



GCSE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LATIN

SUMMER 2018

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
Component 1	1
Component 2	6
Component 3A	9
Component 3B	11

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2018
COMPONENT 1 – LATIN LANGUAGE

General Comments

Examiners were relieved to find that, in this first session of the new GCSE language examination, the paper functioned effectively, providing a good test of ability across the range. Marks ranged from the low teens to the high nineties, with a dozen or so achieving full marks. As anticipated, the new composition/grammar section (Questions 4 and 5) proved challenging for most candidates, though even the very weakest were able to score a few points here. The overall impression was that the standard of attainment was very high.

It was expected that the great majority of candidates would find little to trouble them in Question 1, and this proved to be the case, with a high percentage gaining full marks. Question 2 by contrast contained enough difficulties to challenge the best candidates. Similarly the harder comprehension passage for Question 3 clearly continued the gradient of difficulty, with harder constructions and vocabulary making some of the questions beyond the reach of most candidates. Although there were quite a few candidates who achieved higher marks for Question 3 than for Question 2, the great majority scored lower marks, often substantially lower.

As has nearly always been the case, a story that involves both male and female characters caused much confusion over the genders of the named characters. This is despite the glossing of the names, including their genders.

Allied to this issue of gender was the widespread confusion over pronouns, the meanings and genders of which generated many errors. Similarly conjunctions other than *et* and *sed* also gave trouble.

Multiple-choice questions were handled well if the correct answer could be determined purely by common sense and a continuing grasp of the storyline; if the answer depended more on identification of cases, however, the choice became a lottery. This difficulty with cases showed up again in Question 4, where very few candidates were able to select the correct case endings for their translations into Latin. Here there was much more success with verb endings than with adjective/noun endings.

Question 5 proved twice as popular as Question 4, though many candidates ignored the rubric and attempted both. They were credited with the final mark.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 (a) all candidates identified Jupiter as a king, but many clearly did not recognise the meaning or ending of *deorum*.
- (b) the great majority answered correctly; more than a few gave 'the wife of Io'.
- (c) the great majority correctly chose B and C, though there were many weak candidates who chose one or both incorrect alternatives.

- (d) (i) generally correct responses showed that nearly all candidates were familiar with the verb *credere*.
- (ii) there were far fewer candidates than in previous years who simply did not understand the question, giving meanings rather than derivatives. As a result, nearly all could find a suitable word.
- (e) (i) most chose correctly, demonstrating either knowledge of the verb *abesse* or a good grasp of the logic of the storyline.
- (ii) knowledge of the verb *quaerere* was rather less secure here, compelling weaker candidates to guess.
- (f) most chose correctly.
- (g) (i) more than half were familiar with the use of *noli*, while rather more knew the verb *fugere*.
- (ii) nearly all answered correctly. A few candidates stepped away from the Latin and wrote 'she didn't do as he ordered' or similar; these answers were accepted.
- (h) nearly all answered correctly; the few who guessed 'took' or 'found' were not given the mark.
- (i) this was the first of the slightly challenging questions. Even a few very competent candidates lost a mark here or in (j); this is despite there being more possible answers than marks in both questions. The reasons here for the loss of marks were confusion over the prepositions *trans* and *per*, the use of singulars instead of plurals for the nouns, or ignorance of the verb *festinare*.
- (j) The reason for loss of a mark here was a widespread unwillingness to make more than one point. Also many paid scant attention to the Latin, preferring to create a response from their understanding, accurate or not, of the storyline.

Q.2 Centres are reminded that the marking of the GCSE translation passages is different from that used to mark translations in the Level 1 and Level 2 Certificates. Here nouns, adjectives and infinite verbs carry only 1 mark instead of 2. Also, proper names as subject carry no separate mark; instead they are linked to the mark for the verb ending. Finally, prepositions carry no mark of their own; they are linked to their dependent noun or pronoun.

Iuppiter prope vaccam pulchram stabat.

The only difficulty here was the meaning of the verb.

Iuno, ubi maritum cum vacca vidit, erat attonita. eum rogavit cuius vacca esset.

Two words here caused considerable difficulty: *ubi* and *cuius*, the latter proving to be one of the two least recognised words in the passage. More surprising was the widespread confusion of *ubi* with *qui*. Many weaker candidates wrote 'saw the cow with her husband', ignoring all rules of case endings and word order. Some candidates did not know the verb *rogare*.

ille, qui vera dicere non volebat, 'vacca' inquit 'subito apparuit.'

