



GCSE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LATIN

SUMMER 2022

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	5
Component 3A	8
Component 3B	12

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2022
COMPONENT 1

General Comments

The entry was slightly above that of the last full session, in 2019. The standard achieved by candidates was on the whole high, with relatively few falling below half-marks and most achieving marks in the 80s and 90s; there were on the other hand a number of very low-scoring scripts. Question 1 proved a little more challenging than usual, because of a couple of sub-questions that turned out to raise particular difficulties (see details below). Question 2 generated mostly good to excellent attempts at translation, often giving rise to marks proportionally higher than those for Question 1. Notable was the tendency to confuse Latin perfect and pluperfect tenses. Few candidates failed to score at least reasonable marks for Question 3, which contained many accessible sub-questions. Few candidates opted purely for Question 4, while a larger proportion infringed the rubric and attempted both Questions 4 and 5. In Question 4 the standard was very variable, from desperate attempts by candidates who had very little knowledge of vocabulary or grammar to perfect renderings. Question 5 showed up weaknesses in a high proportion of candidates' grasp of grammar.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 In (a) and (b) most answers were correct. In (c) the superlative was generally noted. (d) and (e) caused few problems. (f) was the first question to cause problems, as very many took *te* to be the subject. (g) generated only a small minority of correct answers, as few candidates realised that *pericula* was plural, while almost as many were unfamiliar with *maxima*. (h) also proved challenging, as very many took *solus* to refer to Ulysses rather than to Tiresias; similarly large numbers took *optimum* to be an adverb ('teach best'). Nearly all answered (i i) and (i iii) correctly, while vocabulary deficiencies caused many errors in (i ii).

Q.2 *Ulixes, cum verba dira deae audivisset, erat perterritus.*
Many weaker and middling candidates took *cum* to mean 'with'. Many did not know *dira. nemo enim ad inferos ibat nisi mortuus.*

Very many omitted *enim* or translated it wrongly. Similarly large numbers treated *ibat* as pluperfect.

deam rogavit quo modo inferos invenire posset.

Many weaker candidates made *deam* the subject. Others did not know *quo modo*. Few knew *invenire* ('go to' and 'enter' were the usual attempts).

'naviga ad Oceanum,' illa respondit. 'quaere flumen plenum flammaram.

Many omitted *ad*. Very many thought *illa* meant 'to him'. Vocabulary deficiencies were the main problems with the second half.

deinde e nave egressus, pete locum in quo tria flumina conveniunt.

Many able candidates lost a mark because they failed to handle the participle correctly; turning it into an imperative was fine, if they then inserted 'and' before the imperative *pete*; few did so; there was also widespread ignorance of the meaning of the verb. *Pete* was unknown to most, while *in* was often ignored. Many worked out the compound verb correctly, but most stumbled with it; clearly there is a need for practice handling compounds of this type, which are permitted by the specification.

ibi cibum manibus offerre debes.'

Many did not know *ibi*. *Debes* was frequently 'you owe', with 'food' as its object, instead of 'you ought'; consequently *offerre* became 'as an offering'.

Ulixes, postquam nautis nuntiavit quid dea iussisset, eis imperavit ut navem solverent.

This sentence caused much confusion, even to more able candidates. First of all, *nautis* and *navem* were very frequently confused. Secondly, Ulysses was often made the subject of *iussisset*. Thirdly, many could not cope with *eis*. Fourthly, few recognised the use of *ut* to express an indirect command ('so that' is not acceptable).

multos dies trans mare progressi sunt.

Few recognised the time phrase, and quite a few thought that *dies* meant 'gods'. Many made the verb singular.

ubi ignem ingentem conspexerunt, qui flumine ad mare portabatur, Ulixes navem nautasque reliquit.

Many were defeated by the meaning of *ignem* or *ingentem*, while many made the verb singular. The relative clause was too complex for the great majority of candidates, partly because they did not recognise the passive ending, and partly because many thought that *flumine* was governed by *ad* (in fact 'to the river from the sea' was quite common).

solus per terram sacram lente ambulavit, cibum portans.

This caused fewer problems than most sections. The main errors were omissions, of *solus*, *sacram* or *lente*.

tam perterritus erat ut vix oculos aperire posset. tandem ad tria flumina advenit.

