

# **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2008**

**1942/MS/R/08**

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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

### Latin (1942)

### REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
1942/06 and 1941/05: Coursework	1
1942/11: Language 1 - Foundation Tier	4
1942/12: Verse Literature - Foundation Tier	6
1942/13: Language 2 - Foundation Tier	8
1942/14: Prose Literature - Foundation Tier	9
1942/21: Language 1 - Higher Tier	13
1942/22: Verse Literature - Higher Tier	16
1942/23: Language 2 - Higher Tier	18
1942/24: Prose Literature - Higher Tier	19
1942/25: Roman Life Topics - Higher Tier	21
Grade Thresholds	23

## 1942/06 and 1941/05: Coursework

### General Comments

Coursework was submitted by approximately 128 centres for Latin and 24 for Classical Greek. The majority of centres opted for Type A (one piece of 2000 words) rather than Type B (two pieces each of 1000 words).

The work of all candidates showed some knowledge of the Greek and Roman world and an understanding of our sources of information. Many candidates also showed the ability to select and evaluate the sources. These three aspects of coursework (knowledge, sources and understanding and evaluation), are reflected in Assessment Criteria 1, 2 and 4, which carry the greatest number of marks. In addition, most coursework was well constructed with an introduction and conclusion and good use of sections and paragraphs.

### Choice of Title and Selection of Material

Centres often submit coursework on a variety of topics, reflecting students' interests, or work on the same topic but with different titles. Many candidates wrote coursework on more focused titles, looking at particular aspects of a topic rather than trying to cover the whole of Roman entertainment, for example.

Some candidates wrote comparisons between ancient and modern aspects of a topic, for instance the Olympic Games or the daily life of women. These are successful provided the modern comparisons remain subordinate to the Greek and Roman aspects. It is often preferable to restrict the title itself to the Greek or Roman life aspects, while encouraging candidates to use modern comparisons *selectively* in the course of their work to demonstrate understanding and evaluation.

This year, fewer candidates submitted work on literary topics. Literary topics are sometimes difficult to manage in such a way that they encourage research on the Roman life aspects of the literature while doing justice to the literature and avoiding duplication of work for the literature papers. Candidates should also avoid purely historical topics, as coursework is designed to assess knowledge and understanding of Greek and Roman life.

Centres in doubt about their candidates' titles, especially literary or historical titles, are reminded that they should write to OCR for advice. It is helpful if centres include a copy of this advice with the coursework when it is sent to the Moderators.

### The Criteria

In general the coursework submitted showed awareness of the criteria.

#### AC1 Factual Content (12 marks)

Candidates' research is often evidenced by a good selection of facts. Lower-scoring work tends to be short on the details of factual content. Where candidates use secondary sources to broaden or add detail to the facts they have derived from primary source material, they should be encouraged to refer to the secondary sources in the text as well as listing the book or website in the bibliography. Direct quotation from sources should be in quotation marks, or a passage from a source may be summarised in the candidate's own words but credited in a note. Some candidates already reference their work punctiliously, and there has been a steady improvement over the years.

#### AC2 Use of Primary Source Material (8 marks)

Many candidates used primary source material successfully as a source of factual content and referenced this material accurately. Many distinguished between primary and secondary sources. Occasionally, candidates' use of diagrams or reconstructions was credited mistakenly

by teachers as primary source material, instead of factual content. On the whole there has been a gradual improvement in candidates' use of primary source material, ranging from basic but useful observations to sophisticated interpretations. Candidates who wrote empathy pieces pretty consistently incorporated notes to indicate the sources of their information.

### **AC3 Organisation (4 marks)**

Some candidates produced work that was far too long. The majority of candidates scored well on this criterion.

### **AC4 Understanding and Evaluation (14 marks)**

Candidates demonstrated understanding and evaluation skilfully and often conveyed a refreshing element of personal response and enthusiasm. Teachers' comments show that credit is given for the ongoing understanding and evaluation of evidence revealed in observations on primary source material. Some candidates wrote about 'the Greeks' or 'the Romans', making little or no concession to the variety of lifestyles or to the biased or fragmentary nature of the sources, while others recognised differences between rich and poor women, for example, or the different life of slaves according to whether they were employed in the town or in the country.

This criterion carries more marks than the other criteria, since understanding and evaluation can be demonstrated implicitly in the whole piece of work. It is dependent on comprehension, engagement and critical reading of sources, skills that are also necessary for translation and appreciation of literature in other components of the assessment.

### **Quality of Written Communication (2 marks)**

This criterion is common to all coursework and candidates generally gained both marks.

### **Marking**

Marking was on the whole consistent and carried out in accordance with the criteria. Where adjustments to marks have been made, centres are advised to look again at the mark scheme and in future to use it also at the planning stage of coursework. Work was most commonly marked too generously on criterion 2 Use of Primary Source Material: there should be substantial amounts of material, used as the source of factual content and integrated, as described above.

Some coursework of a very high standard was too harshly marked by teachers. These centres deducted marks for minor imperfections or omissions, instead of marking positively what the candidate had managed to include within the scope of the component.

The moderators were greatly helped by the thorough marking carried out by teachers and the detailed comments provided on coversheets.

### **Suspected malpractice**

This year only a few candidates were referred for suspected malpractice. Unacknowledged copying from websites still occurs, and candidates should be aware that if they produce a close, unacknowledged paraphrase of a book or website they will be referred for malpractice.

Centres should be aware that giving excessive help to candidates in the form of 'writing frames' or scaffolding, is unfair, deprives candidates of the satisfaction of making their own selection of material and structure, and distorts differentiation.

### **Administration**

The majority of centres supplied all documents and coursework on time and in accordance with OCR instructions. Centres are reminded that coursework and/or marks *must* be submitted on time by 15 May at the latest.

**Conclusion**

The coursework submitted this year has provided evidence of vigorous and enthusiastic study of ancient Greece and Rome. Teaching and learning focused on textual, archaeological and visual sources flourishes producing an outcome as satisfying for moderators as for the centres.