The two pronouns worked havoc among all but the very best candidates; most had no idea of the meaning or function of the two words. Many did not know the verb *dicere*. Many took the negative with the infinitive instead of the finite verb; this was not credited. At least three-quarters of the candidates failed to link *vacca* with *subito apparuit*, often making it appear to be vocative. This is evidence that the great majority of candidates either find it impossible to rework the word order to suit English idiom, or simply don't appreciate the need to do so.

luno statim eum oravit ut hanc vaccam sibi donum daret.

Many did not know the verb *orare*; others did not know *dare*. The most frequent error here was the omission of *hanc*, either from oversight or from ignorance. Many otherwise very good candidates thought it correct English to translate the indirect command as if it were a purpose clause ('begged him so that he...'); this was not accepted.

luppiter, quamquam vaccam tradere nolebat, nihil aliud facere potuit.

Very many were unfamiliar with *quamquam*. Many could only guess the meaning of *tradere*. Only the best linked *nihil* with *aliud*, and many did not identify *potuit*.

luno, cum marito non crederet, Argo imperavit ut vaccam custodiret.

'With her husband' was not uncommon. Many candidates, including some strong ones, left *Argo* with its dative ending. Again the indirect command was often treated as purpose.

Argus centum oculos in capite habebat, quorum quinquaginta semper aperti erant.

Very many did not know *capite*. 'Was having', although inappropriate to the context, was credited. *quorum* was as rarely known as *cuius*. Many did not recognise *erant* ('he had' was common).

sic Argus vaccam semper videre poterat.

The only frequent error here was the omission of *sic*.

lon tristissima erat, quod, si aliquid dicere conabatur, solum mugiebat; sua voce perterrita erat.

Most recognised the superlative, though some did not know the meaning of the adjective. Many were unfamiliar with *si*, and similar numbers did not know *aliquid*. Although 'alone' is a standard meaning of *solus*, it was not accepted here, as the context called for *only*, as most candidates realised. The clause *sua voce perterrita erat* was more error-prone than any other in the passages: few saw that *sua voce* was ablative, while many that did see it failed to realise it represented the agent with the passive verb; the most common versions were 'her voice was terrifying' and 'her voice was terrified'.

ad patrem festinavit, ut auxilium eius peteret, sed pater eam non agnovit.

In more than half the scripts, *ad patrem festinavit* was 'her father hurried'. The purpose clause was most often 'to help her', ignoring *peteret* and converting *auxilium* into a verb. The last clause was generally correct.

- Q.3 (a) (i) more than half the candidates gave 'on the highest mountain' for *in summo monte*; this was not accepted. Many included the answer to (ii) here, and the mark for it was transferred to (ii), as this was deemed an understandable confusion.
- (ii) most gained the mark.
- (iii) only a handful of candidates gained both marks, and very few gained one. The main difficulty was the inability to work out the meaning of *abegit*; it is worth pointing out that regular compounds of verbs listed in the DVL are fair game for the later parts of this paper; also candidates should be aware of less common meanings listed in the DVL, such as 'drive' for *agere*. Less understandable was why the great majority of candidates decided on 'to her father' for *a patre*.
- (b) (i) nearly all identified *tristis* correctly, but a good few did not know what it meant.
- (ii) this was done well.
- (c) (i) most correctly chose C.
- (ii) the main problem here was the handling of *vocatum*: many omitted it, while others rendered it as 'spoke to'.
- (d) most correctly chose A, D and H, but F was as popular as the correct E; this was the result of ignorance of the verb *loqui*.
- (e) (i) the great majority answered correctly, though a few gave 'sleepy' rather than 'asleep', which is not the same at all.
- (ii) there were four ways of gaining the three marks here, but half the candidates managed only one or two marks. Most failed to mention Mercury, simply stating that 'his head was cut off'. Ignorance of *de* or *cecidit* cost other marks.
- (f) (i) nearly all answered correctly; the few who gave 'had been killed' were not rewarded.
- (ii) about half recognised the comparative.
- (g) most noted the extraction of the eyes, though some decided it was only one eye. Many omitted *e capite*. Very many failed to identify *posuit*. Equally many did not know what to make of *in* with the accusative. It had been hoped that candidates would use their imagination to visualise the appearance of 'eyes' on the tail of a peacock, but clearly few did.
- (h) most did not know the appropriate meaning of *ageret*. Also very many did not know that *terra* could mean 'land' ('ground' was not accepted).
- (i) the problems here all related to who was doing what: often it was Juno or Jupiter who was being spared; equally often it was one or other of those two who was exhausted.