Very few were familiar with the meaning or use of *tam*, and so of the following *ut*. Few knew *vix*. There were many lurid attempts at making sense of *oculos aperire posset*, with both verbs often unrecognised.

- Q.3**
- (a) Caused immediate problems, because so few recognised *posuit*. 'In the land' was not acceptable here, as it gave no appropriate sense.
 - (b) Caused more difficulties than usual with multiple choice questions, with many getting all three wrong. In (ii) pleasingly very few gave 'word' as the answer. There was a wide range of acceptable derivatives.
 - (c) In (c) 'huge' was not acceptable for *magna*. Most were defeated by either *circum eum* or the meaning of *apparuit*.

- (d) In (d i) B was a very popular but incorrect choice (instead of C), because few knew the meaning of *tot*. In (ii) many gave simply 'drive away' for *depellere*, without realising that the intransitive use meant something very different; this was largely because *eas* was either omitted deliberately, or simply not noticed.

There were two main errors in (e): many did not know *ceteras*, while equally many had Ulysses approaching Tiresias; again the pronoun was part at least of the cause of this second fault.

- (f) In (f) there were again many wrong choices. This was because the alternatives required candidates to analyse the complex Latin very carefully to work out exactly what was happening.
- (g) In (g) many strayed beyond the lemma to answer particularly the second part. This meant that many gave the same answers for (g) as for (h). In fact (ii) proved one of the most difficult questions in the paper, as, apart from the confusion mentioned above, very few noted the future tense or the plurality of *dei*, while many did not know the meaning of *iter*.
- (h) In (h i) many did not identify the superlative. In (ii) some made *oculum* plural, while many others did not know the meaning of *delevisti*.
- (i) In (i) many were confused by the fact that the Latin for (i) came after that for (ii). This led to nonsensical answers.

The main problems in (j) were the meaning of *comites* and the comparative ending.

- Q.4** (a) In (a) many wrongly assumed that the Latin for 'prepare' was *preparo*. Many failed to make *cena* accusative. There were a number of insertions of part of *esse*.
- (b) In (b) few made *perterritus* agree with *ancillam*.
- (c) In (c) few made *iratus* agree with *amici*, and many had to concoct a word based around *ir-*, because they did not know the actual word. 'Into the garden' was most often *in horto*.

Q.5 While many weaker candidates struggled with all of the questions, for the more able ones there were two questions that caused particular difficulty: (a) and (c).

- (a) In (a) many thought that the difference was one of case rather than number.
- (c) In (c) *cives* was by far the most popular choice, which indicates that these candidates did not succeed in establishing the full meaning of the short passage of Latin.

Summary of key points

It was clear that vocabulary was a major cause of loss of marks for all but the most able candidates. In the translation particularly, but also in the comprehension questions, it was also clear that pronouns and temporal and causal conjunctions were largely unknown. Also prepositions were a stumbling block for very many, including the basic *in*, *ad* and *ex*. Knowledge of indirect commands and result clauses was scant. In the English into Latin, agreement of adjective with noun was rarely accomplished or even attempted.

Despite all the above weaknesses, candidates on the whole showed an admirable level of knowledge, and Centres are to be congratulated on enabling their candidates to reach such heights of achievement despite the problems caused by the pandemic.

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2022
COMPONENT 2

General Comments

As with previous sets of material, there was quite a difference in the take-up for our two Themes – *Superstition and Magic* being by far the more popular choice. Examiners saw a similar range of quality, however, in work on both Themes. Only a small proportion of scripts did not show some evidence of lively engagement with the material, though some candidates struggled to score convincingly across the whole range. The time available seemed ample for most, and those who were assured enough to tackle the short-answer questions without much hesitation frequently had both time and the resources to produce a three or four-page essay at the end.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Each section contained questions which entailed searching within a portion of text for examples where the Latin style may be said to add something to the meaning. Candidates' responses to these 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. Line references must be observed precisely. As always, several candidates offered plausible suggestions relating to the wrong lines. Examiners are unable to reward answers, however worthy, which come from outside the parameters of the question.

