is often more revealing than translation of a longer passage. (f) was generally answered successfully apart from occasional small blemishes, such as *extremam* ('extreme'), *Tyrrii* taken as the Carthaginians and the omission of *munera*. Candidates generally chose appropriately unpleasant things to mention for (e). In questions such as (h) the lines are always carefully selected for the range of possibilities which they contain - such as the reiterative *litora litoribus* etc, the droning A sound in 22-23, or the emphatic position of *imprecor* and *pugnent*. Almost all candidates found (i) straightforward, with only a few omitting to mention the significance of the sword which Dido selected for her suicide or making her climb the pyre after using it.

Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

Question 3

Candidates seemed very familiar with the overall content of this passage, which enabled the majority to supply good responses to (a)-(d). The translation was competently done by many, but frequent omissions were *meritas*, *impia*, and *modo*. There was also a tendency for the two instructions in the last line to blur into one and for *simul* to be translated as equivalent to *statim*. Appropriate ideas for (f), such as the old people's reliance on sticks for support, or their long slow climb up the hillside, were not always satisfactorily matched with corresponding Latin (e.g. *baculis*: often quoted on its own without *levati*) and some candidates connected *ambo* with walking. Most found (g) and (h) very straightforward, though for (h) some gave only two points, the surprising survival of the old people's house being the usual omission, and in (g) several had Baucis and Philemon already standing on the summit and then seemed quite bewildered about where the arrow-shot was being measured from. Some candidates thoughtfully recalled features in the sequel to this extract which illustrate the amazing selflessness and devotion which Baucis and Philemon continue to show. There was less reference than examiners had expected to the considerable amount of relevant material available in the passage itself and many failed to read the question properly and launched into lengthy summaries of the earlier part of the story, which gained them no marks until they caught up with the passage again.

Question 4

This is a memorable but demanding passage and some knew the text well. Others, however, failed to link the cues provided in questions such as (c) and (d) with the appropriate details in the Latin, and some referred to material from the second meal later in the poem. Even (a) yielded a large crop of instances of 'small' and 'a cave' for *paupere* and *cavo*, and in (c) the specific meaning of *asper* frequently went unnoticed. Examiners were impressed by the finesse shown in many answers to (b) - including explanations of the chiasmus, the juxtaposition and anaphora of *vetus/veterem*, the alliteration of *v*, and of how the balance between the word endings *em/um* and *us/es* reflects the symmetry between the two mice. In the translation of (e) there was widespread omission of incidental words such as *amico*, *patientem*, *praerupti* and *feris*, and confusion of *tandem* with *tamen* and *viam* with *vitam*. Almost everyone knew the kinds of luxurious items to mention for (g): few, however, were able to match all three of their items to the corresponding Latin without leaving out essential words. Many candidates answered (h) successfully by picking out features that might be considered amusing. Some candidates showed an appreciation of Horace's irony, eye for visual detail, the pun of *carpe viam* and the epic language he applies with delightful incongruity to a story about mice. The best answers were in fact often quite brief, offering a list of individual examples accompanied by an indication of why they qualified as such.

1942/23: Language 2 - Higher Tier

General Comments

Examiners felt that this was an appropriately testing paper, though perhaps easier than in 2006 as there were fewer really difficult phrases or sentences. The general quality of the work on Section A was extremely good. Candidates with a weaker grasp of grammar often still managed to achieve at least half marks if they knew the meanings of the words from the Defined Vocabulary List. Relatively few lost the plot and struggled to make coherent sense of the story. There was an encouraging increase again this year in the number of candidates answering Section B (English into Latin sentences), many of whom were well-prepared. There were still some who would have been better advised to attempt Section A because they did not have a sufficient grasp of vocabulary or grammar.