## 1942/11: Language 1 - Foundation Tier

### General Comments

The entry was very small: 380 candidates out of a total of 9,900 for the GCSE. The overall standard was high. Several candidates achieved full marks on Question 1 or Question 3. Almost all candidates showed some knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, the majority successfully following the storyline.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Question 1

(a) (i) was answered correctly by virtually all candidates. (a) (ii) required candidates to distinguish between *oppugnare* and *pugnare*, which about half managed; the rest of the question was answered well. In (b) (i) full marks were awarded for either 'they resisted the robbers' or 'they resisted bravely'; most candidates scored both marks. (b) (ii) required a knowledge of *tandem*; a majority of candidates identified this word. In (b) (iii), many candidates thought that 'died' was equivalent to 'were killed' for *necati sunt*; this was not accepted. In (c) (i), 'the other' was not acceptable for *alios*; a substantial proportion of candidates could not distinguish between *alii* and *ceteri* in this paper. (c) (ii) many did not know *pauci*. In (d), many missed the superlatives, while others did not know *ingens*. Although (e) required candidates to deal with the rare combination *visne*, most appeared to know it or work it out, using the context as a guide. (f) contained no difficulties apart from occasional ignorance of *facile*.

#### Question 2

*iuvenis ... inquit*: the only cause of difficulty here was the plural ending of *latronum*, which many rendered as singular.

*ego ... despicio*: the first part was straightforward, except for those who did not know *vir*.

*sum ... terrebat*: candidates generally scored highly; uncertainty over *terrebat* was the only problem.

*sed ... amisi*: no-one rendered *uno die* as 'on one day', examiners accepted the universal 'one day' here. Many failed to construe *amisi*, causing *comites* to become the subject.

*cum ... erant*: some candidates made *iuvenis* nominative rather than genitive, ignoring the plural ending of the verb. Other than that, this sentence was handled well.

*eum ... narravit*: those who knew the vocabulary generally got this right. *totam* was the least familiar word.

*crediderat ... posse*: the pluperfect and the singular were regularly missed. *etiam* was often omitted or set in peculiar contexts. A high proportion handled the indirect statement accurately.

*itaque ... faciebat*: *stulte* was often mistaken for an adjective. Although *qui* was usually correctly translated as 'who', few candidates knew how to use the English word correctly in a sentence. *postquam* was often confused with *postea*. Common misunderstandings here were: the use of *ab* to mark the agent with a passive verb, the meanings and uses of *per* and *in* + accusative and the vocabulary item *iter*.

### Question 3

In (a) (i) and (a) (ii) the vocabulary items *iter* and *fidelis* were sometimes unknown. (b) (i) was well answered. (b) (ii) proved the hardest question in the paper: *inter*, *gladios* and *ibat* were rarely known, and the image was a strange one; there were, however, a good number of candidates who answered this correctly. (c) proved straightforward. In (d) (i), many omitted *media* and gave just *nocte*. In (d) (ii), only *quaerentes* caused problems for a few candidates. Nearly all realised that Haemus was the leader in (d) (iii). In (e), many candidates, forgetting that 'why' is ambiguous, looked for a purpose, closing their eyes to the possibility of a reason and so ignoring *quod voces latronum audivit*; this clause was easy for those who realised that the answer lay here. In (f), most gave correct answers, the commonest error being to treat *servi* and *ancillae* as singulars. (g) (i) proved straightforward. For (g) (ii), most candidates appreciated the need for full detail; while many achieved full marks, common errors were one or more of *ceteros*, *solus* and *effugit* (confused with *fugit*).



## 1942/12: Verse Literature - Foundation Tier

### General Comments

The range of candidate performance on this paper remains wide with about 30 candidates achieving marks in the range 50-60 whilst about 25 candidates scored less than 15 marks. Two thirds of the candidates answered Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology* whilst approximately a third of candidates answered Section A: Virgil. Candidates should be reminded that they must always observe the line references given in questions.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Virgil *Aeneid IV*

##### Question 1

Many candidates were able to build up significant scores on the many short content-based questions here, (a) and (d) were well answered. There were also many thorough and empathetic summaries of Dido's dilemma in (g). Answers to questions requiring specific details of the Latin text were not always secure. In (b), for example, *unanimam* was sometimes referred to Dido rather than her sister, and for (c) (i) many candidates interpreted the phrase *nostris sedibus* as representing Aeneas. In answers to (e), there was frequently vague overlap with material that properly lies in lines 5-6 rather than 8-9. Answers to (f) (ii) generally showed an awareness of the murder of Sychaeus by his own brother-in-law. However, most candidates did not refer to the horror of the murder being committed beside the *penates*. (h) was answered well due the vast range of answers available – the *flamma* of love being the most common. Occasionally, examiners were unconvinced that the English explanation fitted the quoted Latin word: *solus*, for example, was frequently said to show how lonely Dido was.

##### Question 2

Most candidates recognised the context of this passage easily and were able to score good results on much of (a), (d) and (e). In (b) the details of the sword and the cloak were often muddled, and in (d) (iv), whilst the ideas put forward were often appropriate, candidates did not always manage to quote the corresponding Latin words. The reason for referring to Ascanius in (e) was usually appreciated correctly from lines 16-17. Only a third of candidates attempted the translation of (f).

#### Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

##### Question 3

This passage from close to the start of the prescribed text gave candidates a good chance to score high marks from their overall knowledge of the Baucis and Philemon story. Questions such as (a), (b), (g) and (i) were often answered confidently – as was the procedure for firelighting in (j). The *ramalia* in (j) (ii) were sometimes confused with the bacon and, whilst the general ideas behind (d) and (e) were usually appreciated, only a few candidates identified both halves of the contrasting pairs of Latin words in each line. In (c) or (i) candidates did not always restrict their answers to the lines designated in the question. In (k) there was sometimes vagueness over the details of the menu (eg 'leaves' from the garden, or unspecified 'meat'), with the goose from later in the story sometimes replacing the pork/bacon offered here. For (l), besides the various possibilities available from the portion of text studied in Latin, items mentioned in the intervening English sections in the *Anthology* (cheeses, honey, home-made

wine, etc) were occasionally cited by candidates and these were just as acceptable as illustrations of the hospitality offered by Baucis and Philemon to their guests.

#### **Question 4**

This question was less well answered than Question 3. Many candidates demonstrated only a very basic knowledge of the poem. Answers to (g) sometimes included remarkable descriptions of the philosophical arguments used by the town mouse. However, questions (a) to (e) were often answered very vaguely. In (e) many candidates did not work out where the material 'after he has prepared the meal' actually begins. In (a), *paupere* regularly came out as 'small' rather than 'poor', and in (d) the colloquial phrase *quid multa?* often went unrecognised. About half the candidates answered (f), often very well, apart from some poor translation of the phrase *praerupti nemoris ... dorso* and the predictable confusion of *tandem* with *tamen*. Most candidates, in answering (h) found something that could, however loosely, be regarded as 'amusing', though there was a tendency to lapse into a complete summary of the story, without saying what might be amusing about any particular aspects of it.