It is clear that the composition of the 16-mark essays, like any other type of question, requires practice and it should not just be assumed that students will develop a suitable approach for themselves. The most successful responses came from those who adopted a clear line of argument from the start (sometimes working from a brief plan) and selected relevant evidence from a wide range, including both texts and pictures. Too many, however, seemed to ramble through the available material with no apparent rationale, describing individual examples, whether particularly useful or not, at length but neglecting to link these to the overarching question. Some offered no more than a catalogue of the minimum four items with one comment about each, ignoring opportunities to draw further relevant points from the same material. A few, bizarrely, tried to explore stylistic features in various Latin quotations, but the framing of these questions should make it obvious that this is not the place for that kind of response.

Theme A: *Travel by Land and Sea*

Most candidates showed a reasonable grasp of the range of material but there was often pronounced insecurity with one or more texts – most commonly the short but complex Juvenal passage used in Q4, which was occasionally omitted altogether. Q1b was often approached rather casually, sometimes including more than the stipulated two examples without explaining what made any of them (e.g. the comparison to a Bithynian king) ironic criticisms of Verres.

Responses to the pictures in Q2c-d were usually intelligent, though in (c) some failed to link the mule-cart with Martial and a few ideas for (d) – e.g. the number of spokes on the wheels, or the type of material used to make the rims – seemed to go well beyond what can actually be seen in the picture. In Q3a-b, many were perplexed by Horace's allusions to travellers 'with their cloaks hitched up higher than us' and 'declaring war on his stomach'. In Q3c (as in Q2b) there was a noticeable distinction between those who had had systematic practice in handling questions dealing with stylistic features and those who had not. It was especially pleasing to find many candidates sensitive to the striking contrast between the beautifully placid epic tone of the opening lines and the rough-and-tumble of the subsequent interchange between captain and crew, followed by the suggestion of Horace's irritation given by the repeated *dum* clauses.

As might be expected, responses to Q5 contained multiple references to the unpredictability of weather, storms and seasickness, as evidenced by Ovid, Seneca, etc. Perceptive observations were added by some about the size, capacity and means of propulsion of the vessels illustrated in Pictures 4–6, and from background knowledge – such as Rome's dependance on corn shipments via the port of Ostia and barges on the River Tiber. Some obvious points, however, were rarely considered (e.g. it's a long way round the empire by road, which is why a traveller like Pliny needed a combination of sea-going ships, smaller coastal boats, and finally carriages to reach Bithynia from Rome), and it was rare to find any attention given to what might be meant by 'efficient transport around the Roman world' as distinct from pleasant. As mentioned earlier under 'General advice', a frequent fault was to dwell in too much detail on each separate example and, in doing so, to fail to emphasise those aspects which were relevant to the overall question. There was also a regrettable tendency among candidates to keep trying to turn this question into a comparison between water and land transport – very likely an avenue rehearsed in class discussion. In some cases responses hardly featured anything at all about ships or boats! The majority of candidates, however, were able to produce something relevant and well-documented from a wide variety of material, and it was a pleasure for examiners to read many essays that merited marks in the top band.

Theme B: *Superstition and Magic*

Candidates generally seem to have been intrigued by the variety of superstitions and magic covered in the material for this Theme. As with Theme A, most showed a reasonable understanding of the texts, but also in some cases a reluctance to think about the significance of what the authors are saying beyond the words themselves.

Several questions on the texts were harder than they perhaps looked and depended on some careful working-out of a complex sentence or phrase. Answers to Q4b-c (a demanding, but vivid passage) were particularly impressive: Q2b, surprisingly, less so, with much confusion about whether it was Fannius or Pliny who felt pity or had the dream. In Q1, Martial's problems were usually well known, but answers to (c) tended to spot plausible features (the anaphora and tricolon in line 7 being the most popular) without properly explaining why they might be effective (e.g. what *in the Latin* makes the 'ultimatum' in line 8 either joking or threatening), and in (a)(ii) many offered explanations for the disappearance of Martial's wine which did not fit the overall context – such as that he had drunk it all himself. In Q3, almost everyone supplied more than enough information about Romulus and Remus to deserve full marks, apart from a small number who, bizarrely, focused instead on Picture 6 (Augustus as an augur), out of which they struggled to conjure an 'event' to suit the question. Q5, describing the circumstances of Caesar's murder, was clearly a very well-known passage and many grasped the opportunity to score full marks here.

Even so, there was also frequent carelessness – such as leaving out one or more details of the narrative in (b) or (c), and (especially common) quoting Spurrina's comment in lines 23-24 (outside the question) instead of his original warning (as recapitulated in line 22) that some harm would befall Caesar before the end of the Ides of March.

Those who had properly considered during their course both the pictures and the three aspects specified for study in the Specification found plenty of material to use for Q6. As mentioned earlier, the most frequent fault was to offer in-depth descriptions of individual texts or pictures but in the process to lose sight of the question posed. Another, all too common, was to target the extent to which Romans were serious about superstition and magic – a quite different question, and one which was actually set last year! The most successful candidates kept their mind on looking out for what was either 'complicated' or 'expensive' about Roman superstition and magic, and in some cases even tried to draw subtle distinctions between the two. Attention tended to concentrate on Martial, Pliny, tombs (with reference to Picture 1), sacrifices (Picture 3) and *defixiones* (Picture 2) – which were, oddly, said by some to be cheap to produce, by others complicated and expensive. Dido's spooky rite received less attention, but some spotted the relevance to the question of all that elaborate mumbo-jumbo. The many omens described in the Suetonius and Horace passages also featured more rarely than might have been expected, and there was a definite tendency to stick within the confines of the passages used in the question paper, rather than to find the most useful material in the whole corpus of material available.

Summary of key points

- The Specification for this component includes, besides the Latin passages, a number of illustrations and a list of aspects of the chosen theme with which candidates are expected to be familiar. 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 students can sort out for themselves.
- If candidates need extra space for any section, they should go first to the extra page(s) deliberately provided for that purpose at the back of the answer booklet, rather than using perhaps only a few lines of an inserted extra booklet. They are also advised to alert examiners to where they can find the rest of the answer – otherwise short additions are liable to escape notice altogether.
- Looking ahead, the Themes for examination in 2023 remain the same. For 2024, 2025 and 2026 the Themes will be 'Romans in the Countryside' and 'Love and Marriage.' The texts and pictures relating to these will appear on the Eduqas website shortly, together with the usual supporting guidance for teachers.

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2022
COMPONENT 3A

General Comments

After two years without formal examinations, it was always going to be challenging to get back into the groove but there were some engaging answers written on both topics and it was obvious that teachers and candidates had put in no small effort to learn the texts for this paper.

It is hoped that the Advance Information that was issued in February calmed some nerves on which passages had to be known in Latin.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Generally, the examiners found that candidates knew the passages well but that many of the errors resulted from not reading the question and answering from outside the lines given in the question. There were however instances where answers often seemed to be based on what the candidate could remember from the story rather than what was in the set lines. It is often a good idea to bracket the lines or highlight the lines from which the question is taken. Answers given from outside the lines prescribed in an individual question (the lemma) cannot be credited.

The 8-mark questions on content and style are often one of the greatest differentiators. Candidates referred to a wide range of literary devices, but they did not always explain how these devices affected the sense or the story.

The 12-mark essay produced some good answers, the best of which used a wide range of examples from the text and which provided the opportunity for greater analysis. Candidates who tried to include linguistic analysis in their essays tended to run out of time and restricted the degree to which they could come to a satisfactory conclusion. Candidates should remember that they do not have to be wholly on one side or the other of the question, as an understanding that essay questions are not necessarily binary often produces the best answers. It should also be noted that there is no need for every positive point to have a negative one also. Life and essays are not like that and there is no correct answer here, examiners are looking for quality of argument and a range of supporting evidence drawn from the text.

Section A – Tacitus, *Boudica*.

There was generally good knowledge shown of the text though there appeared to be confusion in some candidates about the episode on Anglesey which was considered to be part of Boudica's rebellion.

Q.1 Was based on events before the rebellion when Suetonius was campaigning in Mona (Anglesey). It was included as an example of how the Romans could be initially cowed by the Britons but, ultimately how their training won out. A number of candidates seemed to think that Boudica was present on Mona with the Druids and this misconception also presented challenges for the 12-mark essay.

The last line of passage B tells us that it was during this campaign that Suetonius was informed of the revolt by the Icenii and Trinobantes.

- Q.2** This was mostly answered well but when errors did occur it was usually because the answer was not taken from the lines given. For example, in (a) (iii) there were frequent references to the brutal treatment of Boudica and her daughters which was in the lines after the prescribed lines.

The style question is often the greatest differentiator. The rubric asks candidates to refer to content **and** features of the **Latin** and, as has been said in previous Examiner's Reports, if candidates answer with all content or all features of the Latin then they are restricted to 6 marks out of 8. The Latin is emboldened in the question to indicate that Latin must be quoted, a translation is helpful too. This year the examiners were seeing a greater number of partial Latin quotations such as *cesserant, rapiunt*. The point could be made about the juxtaposition or the promotion of *rapiunt* in its short clause but there was often no reference to what the Romans had reduced the Britons to, i.e. into, the status of a province, which was key given Prasutagus' will. There must be some indication that the candidate has understood the sentence being quoted. There are 8 marks available in this question which is a mark for a valid reference and a mark for a plausible explanation; this would mean four points and explanations. It is perfectly fine to make an extra point or even two, and they will be read.

- Q.3** In every paper there will be one 5-mark question based on one of the English sections. This question will take the form of comprehension (AO3) rather than knowledge (AO2), so questions will typically start with how, why, in what way, to prompt the candidate into explanations. In this passage candidates needed to search out and quote things that Suetonius said to encourage his troops, and this was mostly done well, though there was some confusion about why Suetonius mentioned glory in relation to the few. Candidates who did understand that the Romans were outnumbered and that this was a way of mitigating any nervousness, did well.

- Q.4** The 12-mark essay should range widely across the whole set text for the Section. This essay is thematic and is not designed to be answered with stylistic analysis, which is one of the reasons the rubric states 'support your answer by referring (in English) ...'. The essay is marked on a grid which can be found at the end of the mark scheme, and which gives indicators of bands of knowledge and interpretation. There is no set number of examples that must be given but to reach Band 2 it is suggested that at least four references to specific parts of/ incidents from the text are mentioned along with analysis which draws evidence from those examples. A list of events from the text will score more on AO2, but less on AO3 for example. This year, it felt that many candidates addressed the question clearly which was good to see as it allowed them to come to a conclusion that followed from the rest of the essay. The nature of the questions in these essays is often to have a firm statement to which the candidate is asked to respond. There is no necessity to agree or disagree entirely with the statement, very often a position part-way along the line between agreement and disagreement is the best place and candidates who acknowledge this tend to produce the best essays.

Section B – Ovid , *Ceyx and Alcyone*

Candidates generally responded well to this text and seemed to enjoy in particular the account of the storm.

- Q.1** These questions were based on passage A in which Alcyone reacts to the news that her husband, Ceyx, is going on a sea voyage. The initial questions were generally well done. This is a well-known passage that has been on examination prescriptions before and there is a lot to say about it. The multiple-choice translation question seemed to cause a few problems. The case of *absens* is the giveaway here as it relates to the speaker, Alcyone. The options in this question are often very close to the correct Latin translation with only differences of tense, voice or case, so candidates need to be alert.
- Q.2** The style question in (b) was a differentiator. Several candidates got carried away writing about battering rams and lions, which were not in the lines set for this question, so sadly marks could not be awarded. Again, it is good practice to bracket or highlight the lines from which the response should be taken before the candidate starts answering. As with the equivalent question in Section A, the question requires **both** content **and** features of the Latin, and an answer that gives only content or features will be restricted to 6 marks. Latin should be quoted and preferably translated or, at least, it should be shown that that candidate understands the meaning. It was noticeable this year that there were more answers solely in English and that often a candidate would comment on the number of words meaning dark but did not quote the Latin or quoted only one. It should also be noted that if a candidate is discussing the juxtaposition of words that those words should be close together rather than several lines apart. There are 8 marks available in this question which usually works out to a mark for a valid reference and a mark for a plausible explanation; this would mean four points and explanations. It is perfectly fine to give an extra or even two, and they will be read.
- Q.3** In every paper there will be one 5-mark question based on one of the English sections. This question will take the form of understanding and interpretation (AO3) rather than knowledge (AO2), so questions will typically start with how, why, in what way to prompt the candidate into explanations. In this passage candidates were asked to explain how Ovid showed the emotions felt by the sailors **and** Ceyx. There were some good answers here, with the majority of candidates giving examples of the sailors' behaviour and which emotion they showed, and doing the same for Ceyx. It is worth making the point to students that if there is a '**both ... and ...**' then reference must be made to both.
- Q.4** The first question required the candidates to understand the symbolism of the *sceptra* and the *fragmina* – which was mostly well done with some very pleasing interpretations, and the second was to come up with a plausible reason for Ovid's exclamation '*heu! frustra!*' There were some pleasing answers here too. Ceyx's two wishes were generally well answered and also the final question which required candidates to not only understand Ceyx's predicament but to understand the Latin and particularly *quotiens*.

Q.5 The 12-mark essay was asking candidates to assess the quality of Ovid's story-telling technique by looking at how he engaged his audience. The emotional story of Ceyx and Alcyone is the main focus perhaps, but many candidates made excellent arguments for the dramatic description of the storm. As discussed above there is no necessity or candidates to be wholly on one side or the other, a more sophisticated stance is often part-way between. The key however is for the line of argument to be supported by a range of evidence drawn from the text.

Summary of key points

- As always there are general comments to make about both options which relate to reading the questions carefully and where there is a section of text given in the question it is vital that candidates confine their answers to those lines. Likewise in the 12-mark essay, the best answers were those that ranged widely across the texts using the passages that are in Latin and those in English.
- Use of a technical term is not necessary to gain marks, it is the selection of the Latin and the understanding shown of the effect that is the key. It should also be noted that not all examples of alliteration are a style point, sometimes those are just the letters the words start with.
- The best approach to the 5-mark questions is to locate five relevant, short quotes or close paraphrases from the passage given, to quote them and to give a brief explanation of how each answers the question. There is no need for linguistic analysis as this is a translation but there may be some need of interpretation.

LATIN
GCSE (NEW)
Summer 2022
COMPONENT 3B

General Comments

Having returned to the first 'normal' examination season since 2019, there was some uncertainty as to how candidates would fare after two years of disruption to teaching and preparation. It was very pleasing, therefore, to see some excellent scripts and individual answers where candidates had clearly engaged with the material and (presumably) enjoyed their study of Roman Civilisation. Because of the exceptional circumstances, centres had been given additional information to help candidates focus on specific areas of study and this had clearly helped teachers and candidates in their preparation. There were, however, some scripts which reflected scant knowledge of the prescribed material and the marks were accordingly very low.

As expected, the vast majority of candidates chose to answer Topic 3: Daily Life in a Roman Town. This seems to be the more familiar topic, especially if centres had previously entered candidates for the Level 1/2 qualifications. Examiners were pleased to note that the Roman Civilisation paper again differentiated successfully, and all the grades between 9 and 1 were represented. As previously, some questions only required a one-word answer, whereas others needed a more detailed response, particularly the 12-mark essay question in both topics which proved to be an excellent discriminator.

As in previous years, there were a couple of areas of study about which a number of candidates seemed uncertain. This was particularly noticeable in the question about the laundry in Topic 3 and the *principia* in Topic 4. It is hard to know if this is a result of curtailed teaching time or some other reason but it was disappointing that some candidates had not made use of the additional information on which both these areas were clearly outlined. Examiners would also urge teachers to make use of the resource booklets available on the Eduqas website when preparing candidates for the examination and to refer to the relevant stages in the Cambridge Latin Course and/or other similar courses. Candidates should also take care to read the questions very carefully to ensure they are answering what is being asked (see the comments on individual questions below), rather than reproducing a pre-prepared answer on something related but not quite the same.

Virtually no candidates attempted both topics and there were very few illegible scripts. However, if candidates run out of space, they should always make it clear that their answer is being continued elsewhere and label additional material accordingly. This was not always the case and resulted in some detective work on the part of examiners.

Candidates submitting word-processed answers seem to be increasing and although most of these were easy to follow, one or two had very closely-typed answers which made annotation by examiners difficult.