Overall, examiners were generally impressed by the high quality of candidates' work. The majority seemed to have had adequate practice on passages containing the variety of grammatical constructions listed in the Specification and posing a consistent level of difficulty. There were very many scripts in the 35-40 bracket - they were a pleasure to mark.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

In the first sentence, more candidates than usual spotted the superlative form of *audacissimus* but *rebus* caused unexpected problems, even in the best answers. Many candidates took it as coming from *rex*, *regnum* or, interestingly, *reor*. *perfidus* was sometimes confused with *perterritus*. In the next sentence, only a few candidates saw that *consilia* was plural - in some cases this was the only error in their whole translation. A significant number did not recognise the accusative and infinitive construction after *cognoverunt* and some wrongly took *patriam* as 'father'. Candidates were equally divided as to whether *suam* referred to Pausanias or the Spartans - in this case, both 'his' and 'their' made good sense and both were accepted. Relatively few missed the indirect command, and if they did it was because they took *imperaverunt* as a noun (e.g. 'emperor'). The lack of a preposition with the place name and confusion over *redire* led some to take it as the direct object of *rediret* (e.g. 'to leave' or 'give back').

The next sentence was perhaps the hardest in the passage. *autem* always seems to baffle and the phrase *ex vultu civis cuiusdam* was regularly mistranslated by candidates who connected *vultu* with *velle* or *vulnus* and/or *cuiusdam* with *qui*. *monere* was often confused with *manere* and in even the best scripts, candidates had difficulty with the tense of *ductum esse* - examiners required something like 'he learnt that he had been led ...'. The ablative *hoc cognito* was mostly well handled, but very many candidates sloppily missed the force of the preposition *in* - the point was that Pausanias fled *into* the temple, not just *to* it. If teachers keep a list of commonly confused words, *statim* could usefully be added to it as it was often connected with *stare* or *statua*. The fearing clause introduced by *timebat* as generally done well, though examiners wondered whether a form of *vereor*, which has regularly put in an appearance on this paper, would have produced so many correct versions. As ever, the use of *ne* was problematic ('he was not fearing ...' wrote some). Candidates who translated *timebat* as 'the time was coming' missed the boat altogether.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

The long sentence beginning *tum multitudo* was handled well, perhaps because it fell into four self-contained clauses. Some candidates, however, did not know *multitudo* ('many citizens' was not accepted for full marks) or *deleverunt*. Many took *lapidibus* as singular and some failed to connect *aperto* with *caelo*. *moriturum esse* was mostly correctly taken as a part of *morior* and a pleasing number saw that *celerius* was a comparative ('they hoped that he would die more quickly under an open sky').

In the next sentence, *etiam* ('even', 'also') was sometimes omitted and the deponent *detestabatur*, though glossed, taken as a passive. *ipsa* was often omitted and *lapidem* taken as a plural. The gerundive *ad filium claudendum* was confidently handled by most, some of whom went to great lengths to show they knew the gerundive. The usual confusion between *tandem* and *tamen* was apparent in what followed, and the clause *haud multo post e vita discessit* was a puzzle to many. Those who ignored the preposition *e* tended to write 'life left him', which was not far off. 'He died' was sufficient for *e vita discessit*. Examiners found amusement in mistranslations of *post e vita* as 'the afterlife'. For full marks, candidates were required to take *paratus* correctly as a perfect passive participle ('having been carried' or 'after being carried') or as a main verb with a suitable conjunction (e.g. 'he was carried half-alive from the temple but died not long afterwards').

Although some candidates translated the last sentence perfectly, there were many vocabulary problems here. *tali* was often not known (e.g. 'the tale') and, though the superlative form of *clarissimus* was often spotted, many did not know the meaning of the adjective. Some did not know the meaning of *gentem* ('people', 'race' 'tribe' 'clan' were all acceptable), *saepe* produced some wise men leading them to victory (*sapientes?*) and the pluperfect form of *duxerat* was often missed. Those who know *ullus* and *dignitas* made good sense of *sine ulla dignitate*. *mortem miseram passus est* was a serious stumbling block to those who did not recognise *passus est* from *patior* and/or took *miseram* as referring to Pausanias rather than his death. Most got the gist. Even the candidate who wrote 'he was dead miserable' was, in a sense, not far wrong.