## 1942/13: Language 2 - Foundation Tier

### General Comments

Examiners were impressed by the overall quality of the work. Most candidates had sufficient vocabulary knowledge to make good sense of the passage, though it was noticeable how often adverbs and conjunctions were omitted or mistranslated (eg *nam*, *interea*, *paene*, *itaque*, *atque*). Words like this in the Defined Vocabulary List are important to learn.

### Comments on Individual Questions

In the first paragraph, *accidit* caused some problems ('a grave accident' was a common mistranslation) and *incendia* was often taken as singular. Candidates should be aware that words which appear in the glossary still need to be analysed for case and number. The result clause (*tantae erant flammae ...*) and the indirect statement (*omnes intellegebant ...*) were mostly handled well, however.

In the second paragraph, there were a number of good translations of the difficult sentence *itaque ... fecissent*, which contained an indirect command followed by two indirect questions. As on the Higher Tier paper, the details of the consul's offer were often confused, and candidates who got the point sometimes lost marks for missing the singular forms of *liberto* and *servo*.

In the final paragraph, candidates generally made good sense of the conclusion of the story. The indirect statement (*dixit ... fecisse*) was well-translated, though answers which took *dominum* as *domum* tended to go off track and *quinque* was often unknown. *hi omnes*, referring to the conspirators ('all these men') caused difficulty, but otherwise answers showed good comprehension of the respective fates of the conspirators and the loyal slave.

Previous reports on this paper have commented on the need for candidates to have a good knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List. As last year, examiners were pleased to see that the majority of this year's candidates had been well-prepared by their centres and therefore coped well with a demanding passage of Latin.

## 1942/14: Prose Literature - Foundation Tier

### General Comments

This year the standard of performance on this paper was higher than in 2007. Most candidates had a fairly good knowledge of the texts and a small number wrote really excellent answers. A very small number of candidates knew little of the texts and left large gaps in their scripts. There was little difference in standard between the answers to the two set text prescriptions, however, very few candidates answered on Section B: Selections from *Pliny's Letters*.

Candidates should again be reminded to observe the line references given for each question: answers taken from outside the lines are not awarded marks.

Candidates should pay closer attention to detail when copying out Latin words such as *amoenitas*, *frequens* and *pigre* to use as evidence in their answers, and when using Latin names like Rectina, Stabiae, Pomponianus and Ceres.

### Comments on Individual Questions

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

##### Question 1

(a) and (b) were generally well answered, but (c) (i) proved challenging for many candidates. Those who knew what the Latin meant were able to say that Pliny's uncle headed straight into the danger, free from any fear, while others fled in panic. There was a range of acceptable answers, but some candidates' responses lacked precise detail. (c) (ii) also caused some problems for candidates especially with 'all movements and features of the disaster'. Candidates who wrote 'everything he saw coming from the volcano' understood what Pliny was saying and were given credit for this. (c) (iii) and (d) were generally well answered. There were plenty of references to the ash and the pumice, the blocked shore and the shallow water. In the best answers, candidates included some pleasing comments on the style of writing, such as the use of *iam ... iam*, and on the direct speech at the end of the passage.

##### Question 2

(a) and (b) were well answered, although in (a) some omitted 'full of'. In (c) (i) an exact translation was not required provided that the idea of Pliny's uncle leaving his room and joining Pomponianus (or his friends) was there. (c) (ii) and (d) were generally well answered, although some candidates did not recognise *pervigilaverant* in (c) (ii). In (e) candidates were able to give one or two details of what happened to the buildings. The two most commonly mentioned were the huge tremors and the shaking buildings. Although Latin quotations are not generally required, it is essential to give a brief example in English for each point in a question of this type. (f) and (g) were answered well on the whole.

#### Section B: Selections from *Pliny's Letters*

##### Question 3

While (a) was generally well answered, some candidates found (b) difficult. (c) (i) also caused problems for those who did not recognise the words *studia* and *ingenia*. (b) (ii) was generally answered correctly. In (d) several wrote 'standing in the porticoes' instead of 'sitting' because they translated *stationibus* as 'standing'. In (e) some candidates had difficulty picking out an

### *Report on the Components taken in June 2008*

adjective to describe the audience's behaviour. As well as 'rude', 'impolite', and 'inattentive', modern usage crept in with 'ignorant' appearing several times.

#### **Question 4**

Many candidates produced good answers to (a) apart from some poor spelling of Ceres in (a) (ii). Some candidates were only able to make two points in (b) instead of three, but most answered (c) and (d) well. 'To worship her' was not an acceptable answer to (d) (i) because worshippers were mentioned in the question and candidates are not rewarded for repeating information already given on the question paper. (e) caused few problems but there was some confusion between parts (i) and (ii) of (f) where candidates mentioned the portico instead of the temple in (ii). There were some very good answers to (g) as candidates generally gave good details about the marble.

## 1942/15: Roman Life Topics - Foundation Tier

### General Comments

This year there were some very competent answers, resulting in a number of high scores. A small number scored low marks.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society was answered by about three quarters of the candidates with the remainder answering Topic 7: Roman Religion. The standard of performance on Topic 1 was higher than that on Topic 7. In Section B of Topic 7 in particular, candidates did not use their knowledge effectively. It is important in Section B that candidates answer the essay question precisely rather than giving a long list of facts.

Candidates should be reminded to observe the rubric in Section B where there is a choice of essay questions. A small number answered part (a) of one question with part (b) of the other and so lost marks. A very small number only attempted one part of one question. Several candidates answered both topics.

Handwriting was often illegible and words such as mosaics, tiered, amphitheatre and gladiator were commonly misspelled.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

##### Section A

Question 1 was well answered: most candidates commented on the colonnades and the open space, and a few mentioned the large entrance leading into the baths. There were good answers also to Questions 2 and 3, and in Question 4 a significant number of candidates had made an impressive effort to learn the Latin names for the rooms of the baths. The question asked candidates to say what happened in the rooms. Many candidates did not provide this detail. One common error was to say that the *tepidarium* was a warm bath. In Question 5 most candidates knew the term hypocaust, but there was a good deal of confusion as to how the technology worked. The purpose of the inscription in Question 6 escaped a good many candidates who either thought that Ceius Secundus had been made aedile or they did not make a connection with political events. In Question 7 many candidates did not recognise the term 'aedile' and were therefore unable to give the duties. Some confused 'aediles' with the *duoviri*, and some linked this question with earlier questions and thought 'aediles' worked in the baths. Those who knew about local government gave a good range of duties, including the enforcement of law and order, seeing that taxes were wisely spent, maintaining public buildings and supervising entertainment in the town. A few candidates did not attempt Questions 6 and 7.

##### Section B

Question 8 was more popular than Question 9. There was widespread confusion about what happened in an amphitheatre and some candidates wrote about plays in 8 (a). In the best answers, however, candidates gave clear reasons why they were looking forward to the gladiatorial show and included aspects of the fights which appealed to the spectators. Those who gave an account of the fights but did not answer the question did not score full marks nor did those who described the build up to the show but only mentioned the fight in passing. The same is true of 8 (b) where candidates had to explain why the town house was suitable for its occupants. There were some good answers which took the mediterranean climate into account and the function of the *atrium*. Some candidates included irrelevant details such as the dining arrangements. Answers to Question 9 (a) lacked detail. Many candidates did not give sufficient

details either of the preparations or of the types of performance, although they were able to write about keeping cool. In the best answers candidates either commented on one type of performance such as pantomime in detail or briefly described a range of performances. Question 9 (b) required candidates to say what they liked about life in a Roman town. Those who used the guidelines given on the question paper and wrote detailed answers about the many attractions of town life scored highly. A few misinterpreted the question and compared life in a town with life in the country, which was not what the question asked.

## **Topic 7: Roman Religion**

### **Section A**

Question 1 was generally well answered, but in Questions 2 and 3 'offerings' were frequently confused with the ways in which the Romans tried to cheer up the dead. In their answers to Question 4 some candidates showed that they knew the curse tablet was made from some kind of metal. Many candidates did not read Question 5 carefully. 5 (a) specifically referred to **this** curse tablet and 5 (b) asked for three features other than the ones shown in the drawing. Question 6 was well answered and there were specific references to *Aquae Sulis*. There were also many good answers to Question 7, although one or two did not notice the word 'objects' which meant that 'prayers' was not an appropriate answer.

### **Section B**

Candidates found the questions in this Section challenging. Questions 8 (a) and 9 (a) were generally well answered. Candidates demonstrated some knowledge of Isis and Mithras, although few mentioned the communal activities in which the worshippers of Isis took part. 8 (b) caused the biggest problems for candidates in Section B. There were many vague answers and most of those who chose this question were unable to adapt their knowledge to the demands of the question, despite the guidance they were given in the bullet points on the question paper. Few mentioned the Roman temples or religious ceremonies which helped to spread the Roman way of life in places like Britain. In answers to 9 (b) there was often good detail about the duties of the *haruspex* and the occasions on which sacrifices were made. Some of the answers in Section B were too short to gain enough marks and others lacked precise detail.

## 1942/21: Language 1 - Higher Tier

### General Comments

The overall level of performance this year was high, although a significant number of candidates should have been entered for the Foundation Tier.

The quality of English in candidates' answers was poor. Correct usage of the apostrophe was widely unknown; those who failed to use it correctly lost marks. Redundant personal pronouns were scattered randomly throughout the passage, wherever a sentence contained a subordinate clause. Only a minority of candidates demonstrated confident handling of complex sentences. Another noticeable feature was a weakness of English vocabulary and phrasing; for example 'accused for treason' was just as common as the correct 'accused of treason'. Centres should note that candidates do not receive credit for such solecisms.

As in past years, the main cause of difficulty in the translation continues to be the complex sentence; most candidates were unable to handle any kind of subordination, whether by participle or by clause. This weakness is parallel to their similar difficulties with the English, and indicates a growing gulf between how young people generally express themselves and what they encounter in literary language.

Nearly all candidates completed the paper, though a few candidates ran together their answers to the last few sub-questions in Question 3 with no separation or question numbering in the margin. Centres should make their candidates aware that a straight translation of the Latin in Questions 1 and 3 will not receive credit; numbering of answers to sub-questions must be clear. To aid this further, it is good practice for candidates to start each main question on a new page and to leave a blank line between each numbered response. Multiple obliterations make it almost impossible for examiners to decipher what is the intended final version, especially where deletions are only partial. A substantial minority of candidates wrote alternative translations of Latin words; centres are advised to warn all candidates that, unless they make the status of the alternative very clear, they are likely to lose credit.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Question 1

A high percentage of candidates scored full marks on this question. In (a), nearly all candidates found an acceptable meaning for *auferebant* ('were taking' was accepted on this occasion); a few translated *cives* as 'civilians', despite the cue in the next question. In (b), there were several routes to the first mark. In (c), 'planned' was not acceptable for *constituerunt*, while 'find' was not accepted for *quaerere*. Many candidates did not distinguish between *alii* and *ceteri* in (c). In (d), many candidates did not refer to the second half of the lemma (*illi numquam ingentiorum hominem viderant*) and only translated *iuvenis fortis*; after much deliberation, it was decided to award full marks for this abbreviated answer, even though it made the question much easier than intended. (e) was the only question to challenge the majority of candidates: the *-ne* on the end of *latro*, the use of *an* and the meaning of *vis* were often unfamiliar (*vis* was often construed as equivalent to *vides*).

#### Question 2

The great majority of candidates succeeded in following the storyline. Mistakes arose mainly from ignorance of vocabulary and failure to handle constructions accurately.



*iuvenis ... fortissimi*: most candidates recognised that *iuvenis* was the subject of *inquit*, though the frequent appearance of a redundant 'he' before 'said' rendered this questionable. *simulac* was often omitted. *latronum* was frequently made singular, and the apostrophe was often omitted (causing the loss of a mark). Most recognised the vocative plural *homines*, though the proximity of *iam* may have prompted a substantial minority to write 'I am a very brave man'. Many missed the superlative.

*iam ... mavult*: many candidates did not know *vir*. The other mistake in this clause was to treat *accipite* as indicative. *mavult* was widely unknown, and many adopted *habere* as the finite verb dependent on *qui*. *vulnera* and *manibus* were frequently taken to be singular. *quam* (the first of three different uses of the word) was often given the wrong meaning for the context.

*ego ... terrebat*: many candidates did not connect *despicio* with *mortem*; realising that *ego* required a verb, most converted *mortem* into one: 'I die(d)', which was scarcely logical. The *quam* here was often wrong. *alii* was regularly confused with *ceteri*. In the vast majority of scripts, 'I despise' was added onto the end of the sentence, with no syntactical link; few candidates can handle embedded relative clauses. *enim* was poorly translated. Many candidates did not recognise *cuius*. Most candidates showed a preference for passive over active verbs, and so turned 'whose name frightened very many cities' into 'whose name very many cities were scared of'; while this was not penalised, candidates should be encouraged not to switch from one voice to another without a compelling reason. The superlative was often missed.

*sed ... amisi*: most candidates treated the time phrase as an accusative of duration of time; common sense should have pointed them to the ablative usage. Again the superlative was often missed. Some candidates took *comites* to be the subject of *amisi*. However, *-que* was mostly translated in the right place.

*nomine ... gavisī sunt*: few candidates both recognised the ablative absolute and translated it successfully; a widespread error was to treat *iuvenis* as the subject of a finite verb, and often plural. Most had to guess at the meaning of *gavisī sunt*.

*eum ... accidisset*: *eum* was often omitted or made the subject of a singular *rogaverunt*. *statim* was often unknown.

*Haemus ... fuisset*: 'freely' was not acceptable for *libenter*. For *ut intellegent*, the most frequent rendering was 'so that they understood', which has to be a result rather than a purpose clause. Candidates should be reminded that their translations must distinguish carefully between purpose and result clauses. The third appearance of *quam* was as problematic as the rest; many who correctly opted for 'how' treated it as if it were *quomodo*: 'how he had been unlucky'.

*crediderat ... posset*: this was perhaps the most difficult sentence. *crediderat* was most often translated as 'they believed'. Most recognised the result clause. *potentissimos* was rarely seen to be the object of *oppugnare*: 'he was brave and very powerful' was a frequent version. *oppugnare* was regularly confused with *pugnare*. Some candidates were unable to show how *posset* connected with the rest of the sentence.

*itaque ... faciebat*: the main error here was failure to recognise the adverbial ending: 'a stupid Roman commander' was the most popular version, despite clues given by the context. Many made *legatum* the subject. Here, unusually, because of the lack of contextual clues, 'ambassador' and 'commander' (*vel sim.*) were equally acceptable. About five percent of candidates correctly treated *qui* as a connecting relative, translating it as 'he' instead of the incorrect 'who'. Many treated *accusatus* as a main verb instead of a participle, often also making it active, with *ab inimicis* as its object. As always, *forte* was regularly 'bravely'. The prepositions *per* and *in* caused difficulties for candidates: for most candidates *in exilium* meant 'in exile'; for some this was the only error they made in the whole passage. The context clearly demanded an

English imperfect for *iter faciebat*, which many candidates duly provided; *iter* was frequently confused with *iterum*.

### Question 3

In (a) (i), many candidates guessed the meaning of *relicta*, but some chose the opposite of 'left behind'. Most managed to translate *ire*. In (a) (ii), the main difficulty was the word order of the Latin: many candidates failed to recognise the result clause and so missed the fact that the answer to this question came before the answer to (a) (i). Although a general principle in setting comprehension questions is to make them sequential, there will often be occasions, like this one, where the nature of the Latin forces an inversion. Those candidates who paid full attention to the lemma usually grasped that the answer had to be inside the first sentence. Had the question been intended to call for a personal opinion from the candidate, it would have been worded like (b) (ii). Almost all candidates answered (b) (i) correctly, though a few omitted *capite*, suggesting that the wife shaved like a man. Most found sensible reasons for her masquerade in (b) (ii). In (c), many thought that it was the soldiers rather than the wife who were sharing the danger and caring for her husband's safety; many misunderstood the concept of *curam habere*. In (d) (i), some candidates were uncertain who was attacking/fighting whom. Almost all answered (d) (ii) correctly. The three marks allocated to (e) indicated that a detailed response was needed, and nearly all candidates wisely tried to translate the whole sentence. The main difficulties here were the ablative absolute *Haemo duce* and where to fit in *coeperunt*. 'All good things' was acceptable for *omnia bona*. (f) (i) caused no difficulties apart from the apostrophe for the genitive. In (f) (ii), many had the slaves etc meeting in the garden (*hortata est*), but often full marks were achieved because they gave an acceptable rendering of *convocatos* in compensation. 'Servant' is not acceptable as a translation of *servus*: 'slave' is the correct meaning. Most answered (g) (i) correctly. In (g) (ii), the two difficulties were the meaning of *ceteris* and confusion of *effugit* with *fugit*.

## 1942/22: Verse Literature - Higher Tier

### General Comments

The numbers of candidates answering on Virgil and on the *Cambridge Latin Anthology* remain roughly equal. A large number of candidates demonstrated a high level of engagement and enjoyment of the Latin literary texts and many achieved high scores on this paper.

Some general advice for candidates is given below:

- (i) Please do familiarise candidates with the layout of the OCR question papers. Some candidates attempted both Sections A and B: these candidates may not have been aware that the question paper offers a choice of section.
- (ii) Please encourage candidates to read the questions carefully, eg for literary questions, to check whether 'choice of words' is included in the question.
- (iii) Please encourage candidates to underline and to respond to any trigger words in the question, eg 'urgency' or 'praiseworthiness'.
- (iv) Please remind candidates that where line references are given in questions, only answers and examples drawn from those lines will receive credit.
- (v) Please remind candidates to make sure that their Latin quotations are relevant: irrelevant Latin quotation will not receive credit.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Virgil *Aeneid* IV

##### Question 1

Most responded appropriately to (a), but many either did not locate an adjective (*soror* being frequent) or selected one in the wrong case (*male sana*). Responses to (b) were usually good, except when candidates restricted themselves only to line 4 rather than incorporating the obviously relevant material in lines 6-7. Some candidates did not use the cues provided at the start of the question as a guide. Both (c) and (d) differentiated between simply translating the phrase required, which almost all candidates did, and going one step further by relating that information to the question. Many ascribed *timor* (line 6) to Dido, or interpreted *culpa* (line 12) as Dido's 'weakness' in falling in love again rather than sensing her anxiety about the consequences of breaking her vow of fidelity to her former husband. (e) was well answered, apart from some lack of awareness of the significance of the murder taking place beside the *penates* and a range of partial answers such as 'the household gods were scattered' or 'splattered'. There was a wide range of plausible features cited for (f) – favourites being the emphatic *solus* (sometimes ascribed to Dido), the enjambed *impulit*, and the implications of *flammae* – though some candidates did not earn the mark available for explaining the effectiveness of their chosen example. The standard of translation in (g) was generally very high, apart from omissions of individual words (eg *vel/mihi/ima*) or of repetitive phrases (*ad umbras/pallentes umbras + te/tua iura*), and for (h) many candidates wrote perceptive and empathetic responses to Dido's *animum labantem* – marred occasionally by ignoring the line reference given.

## Question 2

This question as a whole was better answered than Question 1, with most candidates scoring full marks for content-based questions such as (a), (d) and (e). In (b), whilst most easily scored 2 marks, the third mark was not awarded to those who either restricted themselves to lines 1-2 rather than the whole four lines specified in the cue, or who lost sight of the concepts of 'importance' and 'urgency' that their answer was supposed to exemplify. In (c), despite the clear signals given in the wording of the question, many candidates selected material from outside line 6 for (ii), whereas conversely for (iii) only a tiny minority appreciated the relevance of line 5 to the argument that Mercury is making. In line 6 itself the ambiguous phrase *spes heredis Iuli* was an instance where candidates who had a ready-made translation in their minds were often unable to turn this into any kind of meaningful interpretation. There was a wide range of response to (f). The wording of this question was specifically tailored to the passage, so that those candidates who only commented on interesting word choice, for example, could not be given credit here – nor could explanations which simply recycled the wording of the question, saying 'this emphasises Aeneas' confusion'. The translation of (g) was generally done very well indeed, apart from the omission of *alternanti*. As in Question 1 (h), the best responses were impressive. In less successful answers candidates took a simplistic view of the situation (good Aeneas vs bad Aeneas), or quoted at inordinate length without commenting on Aeneas' character.

## Section B: Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*

### Question 3

Answers to (a) and (b) were sometimes not sufficiently distinct, but were otherwise very sound – as were most responses to (e). Suggestions for (c) were usually adequate, commenting on the repetition of *aspice* and various instances of alliteration. For (d), most candidates commented on the change from *aspice* to *ecce* rather than the differences between sheep and goats, green fields and rough rocks. The correct animals usually appeared in answers to (f) and (g). In (g) (ii) there was considerable uncertainty as to which cow was calling for which, and the onomatopoeia of *mugitur* was seldom noted. Many translations of (h) were faultless: other good versions were let down by a lack of attention to detail. Most answered the summative question (i) well by choosing things which were self-evidently attractive – such as rippling brooks, contented livestock or the predictability of Nature's bounty. A few candidates misread the question as 'How does Ovid make the countryside attractive?' – which led them into the very different field of stylistic features based on Latin quotation, whereas the question asked for reference to five details in English.

### Question 4

(a) and (b) were well answered, though some candidates had forgotten the actual names of the gods. In (c), the several stages involved in rekindling the fire were readily recalled: candidates' understanding of the phrase *anima anili*, however, was often vague, related neither to age nor to what Baucis was actually struggling to do at that moment. Answers about *ramalia* for (c) (iii) often revealed similar vocabulary confusion between the wood-supply and the smoked bacon joint. In the translation of (d), many omitted *fertur*, *asper*, and *quid multa*. The elaborate word-patterning and sound effects of line 16 gave almost everyone something interesting to discuss. In their answers to (f) most seemed to pick up the resonance between the two meals: the essential requirement was to stick to the focus of the question, in this case 'praiseworthiness'. (g) was well answered and with an interesting variety of material – often featuring the *dente superbo* of the town mouse and his snooty insistence on the superiority of the town, alongside recollections of the amazing behaviour of the wine-bowl, or the goose that is saved from a roasting by the intervention of the gods, or the appointment of Baucis and Philemon as guardians of their house-cum-temple.

## 1942/23: Language 2 - Higher Tier

The general quality of the work on Section A (unseen translation) was extremely high once again and there were some very impressive answers to Section B (English into Latin sentences).

### Section A

Most candidates correctly translated the superlative form of *dirissima* found in the first paragraph and there were some sensible translations of *res* (eg 'event', 'incident'). *eodem tempore* caused difficulties, however, and candidates who did not recognise *tanti* tended to miss the sense of *ut* in the result clause that followed. The indirect statement (*omnes putabant ...*) was handled well, but some candidates were deceived by the word order of *incendia multis et diversis locis* and wrongly took *multis* with *incendia* rather than *locis*. The deponent *orta erant* was a good test of candidates' abilities to translate a passive form actively and identify the tense.

In the second paragraph, *vis* caused some difficulty, as it was confused with *via* and *vir*. The confusion of similar words (*res/rex*, *liber/liberi/liberto/libertas/libero*, *dominum/domum*, *eo/eos*) was again in evidence this year. The indirect questions after *rogavit* were translated well and candidates who did not know the meaning of *suscepissent* often made a reasonable guess which made sense in the context (though many took it to mean 'whom they suspected'). The concise balance of *liberto argentum*, *servo libertatem* was not well handled and there was often confusion over the meanings of *libertus* and *libertas* - with *liberto* and *servo* occasionally being taken as plurals. The phrase *hoc praemio inductus* ('led on by this reward') was found to be the hardest in the passage - candidates who mistook this as an ablative absolute tended to have difficulty in finding a translation of *inductus* which made sense in the context. Some candidates saw that *inductus* had to be nominative (i.e. referring to the slave), and translated the phrase as 'encouraged/tempted by this reward'. The ablative absolute *fide servi laudata* was not always successfully translated, as the noun *fides* was confused with the adjective *fidelis*. A small number of candidates recognised the subjunctive form of *quaererent* ('he sent soldiers to search for them').

The final paragraph was generally translated successfully. The passive *adducti sunt* caused few problems, *perfidia* was usually known and the phrase *poenam mortis dederunt*, which candidates might have found difficult, was mostly well-handled. The passive form of *data est* in the last sentence with *libertas* as subject did not cause difficulty and the majority of candidates were thus able to finish translating the passage successfully.

### Section B

Some candidates were hampered by vocabulary problems (eg 'winds', 'sea', 'hinder', 'huge', 'drove', 'cruel' etc). The temporal clause ('after the Greeks ...') and the purpose clause ('in order to hinder') were handled well, but the combination of the result clause and indirect statement in Question 4 was found difficult - a few candidates could form the future infinitive *necaturum esse*. Question 5, which required particular knowledge of case endings and adjectival agreements, was not well done, but Question 6 allowed even weaker candidates to finish strongly - some were even able to turn 'Ulysses overcame the giant' into an appropriate ablative absolute. As ever, it was pleasing to see that a good number of candidates had been prepared for Section B.

On the paper overall, as in previous years, examiners were impressed by the large number of high quality answers. The majority of candidates had been well-prepared for passages containing a variety of grammatical constructions and posing a consistent level of difficulty. There were very many scripts in the 35-40 bracket - they were a pleasure to mark.