From the evidence in the scripts, candidates had had sufficient time to complete the examination paper.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Topic 3 – Daily Life in a Roman Town

- Q.1**
- (a) Most achieved three marks although a number referred to flowers and shrubs.
 - (b) Shade and relaxation were the most popular answers here, although some had allotments.
 - (c) Virtually all candidates knew the household shrine: some referred to statues or paintings of gods which were accepted as alternative answers.
 - (d) This was surprisingly challenging for some candidates, given that a Roman house is such a familiar topic. Some repeated answers already given in parts (b) and (c) (often verbatim) but a number treated this as a comparison between living in a house and an *insula* which was not the question being asked. These candidates usually picked up one or two marks on the way but rarely the full four marks on offer.
- Q.2**
- (a) Was done well with an impressive number of candidates knowing both *salutatio* and *sportula*.
 - (b) This question turned out to be a good discriminator. Quite a few candidates got clients and patrons the wrong way round and some saw this as an opportunity to describe how bad an enslaved person's life had been before he/she was set free. Again, these gave the impression of a slightly different pre-prepared answer.
- Q.3**
- (a)(b) Were usually answered well although virtually the only response in (b) was 'urine'.
 - (c) Proved more of a challenge. 'Smelly' was a frequent observation, usually backed up with a link to the urine used in the cleaning process and although some knew it would be hard work, they were often at a loss as to what the hard work actually entailed. The better candidates mentioned the treading pools, the weight of wet clothes and the health issues raised by having skin exposed to urine and other cleaning substances.
Some candidates made no attempt to answer any of question 3.
- Q.4** Generally answered well. 'Socialising' was a popular response, as always.
- Q.5** There was a real mixture of responses here, some very impressive responses citing a wide range of detail on both forum and non-forum facilities. Perhaps understandably, most answers concentrated entirely on the forum in Pompeii but there were occasional references to different fora, to the Circus Maximus and to the Senate House. There was a lot of confusion as to what was actually in the forum with quite a few mentioning the baths, laundries, thermopolia and even the amphitheatre as being located there.

Most candidates described the opportunities for food shopping, temples, the lawcourt and socialising. Many referred to the baths as being an amenity outside the forum but seemed to know nothing else that was found elsewhere. These answers then led to a long description of what would happen in the baths/palaestra which was irrelevant to this particular question. Worryingly, a number of candidates did not know what a forum was, some describing the facilities found in a town house.

Topic 4 - Roman Britain

- Q.1** (a) This was generally well done.
(b) There was some confusion between the *principia* with the *praetorium*. 'It was very big' was often the only response given in answer to the question of why the *principia* would have impressed visitors.
(c) 'Baths' was cited by virtually all candidates. One or two mentioned gambling in the barrack blocks.
(d) Reasonably well done although there were some fanciful claims for the presence of the river ('Roman soldiers under attack could escape down the river' was given by one candidate). The more mundane answer would be that the river afforded extra protection on two sides.
- Q.2** (a) This was done well with the vast majority of candidates identifying the spring.
(b) Most mentioned the hot water supply but some could not come up with another plausible reason.
(c) Well done.
(d) Weaker candidates ignored 'a sense of amazement and wonder' in the question and described Roman baths in general, mostly with no evaluation. However, there were also some excellent responses.
- Q.3** (a) (i) Answered well.
(ii) Virtually all candidates achieved at least two marks here but some went on to repeat the same answer using slightly different words, usually in relation to the Britons being enslaved.
(b) Not well done. The idea of Cogidubnus allowing the Romans to stay in his palace appeared several times in different guises.
- Q.4** The most common answer was the straightness of the roads but some could not say why that was a good thing. Highwaymen appeared as a problem on several scripts and the ubiquitous dishonest innkeepers, thieves and prostitutes.
- Q.5** As intended, this question proved to be an excellent discriminator. Unfortunately, there were some candidates who clearly knew a lot about the country villa itself with its many rooms, mosaics, bath houses etc., but who dealt with the luxury and comfort side in a single sentence, concentrating only on the lives of the enslaved people who managed them. Such responses limited the A02 marks to those in band B. However, there were also some very sound answers which covered both aspects of the question in detail with excellent evaluation. Overall, most candidates who answered this question achieved marks somewhere in the middle, either because of limited knowledge of the topic or lack of evaluation.

Summary of key points

- These topics will again be set in 2023.
- From 2024, the topics will be *Roman Family Life* and *The City of Rome*. Resources for both these topics will be on the EDUQAS website.



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