Section B

1. A pleasing number tried to form a subjunctive after *ut* in the result clause, but some did not know *tam* or struggled to remember *crudelis*.
2. The main difficulty of this sentence was the construction after 'ordered'. Those using *imperavit* often proceeded with a verb in the infinitive, whilst those who wrote *iussit* sometimes used *ut*. This is the sort of thing that examiners expect candidates to have had practice in. The Latin for 'prisoner' and 'carefully' was sometimes not known.
3. 'Crowd' was not always known and of those who knew *turba* some failed to make *magna* agree with it. Predictably and disappointingly, the purpose clause 'to hear the messengers' was sometimes expressed with an infinitive rather than an *ut* clause.
4. There were some interesting versions for 'ship'; only some candidates managed the pluperfect subjunctive *advenisset*.
5. This sentence was done quite well. Problems included the superlative form *audacissimus*, the future tense form of *resistere* and the fact that verb takes a direct object in the dative.
6. 'At that time' was not well done and though many knew that they needed an infinitive for 'had been defeated', relatively few managed something like *victum esse*.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

7. 'As we all knew' caused difficulty either because candidates did not know the use of *ut* in a phrase like this or could not produce *scimus*. Most tried to form the superlative *crudelissima* but some were not able to make it agree with *spectacula*. The agreement of nouns and adjectives is a relative weakness on both sections of this paper and centres can expect future passages to give candidates the chance to show that they can match them correctly.

1942/24: Prose Literature – Higher Tier

General Comments

Overall the standard of achievement on this paper was pleasingly high. Candidates were generally very well prepared and had clearly enjoyed their reading. Some of the answers to the personal response questions showed real literary understanding. Only a very small number of candidates this year would have been better suited to answering the Foundation Tier paper.

Most candidates chose Section A (Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*) but Section B (*Selections from Pliny's Letters*) remains popular with some Centres and this number remains fairly constant. Examiners felt that there was little difference in difficulty between the questions on the two sections but that the nature and the difficulty of the Latin in Pliny's Letters may have caused problems for some candidates. However answers to Section B were stronger and answered more thoughtfully, with some candidates gaining full marks. Candidates from both sections found the questions on style challenging. There is a tendency to quote whole sentences in Latin rather than pick out the relevant words or phrases. Some gave a translation or mentioned a stylistic point without linking it to the demands of the question.

Presentation and spelling remained variable. Most candidates set out their answers clearly and legibly, but there were still a good number who did not, and who may have lost marks if the examiners could not read an answer. Only a handful of candidates failed to finish the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

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

Question 1

Very few candidates got (a)(i) wrong although a large number left out one or more letters of Stabiae. (a)(ii) caused some problems, mainly because candidates found it hard to visualise what Pliny was saying. Some thought that Pomponianus was separated from Stabiae and some placed *sensim* with the shore rather than with the sea. In (b) many candidates failed to note the word particular and gave debris as their answer. (c)(i) and (ii) were both well answered. In (c)(ii) and (d)(i) the direction of the wind was generally well understood, even if candidates did not use precise terminology. Most candidates were able to give the correct Latin words in (d)(ii) and only a few misspelled them. Several candidates included the first part of line 9 in their answers to (e) even though the line reference started at *lotus*. (f) provided good differentiation and only the best answers gained three or four marks. There were many perceptive responses and candidates were able to select examples of vivid vocabulary such as *fulgor* and *claritas*. They need to make sure that they always explain their point as well as quoting the relevant Latin. *Latissimae flammae* shows the extent or the wide area covered by the flames and *alta incendia* the height of the fires. In a question of this type, however, where examples of vocabulary and style are asked for, candidates should be reminded to give at least one example of each. Some candidates wrote about stylistic features such as alliteration, assonance and chiasmus with little idea of how to recognise examples and regardless of whether they made the account vivid.

Question 2

Examiners felt that this question was easier than Question 1: marks gained tended to be higher than for Question 1. A number of candidates had perfect scores. Answers to (a) were mostly correct, apart from a few candidates who wrote *facinora virilis*. (b) and (c) caused no problems, although the line reference *litteris ... docta* was not always observed. (d) provided good differentiation. Some candidates were able to select the words which emphasised Sallust's disapproval and to comment on them. Others tended to copy out whole sentences, instead of

concentrating on the use of words like *probae* and *luxuriae*. (e) was quite well answered, despite the inability of a number of candidates to express in good English the qualities Sempronia lacked. Many wrote down memorised translations. Candidates answered (f) and (g)(i) well, apart from a few who did not know *absurdum*. In (g)(ii) it was relatively easy to score two marks as there were several possible answers. The most common mistake was the failure to be specific about the types of conversation Sempronia engaged in.