- Q.4 (a) nearly all knew the vocabulary, but very few could add the correct endings on either word, especially the noun. In particular, 'the Romans' was frequently singular and nominative.
- (b) Although the verb often had the right ending, only half remembered the -s- between the x and the p. The other three words suffered from a very wide range of wrong endings.
- (c) Very few made *multi* agree with *liberi*, which itself rarely received the right ending. The verb was often correct. Many did not know *per*.
- Q.5 (a) most mentioned the correct cases, but many thought one noun was singular, the other plural.
- (b-f) most were answered correctly.
- (g-h) many got the tenses the wrong way round.

Conclusion

The paper differentiated very effectively, generating a wide spread of marks. Despite all the errors listed above, the standard overall was high, and Centres and their candidates are to be congratulated on the quality and extent of their preparation for this examination.

LATIN

GCSE (NEW)

Summer 2018

COMPONENT 2 – LATIN LITERATURE AND SOURCES (THEMES)

The concept – a selection of Latin passages, prose and verse, chosen both for their literary merit and to form a set of material illustrating a particular theme – will be familiar to users of the former Certificate in Latin Literature. Obvious differences are the inclusion in the specification of a number of illustrations and the need for candidates to study aspects of the wider context of their chosen theme. Teachers are strongly advised to view the specification as a single package and to integrate pictures and historical background into work on the texts, rather than regarding these as a kind of add-on extra which their pupils can sort out for themselves.

Theme A (*A Day at the Races*) was predictably the more popular choice, by a considerable lead, though examiners saw top-quality work on both themes and only a small proportion of scripts did not contain something of merit, even if some struggled to score equally well across all the items tested. The time available seemed ample for most, and those who were expert enough to romp through Q.1-5 had both the time and the resources to produce a three- or four-page essay for Q.6. If candidates need extra space for any section, however, they should go first to the extra page(s) deliberately provided for that purpose at the back of the answer booklet, rather than using only a few lines of an insert, and they should indicate beside the question where the examiner can find the rest of the answer.

General comments

Stylistic analysis of a longer passage has been replaced by a more targeted search within a small section of text for a specified number of examples where the Latin style may be said to add something to the meaning. Candidates' responses to this need to include some explanation of what is special about the Latin words quoted **and** the likely impact of this on the reader, not just to discuss the meaning in English. Technical literary terms (e.g. asyndeton, alliteration) can provide a useful shorthand for those who are thoroughly at home using them, but are no better – and sometimes less convincing – than straightforward observations expressed in the candidate's own words (e.g. *Line 25 continues into line 26 without a break, and that is good because it is like the excitement of the crowd cheering on one ship which is chasing the other*).

Line references must be observed precisely. As always, many candidates offered plausible ideas, but relating to the wrong lines – for example, in Theme A Q.3(b) and Theme B Q.5(c). Examiners cannot reward answers, however worthy, which come from outside the parameters of the question.

Responses to the essay questions (Q.6) generally featured a wide range of relevant material, both texts and pictures, but some could not resist developing individual well-rehearsed examples for their own sake, forgetting to link these to the overarching question. Some, on the other hand, offered no more than a catalogue of items with one point about

each, ignoring good opportunities in the same material and showing little imagination in relating the material to the question posed. It is worth noting that the criteria stated in the markscheme for AO3 include 'perceptive/imaginative interpretation'. A few, bizarrely, tried to explore stylistic features in various Latin quotations, but the framing of the question should have made it obvious that this is not the place for that kind of response.

Theme A: *A Day at the Races*

Most candidates showed a good understanding of the whole range of texts but some revealed insecurity with one or more, most commonly the Boat Race. Q.5(b) depended on having a firm grasp of the passage as a whole and only the best scored both marks here. In Q.5(d) some found difficulty in distinguishing what happens at the end of the race from what happens in the middle. Both in Q.5(c) and Q.3(b) there was a noticeable distinction between those who had had systematic practice in handling questions dealing with stylistic features and those who had not. Some responses to Q.4 also seemed fairly random, depending more on presumption or guesswork than observation of what the pictures actually contain and giving the impression of being spur-of-the-moment rather than something studied in advance.