## 1942/24: Prose Literature - Higher Tier

### General Comments

The majority of candidates answered Section A (Selections from the *Cambridge Latin Anthology*) rather than Section B (*Selections from Pliny's Letters*). It was felt that the Pliny questions were perhaps slightly easier than those set on the Anthology, but that the more demanding level of the Latin of the Pliny Letters compensated for this. Overall the balance between straightforward factual questions and the more demanding questions on style ensured that the paper differentiated effectively. The candidates had learned the texts well and their answers were generally of a very high quality.

Most candidates were better at observing the line references this year and a pleasing number used Latin words and phrases in their answers. Spelling, particularly that of Latin place names, was variable, and candidates were sometimes hampered by a lack of adequate vocabulary when summarising a person's behaviour or attitudes. There was little evidence this year that candidates ran out of time.

### Comments on Individual Questions

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

Most candidates scored at least two marks on (a) (i) as the mark scheme allowed several possible answers. In (a) (ii) the situation was well understood and (b) (i) only presented problems for those who did not recognise *excitatus*. In (b) (ii) *pervigilaverant* was sometimes linked to 'being vigilant'. (c) was well answered and most grasped the contrast. (d) proved to be a question that differentiated well. In the best answers, candidates mentioned the personification of the buildings in *nutabant* and noted the simile or comparison introduced by *quasi*. Some candidates were not able to translate the Latin they quoted correctly, most notably *abire et referri* which was confused with *emota sedibus*. Candidates need to give some explanation or translation to make it clear to the examiner that the Latin has been understood. There were many references to alliteration, such as *tremoribus tecta*, where candidates did not explain the effect of the alliteration and so were not awarded marks. Some candidates omitted to give an example of style of writing. (e) and (f)(i) were well answered. Some found it difficult to explain the Latin in their own words and simply gave a translation. One wrote that Pliny's uncle was weighing up his actions in a rational way while the others chose what to do based on what they found less frightening. A number of candidates stated precisely what the different options were. There were many good answers also to (f) (ii). Most of these mentioned the repetition of *ratio rationem* and *timorem timor*, and the contrast between *apud illum* and *apud alios*. Others either omitted to quote the Latin altogether or quoted the whole sentence.

#### Question 2

Most candidates gained full marks for (a) (i) as there was plenty of choice. In their answers to (a) (ii) candidates responses ranged from sophisticated to quaint: some referred to his hedonistic lifestyle while others called him 'naughty'. Many clearly disapproved of Caelius' behaviour but struggled to find the right word to describe it. In (b) there was some uncertainty about whether the question meant Clodia's involvement in the accusations in court or her involvement in the charges against Caelius. (c) proved a good question for showing which candidates knew the text well. Most managed to score some marks, but those who kept close to the text had the safest approach. From the answers to (b) and (c) it was clear that a few candidates were uncertain about Clodia's role in the trial. (d) was well answered. In (e) although most candidates could give *non numquam* or *saepius* as examples of choice of words, in only the best answers did candidates also successfully select an example of word order. Here the most frequently quoted

was the position of *saepius* at the beginning of the sentence. Few noticed the juxtaposition of *eius te* or that *saepius* was a comparative. (f) was generally well answered. It was intended to be a question with a short answer but a few candidates wrote far too much for the award of two marks and in some cases became far from clear in what they were trying to say. (g) was generally well answered although many candidates struggled to summarise Cicero's attitude to Clodia, and only gave examples of her behaviour. Most candidates found these examples without difficulty. A number of candidates got confused between Cicero, Clodia and Caelius. Some thought that Cicero rejected Clodia and thought her gifts were not good enough.

## Section B: Selections from *Pliny's Letters*

### Question 3

There were good answers to (a) (i) and (ii) and also to (a) (iii) where the mark scheme allowed several choices. In (b) (i) there were difficulties with the vocabulary. Some candidates did not know *studia* and *ingenia*, but many grasped the point that Pliny was making and, using their own words, explained that people wanted to show off their work. (b) (ii) was generally well answered as was (c). Candidates found (d) (i) very straightforward and virtually everyone gained full marks. In (d) (ii) there was a wide range of possible answers, so again many scored full marks, although a few were hard pressed to name a second venue and wrote 'in the streets' or even 'in amphitheatres'. In their responses to (e) candidates produced some very good Latin answers with most choosing *cunctanter* and *lente*. Only a few quoted *tum demum*. (f) caused few problems and many candidates quoted the Latin to support their answers even though this was not a requirement.

### Question 4

(a) was generally well answered. A few candidates guessed incorrectly in (a) (ii) that the estate was in Comum or even Bithynia and in (iv) quite a few stated that the temple was crowded or cramped but did not give both answers. Most gave sensible answers to (b) (i) and (b) (ii) stating that worshippers would make a sacrifice in order to have a good harvest. In (b) (iii) most candidates referred to the repetition of *multa* and *e regione tota*, to suggest how busy the temple was, but few mentioned asyndeton. One or two candidates did not observe the line references and picked out *frequentissima* as an example of choice of words. Virtually everyone quoted the Latin in their answers and most concentrated on choice of words rather than style of writing. The same word can sometimes be used to illustrate both, and can thus score two marks. Here candidates could comment on the repetition of *multa* as well as the position of *multae* and *multa* at the beginning of clauses. (c) (i) and (c) (ii) were well answered although some candidates did not distinguish between piously and generously and some got confused between the temple and the porticoes as to which was for the goddess and which for the people. Some candidates noted that *quam pulcherrimam* meant as beautiful as possible. The final question (d) tested candidates' understanding of Latin as well as their knowledge of the text. Many wrote confidently about Pliny's enthusiasm for the project concerning the temple and its site.

## 1942/25: Roman Life Topics - Higher Tier

### General Comments

This year the quality of answers was very pleasing and there were many high marks, a substantial number of candidates in the middle range of marks and only a small number of low scores. Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society was considerably more popular than Topic 7: Roman Religion.

Essays in Section B were generally well structured, but if candidates are to score at the highest level, it is important that they answer the question and use their knowledge effectively, rather than giving a list of facts on the topic. The standard of written communication in the Section B Essays was high. The standard of presentation and handwriting was worse than last year and some scripts were very difficult to read.

A few candidates failed to finish the paper. Candidates are advised to leave time to finish Section B and not to write long or repetitive answers on Section A. One or two candidates attempted both topics or answered part of Question 8 with part of Question 9.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

##### Section A

Questions 1 and 2 presented no problems for candidates, nor did Question 3 where the most common answers given were socialising and having a massage. In Question 4 spelling of Latin names was sometimes approximate, but candidates generally knew what happened in each room of the baths. The most common mistake was to describe a warm bath in the *tepidarium*. Many knew the term hypocaust in Question 5. There were some excellent diagrams and descriptions of the heating system, but also a few strange ideas about steam and heating water in pipes, which suggested a lack of understanding of the process. There were also some mistaken references to the hot springs at Bath. Question 6 was poorly answered. Many candidates did not recognise this as a notice appealing for support for an election candidate. Question 7 was very well answered when candidates recognised the term 'aedile'. In good answers, candidates often listed up to five or six of their duties, although some confused 'aediles' with clients or bath attendants.

##### Section B

Question 8 was more popular than Question 9 and candidates produced some very good answers to both parts of the question. In 8 (a) a small number of candidates wrote about the theatre instead of or, in some cases as well as, the amphitheatre. In the best answers candidates gave some excellent reasons why a visit to a gladiatorial show would have been eagerly awaited. There were also some very good answers to 8 (b) although some candidates described the advantages of its location instead of its design or did not understand the term 'town house' and wrote about *insulae*. In the best answers candidates wrote in great detail about the suitability of the house, citing the part played by the climate in the development of the design. There were also good observations on the functions of the house, to accommodate family and slaves, to entertain guests and to welcome the master's clients. Some candidates focused on one area of the house to the exclusion of the rest or wrote at length about the furniture in the *atrium* and dining room, which was not strictly relevant. There were a few inaccuracies about the different rooms, but in general knowledge of Latin names was impressive.



There were some good answers to Question 9 (a) on the visit to the theatre. Some candidates wrote knowledgeably about comedy and were able to go into great detail describing the plot of a typical play. Most candidates gave good details of the atmosphere, which made the occasion so enjoyable, even if their knowledge of the performance was sometimes very vague. There was some confusion between comedy and farce, but the details of the pantomime were generally better known than in previous years. Answers to Question 9 (b) generally showed that candidates had a good knowledge of the Roman town. A few candidates wrote about life in Rome rather than a Roman town or compared life in town with life in the country. Some used Pompeii as an example. Good answers included references to the variety of shops and products available, the opportunities for business, the chance to participate in local politics, and entertainment and the baths.

## Topic 7: Roman Religion

### Section A

Question 1 (a) was well answered and most candidates gave two acceptable reasons for identifying the buildings as tombs. In Question 1 (b) few mentioned lack of space in the town or health and safety as a reason for placing tombs outside the town. Questions 2 and 3 were generally well answered. Candidates did not always answer Question 4 correctly, but Questions 5, 6 and 7 were generally answered confidently. A few candidates did not notice that 5 (a) referred to **this** curse tablet and that in 5 (b) they were required to give three additional features of the tablet reproduced on the question paper. There was also some irrelevant information (for example, a long list of crimes) given by some candidates. Question 6 was well answered, but in Question 7 some ignored the word 'objects' and included prayers in their answer.

### Section B

Question 9 was much more popular than Question 8. Those candidates who did choose Question 8 often gave impressive and lively details of the festival of Isis in 8 (a). Fewer however wrote at any length about the brotherhood and the communal activities. The omission of this aspect of the worship of Isis or any reference to new life or life after death prevented candidates from scoring full marks. Question 8 (b) caused problems for some candidates. Such candidates generally wrote too vaguely and of those who did mention emperor worship many gave too little factual information. The best answers however were well presented and well argued. Question 9 (a) was a popular essay with many excellent, detailed answers, especially about the *haruspex* and the *augur*, although a few candidates spent too long writing about the sacrifice. There were some interesting accounts, too, of the part played by astrology in foretelling the future, although a few confused astrology with astronomy. There were also some very good answers to Question 9 (b), although some candidates only described one eastern religion in detail. A number of candidates mistakenly thought that Sulis Minerva was an eastern goddess. There were some very some good references to Christianity, but comments on philosophy were not relevant. Candidates should answer the question precisely. 9 (b) required them to say why eastern religions appealed to the Romans and not merely give an account of their worship as some candidates did.

# Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education  
Latin (Specification Code 1942)  
June 2008 Examination 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 (Foundation)	60	n/a	n/a	36	30	25	20	15
12 (Foundation)	60	n/a	n/a	36	30	25	20	15
13 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	27	21	16	11	6
14 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	29	25	22	19	16
15 (Foundation)	40	n/a	n/a	24	20	16	12	8

21 (Higher)	60	45	39	34	26	n/a	n/a	n/a
22 (Higher)	60	44	37	31	25	n/a	n/a	n/a
23 (Higher)	40	32	28	25	21	n/a	n/a	n/a
24 (Higher)	40	32	27	23	19	n/a	n/a	n/a
25 (Higher)	40	30	25	20	16	n/a	n/a	n/a

## Specification 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	128	108	89	70	51
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	67.2	81.3	87.5	93.8	98.4

The total entry for the examination was 67

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	123	103	83	63	43
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	42.9	76.2	90.5	95.2	95.2

The total entry for the examination was 21

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	125	107	89	71	53
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	50	74.3	85.6	94.6	97.5

The total entry for the examination was 208

<b>Option FD (06, 11, 12, 13)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	123	103	83	63	43
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	70.6	82.4	94.1	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 19

<b>Option FE (06, 11, 12, 14)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	125	107	89	71	53
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		n/a	n/a	n/a	49.2	63.9	83.6	91.8	95.1

The total entry for the examination was 66

### Higher Tier

<b>Option HA (21, 22, 23, 24)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	173	153	133	113	91	80	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		52.1	81.1	91.8	96.9	99.4	99.7	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 4411

<b>Option HB (21, 22, 23, 25)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	172	151	130	110	88	77	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		43.4	76.7	91	95.8	98.2	99.1	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 585

<b>Option HC (21, 22, 24, 25)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	149	128	108	86	75	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		32.9	63.4	81.3	91.9	97.2	98.6	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 3363

<b>Option HD (06, 21, 22, 23)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	171	152	133	114	92	81	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		34.7	62.9	74.3	86.6	98.5	99	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 203

<b>Option HE (06, 21, 22, 24)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	172	152	132	112	90	79	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		29.1	60	77.6	90.9	97.4	98.7	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 994

<b>Option HF (21, 22, 23, 86)</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	171	152	133	114	92	81	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		25	75	75	100	100	100	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 4

### **Overall**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	40.5	69.3	83	92.7	97.4	98.7	99	99.1

The total entry for the examination was 9941

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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**

© OCR 2008