Section B: Selections from Pliny's Letters

Question 3

There were good answers to (a)(i), (ii) and (iii). In (b) virtually all candidates gained the first mark, but not everyone knew the meaning of *ambigui* for the second mark. There were further good answers to (c) and (d), where several candidates referred to *patria potestas* from which Regulus freed his son by selling him to a third party so that he could inherit from his mother. In (e) a number of candidates overlooked Regulus' pretence and only commented on his indulgence of his son. (f) produced some impressive answers comparing the funeral with those given to epic heroes to show how Regulus exaggerated his grief. (g) proved a difficult question for candidates, who often could do little more than translate the lines. Those who could express in their own words the idea that Regulus' friends pretended to love him, by flocking round him, but really detested him, gained full marks. (h) discriminated well. As in Question 1 (f) some candidates lost a mark because they omitted to give an example of style of writing which showed Pliny's disapproval of Regulus.

Question 4

This question produced a very wide range of answers, ranging from Abyssinia to Gaul and Britain. Those who knew that Bithynia was Pliny's province frequently failed to spell it correctly. In (b) candidates did not distinguish between *probus* and *honestus*, but most were able to give at least three of Pliny's recommendations correctly. In (c)(i) there was general awareness of the *ius trium liberorum* although not everyone mentioned that it was granted to parents. The idea of deserving the approval of friends was often misunderstood in (c)(ii), with candidates believing that Suetonius had already got their respect and deserved the honour because of this. (e) proved a challenging question for many as they found it difficult to link the importance of the request with style of writing or choice of words. There were some excellent examples of the latter, but even in the best answers candidates had difficulty in locating examples of style. The repetition of *cupiam ... cuperem* stresses the strength of Pliny's desire, the repetition of *petam ... peto* shows that Pliny is begging the emperor and the position of *absens* which follows the verb to emphasise the urgency were all good examples of Pliny's style of writing. In (f)(i) most candidates could identify Trajan's tone, but found it difficult to give evidence from the letter. A good number thought that the tone was friendly and quoted *mi Secunde carissime* in support. Others thought Trajan was grudging, because he used the word *parce* and reminded Pliny that he had not yet used up his allocation. In (f)(ii) many candidates concentrated on friendship between Pliny and Trajan but some candidates noted that Trajan valued Pliny's judgment or that he felt that Suetonius deserved the honour.

1942/25: Roman Life Topics - Higher Tier

General Comments

This year it is pleasing to note that there were very many good scripts and very few of a poor standard. Most candidates had been well prepared and showed evident enjoyment of the topics they had studied.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society was considerably more popular than Topic 6: Roman Britain, but there was little difference in the quality of the answers to the two topics. Most candidates scored well on Section A and the essay style questions in Section B provided differentiation. This year marking by level descriptors was introduced for Section B, which rewarded candidates according to how far they answered the question as well as for the content of their answers.

Spelling was often below the standard expected of candidates entered for this tier. Incorrect spelling, including the spelling of Latin terms, is penalised under Quality of Written Communication in Section B. Candidates should also realise that they may lose marks through illegible handwriting when it proves impossible for an examiner to read an answer.

No candidates appeared to have failed to finish the paper and one candidate managed to answer both topics.

Comments on Individual Questions

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

Section A

Question 1 (a) and (b) were well answered, although one or two candidates thought that the labelling in the photograph referred to the *atrium*. In Question 2 some candidates failed to gain full marks because they did not distinguish between the floors and the walls. Questions 3 and 4 were generally well answered, but in Question 5 many candidates only earned one mark because they omitted to mention family use of the *atrium*. Questions 6 and 7 were well answered although some candidates embarked on lengthy descriptions of the theatre seating because they did not know the word 'tiered'. In Question 8 those who chose to write about comedy or pantomime generally scored full marks. The best answers were for pantomime, some of which contained full details of the performance, such as 'The play was acted by a single male actor who changed masks in order to change character. He mimed and danced to the accompaniment of an orchestra of pipes and castanets, while the story was told by a chorus of singers.'

Section B

Question 9 was more popular than Question 10, there were answers of a high standard to both. Answers to 9 (a) contained much detailed information. Some candidates took Pompeii as their example of a Roman town, which was fine, but Rome was not an acceptable choice. The best candidates showed a thorough knowledge of all the main buildings in the forum and their functions and were able to give a good range of examples. Some candidates either wrote in general terms with little reference to specific buildings or events, or they included long accounts on procedures at the baths or entertainment in buildings normally outside the forum, such as the amphitheatre.