Questions focusing on specific details of the Latin, such as Q.5(a), were often tackled successfully, even by some who collapsed in other areas. In Q.1(d) it was surprising to find *etiam* quoted as often as the more obvious *traditur* but both were equally acceptable, as long as the explanation provided tallied with the question. The conflated and bitty answers sometimes given for Q.2(a) (e.g. 'waving palms' and 'throwing her crown into flames') did not suggest much grasp of the overall sense of the passage, and in Q.2(b) reading *iungis* as *iuvenis* meant that the significance of *tam cito* was frequently missed. In Q.2(c), while most appreciated that Martial was likening the manner of Scorpus' death to his career, fewer could describe precisely the correspondence between his speed in reaching the *meta* in the Circus (*properata brevisque*) and his premature arrival (*tam prope*) at the *meta* of his life, and some made the unwarranted assumption that Scorpus had actually died during a race.

Candidates were largely able to produce something relevant and well-documented for Q.6, and it was a pleasure for examiners to read so many essays that merited marks in the top band. As mentioned above, the main weakness – apart from any lack of familiarity with the texts and pictures – was the tendency to dwell too long on what was interesting in each separate example and, in doing so, to miss the opportunity to draw any link between it and the initial question. Thus, for too many, the question became 'what did Ovid/Pliny/Juvenal etc. think about a day at the races?' rather than using the texts and pictures as a basis to imagine what a **family** – parents, children, men, women, older people, teenagers, etc. – might have found enjoyable or unpleasant about it.

Theme B: *Youth and Education*

As with Theme A, candidates generally showed a good understanding of the majority of the texts but found the Virgil extract in Q.5 the most demanding. Responses to both Q.5(c) and Q.4(b) were often flawed by being based too much on English paraphrasing and, even where appropriate Latin was quoted, making no comment about any features of the style of writing.

Questions focusing on specific details of the Latin met with mixed results. Several, including the multiple-choice Q.1(c) and Q.5(d), were harder than they perhaps looked and depended on some careful working out of a complex sentence or phrase. Answers to Q.2(a) usually made one or two good points but rarely included enough of the possibilities available in these five lines. Success with Q.1(d) depended on (a) not – as many did – reading *vincimur* as active ('we usually surpass our parents'), and (b) interpreting this cryptic phrase in relation to what immediately follows (e.g. 'we are surpassed by our parents ... for while they are alive, we can never really match what they do for us').

It was evident that some had paid little attention during their course to either the pictures or the aspects of education specified for study. In Q.3(a) (the subjects taught by a *grammaticus*) and Q.3(c) (the picture of a wax tablet) and, above all, in what they found to say in their essay for Q.6, candidates' responses to the non-Latin material often gave the impression of relying more on intuition than on prior study. As mentioned above for Theme A candidates, responses to Q.6 often included impressive summaries of the content of individual texts or pictures but in the process tended to lose sight of the question posed. Those who had properly addressed the third bullet point in the specification were able to point to the appropriateness of a training in rhetoric for a limited range of upper-class careers – principally in law and politics, perhaps also officers in the army – but its almost total neglect of any skills or knowledge that, say, a tradesman or a legionary might require. Another fruitful line of discussion that some developed was, in more modern style, to speculate on what more general effect such an education might have had on the character, morals, self-confidence, sociability etc. of the young Roman. It was a mistake, however, to judge Roman education against the desiderata of the present day and therefore to write it off as a total waste of time. Horace, for one, completely disagreed and attributed his success in adult life to the education which his father went to some trouble to provide for him in the classy school of a *rhetor* in Rome.

Though success on all parts of the paper was achieved consistently by only a few, many more were able to score highly on at least some of the texts/sources studied. They are to be congratulated on meeting the challenge of studying material of such complexity and subtlety. Finally, two important points to note for the future.

The content of the two themes remains the same for 2019 and 2020. With effect from the 2019 paper, however, the pictures will appear in the Resource Booklet supplied with the question paper without any accompanying captions and without the heading containing the synopsis of the theme.

The themes for examination in 2021, 2022 and 2023 will be 'Travel by land and sea' and 'Superstition and magic'. The texts and pictures relating to these are in preparation and will appear on the Eduqas website shortly, together with supporting guidance for teachers.

LATIN

GCSE (NEW)

Summer 2018

COMPONENT 3A - LATIN LITERATURE (NARRATIVES)

General comments

There was an overwhelming preference for Section B: *Echo and Narcissus* over Section A: *Germanicus and Piso* but there were excellent answers in both sections and the examiners were pleased to see some thoughtful evaluation in the essays. Candidates should remember that the 12-mark essays are thematic in focus and do not need stylistic answers referring to word order, choice of vocabulary and reference to Latin. These essays are differentiated from the style questions by the need to select examples in English from the whole narrative with which to support the argument.