In Section (b) candidates did not always answer the question, which asked them to say what impressed them about a dinner party at the house of a rich Roman. In many answers the description of the rooms was given more space than the meal itself. There was also much about the clothes and jewellery of the host and guests. To obtain full marks it was necessary for candidates to describe the food and wine, and the entertainment that followed the meal. Some seemed unsure at what point the entertainment occurred. Question 10 produced some very good answers. In (a) there were interesting and lively accounts and candidates seemed to enjoy this style of question. Some candidates named the office they were seeking and described how they made their election speeches from the steps of the temple of Jupiter. Some even mentioned *fautores* and support from guilds such as bakers. There were references to political families like the Holconii and to actual election graffiti. (b) was equally well answered. Most candidates avoided giving a list of what happened at the baths and answered the question on why a visit to the baths was so important. One or two suggested that a visit was a great way of networking.

Topic 6: Roman Britain

Section A

Questions 1 and 2 were well answered. In Question 3 some candidates managed to give two examples of archaeological evidence but omitted to explain what that evidence told us. A few ignored the phrase 'apart from buildings'. Questions 4 and 5 were well answered on the whole, but in Question 6 some candidates failed to distinguish between importing and introducing products into Britain. In Question 7 most were able to name the metals mined in Britain, but a few had problems identifying the regions where they were mined.

Section B

Question 9 was more popular than Question 8. In 8 (a) candidates had plenty to say about the problems of staying in wayside inns and the thieves they encountered on the way, but gave few details of the actual journey and the quality of the roads. One candidate described arriving at Dover, buying a mule and cart, then proceeding safely to London where he stayed in an inn and sold his *amphorae* of wine in the forum. Not all candidates had thought how they would transport their wine. Some were travelling by mule, presumably without a cart, or walking. 8 (b) was generally well answered, although the role of the bailiff was often underplayed. Many candidates described the routine duties of domestic slaves without mentioning those done by those who were better educated, such as secretarial duties, or jobs like stoking the furnace for the heating or baths. Despite the bullet points, some omitted to mention the farm slaves. Some candidates mentioned jobs like fetching water and cutting timber as well as the more obvious ploughing and harvesting the crops. Question 9 proved a popular question and answers to (a) contained plenty of excellent detail about the Italian style and Italian craftsmanship of Fishbourne palace. Few, however, mentioned the inscription which provides further evidence of Cogidubnus' loyalty to Rome through the dedication of a temple to Roman gods at Noviomagus. Some candidates also mentioned Vespasian's earlier arrival in the area with the 20th legion and the fact that he had just become emperor when the palace was built. (b) also produced some good answers. Candidates generally focused on the demands of the question and included many excellent points. They cited the Druids' loss of religious and judicial power, the brutality of the Roman soldiers in their treatment of the Iceni, the imposition of taxes, and the loss of both land and independence as some of the reasons for the resentment of Roman rule.

Principal Moderator's Report

1942/06 and 1941/05: Coursework

General Comments

The coursework submitted this year, as in previous years, was generally of a high standard. It demonstrates in varying degrees the following outcomes.

- Considerable knowledge of the ancient world.
- Understanding the sources from which that knowledge is derived.
- Evaluating and responding to the evidence.
- The skills needed for delivering the coursework:
 - engaging with primary source material (textual, visual and/or archaeological) and secondary source material;
 - selecting facts relevant to the title;
 - commenting on and drawing conclusions from the material;
 - organising the material into a coherent whole;
 - learning to acknowledge sources through referencing and supplying a bibliography.

Almost all candidates showed evidence of all of these outcomes, and all candidates showed some evidence of most of them.

New Specification

This year a new Specification came into force. The main change is that the length of coursework is reduced from 3000 words to 2000 (Type A) 1000 + 1000 words (Type B). Oral coursework is no longer an option. This is also the first year when the markscheme has been used by centres as well as moderators (see further below under 'Marking').

Choice of Title and Selection of Material

On the whole titles are well chosen to result in focused, well-organised work that gives scope for the use of primary source material, selection of content and understanding and evaluation. Entertainment, (especially gladiators) remains a popular choice of topic, along with the army and women, but excellent work has also been submitted on, for example, aspects of religion, housing, the theatre and the water system. There were some good empathy pieces, mostly well referenced in the text or in footnotes, and while marks are not awarded for the quality of the creative writing, these pieces are often entertaining as well as scoring highly on the criteria. It is clear that some candidates are pursuing their own interests with enthusiasm. This is obviously to be encouraged, and it is usually possible to find ways of accommodating candidates' interests within the Specification, but if centres are in doubt they should consult OCR.

A few centres continue to overlook the requirement that coursework must have a Roman Life (or Greek Life) element, and if based on the prescribed literature it must not overlap with the assessment of the literature in the written papers. Nor should work on Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius focus exclusively on the details of the eruption on the one hand or on the movements of Pliny or his uncle on the other. Literary coursework remains problematic, as there is little literature that yields substantial evidence for Roman (Greek) life that can be analysed independently of its literary conventions and without diminishing its impact as literature. Centres contemplating literary coursework are strongly recommended to consult OCR on the choice of title.

There are still some very broad titles that indicate the topic, but not a selected aspect of the topic, for example, 'Slavery', 'Roman women', 'The Roman army'. This kind of title is becoming less frequent, and it is to be hoped that the lower word-limit will provide further encouragement to centres to narrow the scope and teach their candidates to select material for a particular purpose. Candidates working on any title should be encouraged to be selective: for example, a candidate writing on reasons for the popularity of gladiatorial contests who refers to a book or website that lists the different kinds of gladiators and then selects one or two to consider in detail should gain at least as many marks as the candidate who reproduces the entire list.

In general, centres are reminded that they are not obliged to get candidates' titles approved, but they are free to seek advice from OCR on any titles, as well as in the particular cases mentioned above. Advice received should be read in conjunction with the Specification and the published guidance, and centres should enclose the advice they have received with coursework sent for moderation.

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

These two criteria are connected and will therefore be discussed together. The discriminators in the markscheme for assessing AC1 are:

- selection of facts relevant to title
- evidence of research
- extent of error or omission
- references.

The discriminators for AC2 are:

- facts derived from primary source material
- identification of sources as primary and referenced
- primary source material integrated into text.

It is therefore clear from the markscheme that the priority is to derive factual content from primary source material, indicated as such, which should not be used merely to illustrate facts drawn from secondary sources. This priority reflects the skills of reading with comprehension and understanding the sources of our knowledge of the ancient world that are inherent in the study of Latin (and Greek). The reasons for the emphasis on referencing are first, that candidates should appreciate the sources of their information, second, that they should acquire skills regularly needed in the workplace, and third, that they should avoid laying themselves open to plagiarism. A bibliography is not sufficient on its own: references should be provided in the text, with direct quotes indicated by quotation marks. See further below on 'AC3 Organisation' and 'Suspected malpractice'.

The coursework submitted demonstrates that practically all candidates understand what a primary source is. In a very few centres there is some confusion about what can be credited as primary: reconstructions or modern demonstrations of military tactics can be credited under factual content, but do not count as primary source material. Nor does the use of Latin terms in itself indicate the use of primary source material. Conversely, centres can encourage their candidates to be confident in the knowledge they acquire from their 'reading' of visual as well as written primary source material, and apparently simple observations should not be discounted: for example, 'This picture of a mosaic from Rome tells me that there were different kinds of gladiator with different weapons. The one on the left ...' etc.

In an entry that is generally of a high standard, there is naturally differentiation between candidates, especially on these criteria. Some candidates produce work of a very high standard on the principle of starting from primary source material: the sources of their factual content are primary and well referenced, and secondary sources are used appropriately to reinforce a point or provide a wider context. In outstanding pieces of coursework, candidates do not only reference their sources but add notes explaining exactly what they have learned from a source, or, in the case of empathy pieces, how they have used the information in their work. On the other hand, some candidates do not use enough primary source material, or use it purely as illustration. Others do not include references to indicate where they have derived factual content from primary source material, so that it cannot be credited as such. However, teachers' comments suggest that candidates are increasingly guided in the direction of greater use of integrated primary source material, and that this skill is regarded as a valuable and important aspect of coursework.

AC3 Organisation (4 marks)

Most work shows signs of being planned with paragraphs and a conclusion, and many pieces have an introduction setting out what the scope of the work is to be. Most candidates include a bibliography, but they do not always include all the websites they have used, laying themselves open to suspicion of malpractice (see further below).

Length continues to be a problem, and particularly so this year when the word limit is reduced to 2000 words. Notice was given of the change in 2005 and full details are in the revised specification distributed to centres in hard copy in 2005, yet a number of centres were taken by surprise. Teachers are reminded that centres must use the current specification. Marks have not been deducted this year specifically for length and in general excessive length is one factor among several that are included in this Assessment Criterion, such as structure and relation of structure to title (see the markscheme). However, submitting work that is overlength breaks the coursework regulations and centres are advised that in 2008 any piece of work that is more than 5% overlength may be referred to the Malpractice Team for further action.

AC4 Understanding and Evaluation (14 marks)

Candidates generally score well on this criterion, and there are no longer centres that believe that the assessment of Understanding and Evaluation is restricted to the conclusion. Most candidates include some kind of comment or reason for their section of material, and the best candidates reveal their understanding also by recognising the bias of some authors or the incompleteness of our evidence for certain aspects of the ancient world (for example, the lack of information about women produced by women). Modern comparison is often well used, and as last year, there were few cases where the modern element was out of proportion to the ancient one. In general modern comparison is more effective when it emerges from the context than when it is included in the title and can acquire excessive prominence.

A few candidates scored highly on this criterion through describing practical work they had undertaken. While this can be a good approach for the enthusiast with the necessary time and skills, such work should not be regarded as indispensable: it is very labour-intensive, and marks cannot be awarded for the quality of the artefact, only for the sources and factual content it is based on and observations that form evidence of understanding and evaluation.

As in previous years, many candidates who submitted empathy pieces scored well on this criterion. Again, marks are not awarded for the standard of creative writing (often very high) but for the factual content and use of primary source material (generally well integrated and clearly referenced out in notes, as indicated above on AC1 and 2), as the basis for their understanding and evaluation.

Quality of Written Communication (2 marks)

Almost all candidates scored the two marks available for this criterion which is common to coursework in all subjects. A few centres tended to mark candidates down for slight lapses, which should not be penalised given the small allocation of marks for this criterion.

Oral Coursework

The oral coursework option, taken by very few candidates, has been withdrawn under the new specification.

Marking

The marking of the coursework is of a high standard. The teachers' comments are a valuable and much-appreciated part of the process of moderation, and are evidence for marking that is thorough, consistent and an accurate reflection of the criteria often internally moderated. The comments also show that centres are using the new markscheme which is encouraging and it is to be hoped that the markscheme will be a contribution to the principles and priorities that make coursework a distinctive form of assessment. The marking of very few centres required adjustment, and comments in the individual centre reports indicate where marking could be brought more into line with the criteria and markscheme.

The two criteria on which the marking is most frequently over generous are AC1 and AC2. In the case of AC1, a lot of factual content is not sufficient on its own to gain the highest marks without fulfilling the other aspects of the criterion, such as the need for referencing. Similarly, on AC2, illustrations and allusions to primary source material are not sufficient on their own to score high marks: marks should be awarded according to how far the primary source material has been integrated as a source of factual content. See the summary above in the sections on AC1 and AC2, and the markscheme setting out bands of marks as guidance.

Suspected malpractice

The problem of plagiarism in coursework continues to have a high profile. The importance of the Centre Authentication Form reflects the centre's responsibility to supervise coursework effectively and minimise opportunities for malpractice.

Good practice at all stages is the best defence.

- Coursework titles should be directed towards tasks that are manageable and focused.
- Candidates should have confidence in their own research and skills.
- Centres *must* ensure candidates understand what constitutes cheating: copying sections from websites and books without indicating direct quotes, acknowledging their sources or including *all* sources of material, both primary and secondary, in their bibliography.
- Candidates whom the centre suspects of copying should be challenged **by the centre**, not simply flagged up in comments on work submitted for moderation.

Suspect work that reaches the moderator has to be reported for suspected malpractice. For more guidance on avoiding and recognising malpractice, see the coursework guidance for centres posted on the Latin and Classical Greek pages of the OCR website.

Centres should be aware that if they give their candidates excessive guidance ('scaffolding'), resulting in 'cloned' coursework, this is also malpractice. Guidance given by the majority of centres appears to support candidates but also allows them scope to do their own work, but centres should be aware of the dangers of guidance that is too detailed or prescriptive, thereby reducing the natural differentiation in outcome.

Administration

Centres co-operate with the procedures for administering coursework and the paperwork involved. Including the correct documents, properly filled in, and following the instructions for sending coursework make an invaluable contribution to the smooth running of the process. **Centres are reminded that private candidates are *not* allowed to submit coursework. A “private candidate” is one who has entered for a qualification through a centre without attending a course of study provided by that centre. Additionally, the Latin and Classical Greek specifications state 'internally assessed work should be completed during the course of normal curriculum time' p.25.**

Conclusion

The shorter word-limit has not had a major effect on the scope of the coursework submitted, but is perhaps an incentive to be selective and concise. As in previous years, the moderators have been encouraged by the standard of the work submitted and the engagement with the Roman/Greek world it implies. They remain confident that coursework offers a rewarding and distinctive form of assessment that extends candidates' knowledge, develops their ability to handle and evaluate primary source material, and gives them the satisfaction of selecting and presenting content in a form they have chosen themselves. Keeping these objectives in view and encouraging candidates to take pride in achieving them through their own efforts can offer the most effective means of curbing malpractice.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Latin (1942)
June 2007 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	36	30	25	20	15
12 paper 2 (Foundation)	60	n/a	n/a	35	29	23	17	11
13 paper 3 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	27	21	16	11	6
14 paper 4 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	20	16	13	10	7
15 paper 5 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	22	18	15	12	9
21 paper 1 (Higher)	60	45	39	34	26	n/a	n/a	n/a
22 paper 2 (Higher)	60	44	36	28	21	n/a	n/a	n/a
23 paper 3 (Higher)	40	32	28	25	21	n/a	n/a	n/a
24 paper 4 (Higher)	40	33	28	23	19	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	118	98	78	58	38
Cumulative percentage in grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	55.9	78.0	91.5	96.6	100

Total entry for this examination was 63

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	112	94	77	60	43
Cumulative percentage in grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	39.0	51.2	75.6	87.8	95.1

Total entry for this examination was 44

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	107	91	75	59	43
Cumulative percentage in grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	45.1	66.7	85.9	93.4	98.1

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Total entry for this examination was 227

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	113	95	77	60	43
Cumulative percentage in grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	42.9	85.7	92.9	100	100

Total entry for this examination was 15

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	112	94	76	59	42
Cumulative percentage in grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	48.6	67.6	82.4	89.2	94.6

Total entry for this examination was 74

Higher Tier

Option HA (21, 22, 23, 24)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall threshold marks	200	176	154	132	110	87	75	n/a	n/a
Cumulative percentage in grade		52.7	79.7	90.9	96.0	98.6	99.2	n/a	n/a

Total entry for this examination was 4346

Option HB (21, 22, 23, 25)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall threshold marks	200	172	151	130	109	86	74	n/a	n/a
Cumulative percentage in grade		40.5	72.4	85.0	91.4	97.5	98.5	n/a	n/a

Total entry for this examination was 482

Option HC (21, 22, 24, 25)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall threshold marks	200	173	151	129	107	84	72	n/a	n/a
Cumulative percentage in grade		32.4	63.4	80.7	91.6	97.4	99.0	n/a	n/a

Total entry for this examination was 3358

Option HD (06, 21, 22, 23)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall threshold marks	200	171	151	131	111	88	76	n/a	n/a
Cumulative percentage in grade		42.1	67.0	83.7	90.4	96.7	99.5	n/a	n/a

Total entry for this examination was 212

Option HE (06, 21, 22, 24)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall threshold marks	200	175	153	131	109	86	74	n/a	n/a
Cumulative percentage in grade		30.4	63.1	82.4	93.3	98.6	99.4	n/a	n/a

Total entry for this examination was 1189

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage	40.2	28.2	14	9.4	5.1	1.7	0.3	0.2
Cumulative percentage in grade	40.2	68.4	82.4	91.8	96.9	98.6	98.9	99.1

Total entry for this examination was 10010

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



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