Section A: *Germanicus and Piso*

- Q.1 This was done well in almost all cases. Candidates were familiar with the text and able to give correct answers to all parts.
- Q.2 The same was true of 2(a) but in (b) there was a significant number of responses which did not pay attention to the lemma – *erit vobis ... leges* – answering that they should take revenge. It is very important that the boundaries of the lemma are taken into consideration as examiners are not able to award marks for responses outside these lines.
- Q.3 This was generally answered well.
- Q.4 This question was relating to part of the text that was in English and invited candidates to think about why Germanicus' body was displayed in the forum at Antioch. There were many who, correctly, commented that this was where he had died, but many took it further and made more perceptive comments. The second part was also well answered, demonstrating an understanding of Tacitus' method.
- Q.5 (a) (i) This question was variable in the accuracy of the answers. Most responses scored 2 marks but a relatively large number mistranslated the Latin of *sociam ... futuram esse*. Although there is no necessity to translate passages of the text in this component, it is important that candidates know exactly what the Latin means.
- (b) The style question caused rather more problems, though there were some good answers also. It is important to remember that the style questions need quotation of Latin and comment explaining why and how the particular words are relevant. It is being specific that gathers the marks. Candidates should read the questions carefully and underline the key words to ensure that their answers address the specific terms of the question.
- Q.6 There were some very pleasing essays here. Most candidates were able to find arguments to address the question and remembered to address both parts i.e. Piso **and** Plancina. There was a general belief that Piso and Plancina had been set up but that they were also culpable in their thoughtless behaviour following the death of Germanicus. The quality of the argument is key in these essays as is the ability to range across the whole text in search of supporting evidence.

Section B: *Echo and Narcissus*

- Q.1 This was answered well in the main but a reasonably large number of responses for (b) gave *loquenti* as the second example. As with Section A, this shows that candidates had not taken care with the boundaries of the lemma and so lost a mark.
- Q.2 (a) was generally done well.
- (b) the style question gave more problems as responses were often merely narrative and did not quote the Latin to support the comment. When dealing with style questions it is vital to support the answer with specific reference to the Latin as specified in the question. There was also a tendency to simply give a piece of information from the text and move on; it is important to link the Latin and the comment to the question to gain the full marks.
- Q.3 Both parts here were generally answered well but in (b) it was often the case that there was a vagueness around what actually happened and the specifics of it. (d) This was quite a difficult question but it was pleasing to see that many candidates were able to succeed at least partially. The best answers did not just focus in on the actual repetition of *probat/probatur* and *petit/petitur* but explained what the effect was. Perhaps it was an attempt to mirror or to emphasise that everything Narcissus said was relevant to himself as well. Some candidates realised that *accendit* and *ardet*, while not looking like repetition, were actually repetition of meaning. These were the answers that gained the most marks.
- Q.4 (a) Well answered.
- (b) As with the English passage in Section A, this had some good responses, some which simply retold the content of the passage but the better ones actually evaluated the examples and thought about them.
- Q.5 The 12-mark essay, as with the Section A essay, was designed to be thematic and it seemed that more people engaged with the content of this narrative than with the Germanicus and Piso option. The subject matter perhaps was more easily accessed by teenagers. There were some very good answers either saying that Echo was completely to blame for her fate or that she was simply unlucky; others believed that Narcissus was either completely to blame for his fate but that he deserved it or that he too was the target of fate. Ovid's myths still seem to speak to teenagers and it was pleasing to see the degree of engagement which the story had engendered. The responses often discussed psychological elements as well as looking at the actions of the characters which led to some interesting essays, particularly at the top end of the range.

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2018
COMPONENT 3B - ROMAN CIVILISATION

General comments

In this first season of the new GCSE Latin, examiners were pleased to note that the Roman Civilisation paper differentiated successfully, given that all the grades between 9 and 1 were represented. The paper offered some simple questions, for which a one-word answer was sufficient, and these were accessible to all candidates. Other questions required a more detailed answer and, as expected, the 12-mark essay question proved to be a good discriminator.

Given that this is a new qualification, it was surprising that some candidates did not seem to know some of the topics listed in the specification: this was particularly noticeable in answers to the pantomime/comedy question in Topic 1 and the questions about Isis and Mithras in Topic 2. The examiners would encourage teachers to make use of the resource booklets when preparing candidates for the examination and to refer to the relevant stages in the Cambridge Latin Course and/or other similar courses. All details of what candidates are expected to study are available on the Eduqas website.

Candidates should also take care to read the questions very carefully to ensure they are answering what is being asked, rather than reproducing a general description of, for example, a dinner party or the celebrations in honour of Isis in Alexandria. Knowledge and evaluation are assessed throughout the paper and although some candidates were able to give an abundance of factual information, not everyone scored highly for the AO3 marks.

A small number of candidates (often the weaker ones) attempted both topics but it was pleasing to note that there were very few illegible scripts: there were quite a number of candidates who submitted word-processed answers.

Candidates were asked to continue their work on pages 23/24 if necessary: many did not do so, preferring to use additional answer sheets randomly inserted into the main booklet. Candidates did not always make it clear that their answer was being continued elsewhere. Some included additional sheets which were then not used.

The vast majority of candidates chose to answer Topic 1: *Roman Entertainment and Leisure*, probably because this was the more familiar topic, especially if centres had previously entered candidates for the Level 1/2 qualifications.

Comments on individual questions

Topic 1: *Roman Entertainment and Leisure*

- Q.1 This was generally well done although a surprising number of candidates in 1(a) thought that the area in question was a swimming pool. Many candidates used (c) to write everything they knew (or thought they knew) about the baths rather than addressing the question and the relaxation element. Some used Latin terms although the spelling of the various rooms was frequently incorrect. Embarrassment about naked bathing cropped up frequently as a reason why the Romans would not have found the baths totally relaxing.
- Q.2 (a) was not particularly well done. Many candidates were unsure about the nature of a recitation. Common sense if nothing else usually resulted in full marks in question (b).
- Q.3 A number of candidates confused comedy and pantomime or talked about the modern version of the latter. Since the question asked '*Would you have preferred ...?*', it was essential to explain one's choice. In doing this, some gave simple answers along the lines of '*I would have preferred comedy because it was funny*': better candidates debated whether the similarities of the plots in comedy and use of stock characters made it more enjoyable, as they were familiar, or rather tedious.
- Q.4 Both parts were well done by most although the negative aspects of using animals in the arena sometimes came almost as an afterthought with an additional sentence at the end starting: '*However, ...*'
- Q.5 There was a great range of answers here. Some candidates only gave details of food that might have been eaten and entertainment on offer: others were able to write about networking, using the occasion for personal advancement, showing off wealth etc. and giving a fully detailed answer viewed from both the host's and the guests' perspective. There was a certain amount of overlapping information: at a simplistic level – '*The host proved free food and drink*' '*The guests were lucky as they got a free meal.*'

There seemed to be a number of previously prepared essays here which did not address the usefulness of dinner parties. Marks for AO2 tended to be higher than for AO3.

Topic 2: *Religion in the Roman World*

- Q.1 Most candidates were able to give three design features; some answers were very well explained. Many candidates scored full marks for (b) although one had the feeling that at times it was educated guesswork!
- Q.2 Mostly done well.
- Q.3 Disappointingly not very well done. (a) was often answered correctly but there were also stabs at possible reasons for the presence of the flute player: '*to calm down the animal*', '*to entertain the people*', '*to appease the gods*' (b) the most enjoyable feature seemed to be eating the meat of the sacrificed animal although few considered it to be a special occasion. Few achieved full marks. Answers to (c) showed that candidates either knew facts about the worship and cult of Isis or they didn't; there was a lot of waffle about the nature of Isis as a goddess (of almost everything). ISIS, in capital letters, appeared more than once.

- Q.4 This was another question which identified those who had any knowledge of Mithras worship and those who were somewhat confused. The majority said correctly that Mithras was killing the bull in the picture: some said that he was sacrificing it, others that he was riding it. (a)(ii) tended to bring out wrong answers such as '*it showed that he was brave.*' (b) was generally correct and (c) was reasonably well done.
- Q.5 There were some very good answers with candidates giving many details of public and private religion with most referring to *defixiones*, *haruspices* and augurs. Some had used the sources in the resource booklet and referred to these to support their arguments. Most candidates concluded that religion was important to the Romans in their daily lives.

There were others who focused too much on just a few aspects of religion. Some (rightly) mentioned the religious aspects of gladiator fights and chariot racing but then went completely off the point, writing about how much the Romans enjoyed these kinds of entertainment.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk