



---

# **EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**LEVEL 1 AND LEVEL 2 CERTIFICATES IN  
LATIN LANGUAGE AND LATIN LANGUAGE &  
ROMAN CIVILISATION**

**SUMMER 2017**

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.

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9511	1
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9521	3
Roman Civilisation Level 1 – Unit 9512	6
Roman Civilisation Level 2 – Unit 9522	10
Roman Civilisation Levels 1 & 2 – Units 9513 & 9523	13
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9514	15
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9524	18

## LEVEL 1 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2017

UNIT 9511

### General Comments

Standards were generally high this year. There were few problems with the multiple-choice questions, which appear to have been more straightforward than those in last year's paper. As in previous years, it was the translation questions that provided the main discriminator.

### Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 all answered this correctly.
- Q.2 this was the only translation question that caused no difficulties.
- Q.3 the first part was nearly always answered correctly; in (ii) the only frequent error was the omission of a reference to *tibi*.
- Q.4 the correct choices were always made.
- Q.5 a large number of candidates at first tried to find the answer outside the lemma, before reverting to the lemma for a correct response. Some omitted to mention Statius' dash through the house.
- Q.6 this translation question provided the greatest single loss of marks for the unwary. Many failed to note the pluperfect tenses. Equally many had, illogically, Statius left behind by his wife, sons and slaves; these candidates lost all the marks for the nouns, as they were all in the wrong case.
- Q.7 all three parts were answered correctly.
- Q.8 this was answered correctly by all.
- Q.9 all correctly chose C.
- Q.10 most gave full answers; a few omitted to mention the slaves.
- Q.11 (i) the only error here was the occasional omission of *quoque*.  
(ii) all correctly identified and translated *perterritus*.
- Q.12 nearly all thought of a sensible reason for Statius' visit.
- Q.13 most correctly rendered *Statius ad urbem iter fecit*; his reason for doing so proved rather more problematic, with many stumbling over *nullae aliae villae*.
- Q.14 all answered correctly.
- Q.15 all chose correctly.

- Q.16 over half the candidates were unfamiliar with *num*.
- Q.17 the first part was generally answered correctly. In (ii), many omitted *nostra*. All chose correctly for (iii).
- Q.18 unfamiliarity with *noli* caused many to lose the first two marks; also many did not recognise the imperative *veni*.
- Q.19 the only error here was the choice of F instead of E, revealing uncertainty over case endings and unfamiliarity with the pronoun *eos*.
- Q.20 many candidates, including some of the top scorers, chose the wife as the answer here instead of Statius himself. This again reveals a widespread inability to see that *uxorem* is accusative. In (ii) some weaker candidates failed to see that *vos* is plural.
- Q.21 (i) most answered correctly.
- (ii) many omitted the superlative; very many took *multas* to agree with the more remote *piratae* instead of the adjacent *villas*.
- Q.22 (i) many did not know the meaning of *petebant*.
- (ii) 'to the city' (a very frequent response) was not accepted for *in urbem*.
- (iii) most answered correctly.
- Q.23 weaker candidates failed to note the comparative.

### **Conclusion**

There were fewer vocabulary problems this year. There was evidence, however, of some difficulty in recognising accusative cases.

## LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2017

UNIT 9521

### General Comments

This paper was again challenging for candidates. Marks ranged from low double figures to the high nineties. For very many candidates it was the translation that proved the greatest hurdle, with many unable to reach halfmarks. On the other hand there were enough straightforward questions in the third section to enable the weakest candidates to score a reasonable number of marks. The candidates from some Centres were unable to identify any constructions; others could not handle any pronouns; others again were unfamiliar with key verbs such as *volo* and *possum*.

### Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 (a) some thought Atalanta was the daughter of a queen (which may have been true, but it is not what the Latin says).
- (b) (i) many omitted the superlative.  
(ii) many omitted *multi*.
- (c) most answered correctly; some however got the answers the wrong way round, in defiance of logic.
- (d) the great majority correctly chose B and D.
- (e) (i) many did not know *legere*, but were often able to gain one mark by paraphrasing, such as 'not to get married'.  
(ii) most did not know *melius*, but many were able to gain the other two marks.
- (f) most chose correctly.
- (g) only the weakest candidates failed to gain both marks.
- (h) (i) very few candidates knew *minime*.  
(ii) weaker candidates were content with 'win a race', which gained one mark.

Q.2 *iam Atalanta maritum habere nolebat. consilium dirum igitur cepit:*

Many were unfamiliar with *nolebat* and *maritum*. Often *igitur* was the only familiar vocabulary in the second part.

*se offerebat illi iuveni qui eam vincere potuit;*

The reflexive pronoun *se* was unknown to the great majority of candidates. Most ignored *illi*. Many thought *iuveni* was plural. Many did not know *potuit*, and most omitted *eam*.

*mortem tamen promisit omnibus iuvenibus quos ipsa superavit.*

The only unknown vocabulary here was *ipsa*. However, only the strongest candidates could handle the structure of the sentence. A particular difficulty was *quos*, which was rarely construed correctly.

*quamquam nemo umquam antea Atalantam superaverat,*

Most knew *quamquam*; however *umquam* and *antea* were widely unknown.

*plurimi iuvenes adeo eam amabant ut contendere vellent;*

Omission of the superlative was the norm rather than the exception. Very few knew *adeo* or recognised the result clause.

*milites iuvenes superatos gladiis necabant.*

Many handled the participle well, including many weaker candidates. Some however took *milites iuvenes* together: 'the young soldiers'.

*omnes igitur, amore atque ab Atalanta victi, perierunt.*

Most took *omnes* correctly with *perierunt*. The words in parenthesis however defeated the great majority.

*cives, ubi certamina spectabant, semper tristes erant.*

Very many translated *ubi* as 'who'. Very few recognised the plural *certamina*.

*tandem alius iuvenis, Hippomenes nomine, ad urbem Atalantae venit.*

Very few knew *alius*. Many confused *tandem* with *tamen*.

*cum nesciret quid accideret, aliquem rogavit, 'quid spectatis?'*

Many translated *accideret* as if pluperfect.

*'illi iuvenes,' respondit, 'quos milites ad mortem abducunt,*

Most ignored *illi*. Again *quos* was not recognised by very many; as a result there were many attempts to turn the sentence into the passive, some successfully with the agent correctly expressed. Few noted the prefix in the compound verb *abducunt*.

*volebant Atalantam in matrimonium ducere. illa eos certamine facile vicit.'*

Most made good sense of the first part. However the two pronouns *illa* and *eos* defeated the majority. Many failed to note the ablative case.

*Hippomenes intellegere non potuit cur iuvenes uxorem per tanta pericula peterent.*

Most began well (if they knew *potuit*); few however took *uxorem* as the object of *peterent* (and many did not know the meaning of this verb). Few recognised the plural *pericula*.

- Q.3
- (a) (i) most answered correctly.  
(ii) most handled the detail well and gained all five marks.
  - (b) many did not know *constituit*.
  - (c) there were many wrong choices here.
  - (d) most answered both parts correctly; the many who included the answer to (ii) in (i) were given credit for both. Weaker candidates thought *primus ei placebat* meant that Hippomenes was in first place!
  - (e) most chose correctly.
  - (f) (i) vocabulary weakness was the main cause of loss of marks here.  
(ii) most correctly gave 'sad', though some guessed the opposite.
  - (g) both parts were answered correctly by the great majority of candidates.
  - (h) (i) most correctly chose A, E and F.  
(ii) most gave acceptable derivations. The two frequent words that were not accepted were 'peddle' and 'paediatrics' (or similar). There were many misspellings; provided it was clear that a correct word was intended, the mark was given.
  - (i) (i) many did not know *celer*.  
(ii) the many who wrote 'Hippomenes was left' or 'Hippomenes was abandoned' gained no credit, as the sense was either incomplete or wrong.
  - (j) most correctly chose D.
  - (k) all three parts were answered correctly by the great majority.
  - (l) most answered correctly. Weaker candidates were content with either 'he won a race' or 'he married her'.

## Conclusion

The paper differentiated very effectively, generating a wide spread of marks.

## LEVEL 1 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2017

### UNIT 9512

#### General Comments

Candidates achieved once again a high standard of performance and there were very few poor scripts and virtually no rubric errors. As in previous years, Topic 1: *Daily Life in Roman Society* was much more popular than Topic 2: *Roman Britain* but there were some very good answers on both topics.

It was clear that most candidates had studied the source material, on which the questions in Section A are based. However, not all appeared to know the extra information given in bullet points which accompanies each source.

Although there were some excellent detailed answers in Section B in both topics, some candidates did not resist the temptation to write down everything they knew about the subject, whether it was relevant or not. Weaker candidates' answers were often very good pieces of creative writing but lacking in detail and because of this, evaluation was rather sparse.

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

##### Section A

- Q.1 (a) This was generally well answered although the vague 'socialising' appeared quite a few times.
- (b), (c) and (d) were all well done.
- Q.2 (a) A surprising number of candidates got this wrong.
- (b) This was not answered well, either. A significant number gave answers based on their own lives (getting up, dressed, having breakfast) and some mentioned clients meeting clients.
- (c) Most managed to get one mark here but there were any number of other suggestions ranging from going to the Circus Maximus to reading Cicero's speeches. There were references in the poem to a siesta, the *palaestra*, dinner and entertainment, all of which would have gained a mark. The vague 'socialising' appeared again.
- Q.3 The whole of this question scored highly.
- (a), (b) and (c) were very well done.
- (d) Some candidates missed the word 'skilled' in the question and included shopping and cleaning.



Q.4 (a) Not everyone referred to features shown in the picture or picked up the word 'pleasant'. Others did not give a reason for their choice. Consequently, this question was not answered as well as expected. Many mentioned the forum being only for pedestrians, which is not clear from the picture, and others said it was a good place for socialising, without giving any further details.

(b) and (c) were answered well.

## Section B

Q.5 This was a very popular choice, perhaps because of the likeable character, Grumio, in the *Cambridge Latin Course*. Candidates wrote with great enthusiasm if not complete accuracy – in many accounts, Roman kitchens were huge and well-equipped with ovens and every mod con. Evaluation in many cases was limited to the fear that the cook would be beaten if his master did not like the food. Some candidates went into great detail about the different courses, the chance for the cook to show his skill, the way the food was prepared and cooked, and the limitations of working in such a small kitchen. As often, some candidates included a lot of irrelevant material such as a description of the beautiful mosaics in the dining room and the arrangement of the couches. One candidate expressed relief that the house had a *vomitorium* just in case the guests wanted to eat more of his exquisite food.

Q.6 Another popular choice: some candidates knew a lot about the different stages of schooling and gave detailed accounts of the school day, what a boy would learn and how this would benefit him in later life. Students often included the Latin terms *ludi magister*, *grammaticus* and *rhetor*. Many voiced the concerns that a parent might have and these were excellent answers. At the other end of the scale were those who were answering a different question from the one set and these had too many references to modern schools with interactive whiteboards and exercise books. English cropped up several times as a useful language for a Roman boy to learn, as did Business Studies.

Q.7 This was probably the least popular question, but those who chose it coped reasonably well and mentioned the slogans on the wall, the whitened toga and the promises for the future. There was little about bribery and corruption or the fact that the candidate might renege on his promises once he was elected. Some took the bullet point 'How your candidate spends his day' as an opportunity to give a very detailed account of a visit to the baths, complete with a massage.

Q.8 This was, on the whole, the least well answered question although it was a popular choice. Too many candidates wrote at great length about nothing in particular and there were many inaccuracies – rich women scrubbing the fine mosaic floors and doing all the shopping (although a number of answers said that women were not allowed to go out without their husband). Some did mention supporting their husbands by talking to guests at dinner parties but many candidates' support was limited to always dressing up in fine clothes and jewellery so their husbands were proud of them. Others took the chance to rant against a system where a girl could be married at 13 and have no say in the matter. Several expressed a fear of their husbands rejecting them and throwing them out on the streets.

## Topic 2: Roman Britain

### Section A

- Q.1 (a) and (b) were answered well.
- (c) Not everyone based their points on the passage, mentioning instead Boudica's ginger hair and the way she dressed.
- (d) This was well answered. Most gained two marks.
- Q.2 (a) There were varied responses to this question although a good number gained full marks.
- (b) Virtually everyone ticked the correct answer.
- (c) This was surprisingly tricky for some who seemed to assume that the examiner would know that Neptune and Minerva were Roman gods so didn't have to make that clear. There was a variety of opinions and explanations: many took the view that as Cogidubnus was pro-Roman, he would readily worship their gods even though he was British.
- Q.3 (a) This was well done. A few mixed up A and B.
- (b) Some did not focus on bathing at Aquae Sulis but wrote about going to the baths in general. Consequently, there were incorrect answers such as exercising and having a massage.
- (c) Most knew about the entrails but few achieved both marks. One candidate wrote of the soothsayer 'He studied the sooths'.
- Q.4 (a) Agricola's position included Caesar, king and the vague 'leader'.
- (b) This question was very challenging. Some candidates clearly did not understand the passage although it is one of the sources or were unable to phrase an answer appropriately.
- (c) Most knew that Tacitus and Agricola were related although others cited Roman solidarity.

## Section B

None of these questions proved to be more popular than the rest and the standard of the responses in each one was varied.

- Q.5 This was probably the least well answered as there was quite a lot of confusion over what work was done by the bailiff and by the other slaves. Most knew the bailiff was in charge of the farm when the master was away and that the other slaves might resent him but answers often lacked specific detail.
- Q.6 Many candidates seemed to have prepared this topic very well so were able to write detailed accounts of the routes chosen and the actual construction of roads. Some included diagrams. The better ones incorporated the challenges as they went along, mentioning the need to build bridges if the land was marshy and the need for cambering and ditches to prevent the roads flooding. A few, surprisingly, ignored the difference the roads would make to Britain and one candidate relocated his building career to Italy, writing about the building of the Appian Way.
- Q.7 The standard of the answers to this question varied considerably. Some wrote about a Roman town house so had problems addressing the geography of the area except that their villa needed to be near the shops and the baths. Of those who wrote about country villas, most mentioned building near a water source and on raised land to prevent flooding: they also needed land for crops and animals but few mentioned pens or barns for storage. A number of candidates did not focus on the 'ideal site' but described in detail the features of the villa itself with fine dining rooms, mosaics and several suites of baths. Descriptions seemed to have been based on Chedworth.
- Q.8 Candidates who chose this essay seemed to write everything they knew about Fishbourne with little or no reference to its suitability as a home or the concerns a local leader might have. Obviously, many had visited the site and wanted to show off their knowledge. Many of the accounts were sufficiently detailed to score well but lack of evaluation meant they could not achieve the highest marks. No one commented on the palace being too big to be a family home: one or two thought that other Britons might be resentful and even attack the palace.

## Conclusion

The answers showed a strong personal response and there were some lively and imaginative accounts of life in the ancient Roman world. Candidates displayed good knowledge of most of the material covered in both topics and had clearly enjoyed studying them.

## LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2017

UNIT 9522

### General Comments

The good standard achieved this summer was once again extremely pleasing. Candidates generally knew the subject matter well and many used primary source material effectively, making reference to inscriptions, to Roman buildings in Britain and to Latin writers such as Horace and Tacitus.

The topics again were 'Daily Life in Roman Society and Roman Britain. As has been the case in the past, *Daily Life in Roman Society*' was the more popular but there were some excellent answers to both topics.

There were very few rubric infringements this year, which was pleasing, and in general candidates' work was very well presented. In some cases however, presentation and spelling still caused problems for the examiners and candidates should be reminded that they will lose marks if their writing is illegible. Latin terms were on the whole spelled correctly which is commendable.

In both topics, the longer questions which required evaluation provided the differentiation between the weaker and best candidates. Candidates should also read the question carefully to ensure they do not write an answer on a slightly different topic (for example, how enjoyable school was for a Roman pupil rather than simply what he learned).

### Topic 1: Daily life in Roman Society

- Q.1 (a) and (b) were done well. Most mentioned the small, high-up windows and the *atrium*.
- (c) This was well done by those who focused on the design of the house as required by the question. Most of these concluded that people today would like the Roman house, apart from the unattractive appearance from the front. Too many, however, spent a lot of time describing the dining arrangements with couches for reclining, the use of slaves and lack of electricity. A few described what they liked about their modern houses in too much detail.
- Q.2 (a) Most gained at least one mark. Many described the slave as shaking hands with someone which is not correct.
- (b) Well answered.
- (c) Well done.
- (d) Some ignored 'outside a town' and mentioned cooking, cleaning etc. There was quite a lot of overlapping of answers – 'looking after cows', 'looking after sheep' – but many candidates scored full marks.
- (e) Very well done. Being able to marry and own property were the most popular answers.

- Q.3 (a) Surprisingly, this was not particularly well done. Most mentioned the cooking pots. Many referred to coal as a fuel and that bread could be baked at home in an oven.
- (b) A huge variety of answers for this question, from midday to late evening or even 'dinner time'.
- (c) Candidates knew a lot about dinner parties and virtually all mentioned the couches, entertainment and the different courses. Many ignored the influence of the host completely but the better ones wrote about him providing cushions, making everyone feel welcome by not serving inferior wine to some guests and ensuring there was interesting conversation. On the downside, candidates realised that not everyone might like the entertainment and that was beyond the control of a host.
- Q.4 (a) 'Made of wax' was a popular (and incorrect) answer. Some seemed to think their answers had to come from the passage and gave 'carried by great big boys' and 'dangled from the left shoulder' as answers.
- (b) Most knew public speaking and debating skills.
- (c) Many candidates achieved high marks here but a significant number seemed to ignore the requirements of the question and wrote everything they knew about Roman schools (sometimes not very much) or another question completely, the differences between Roman and modern schools. Many wrote at length but failed to address the question of enjoyment. A significant number mentioned that girls didn't go to school but learned household skills from their mothers. Some thought pupils would enjoy the study of Latin and Greek – and English! Most knew about the *paedagogus* and the strict teachers.
- Q.5 (a) (i) and (ii) were not well done.
- (b) There were some very lengthy answers here but very few mentioned what was available elsewhere. The answer for most became a description of the forum in Pompeii with very little evaluation of how necessary it was to visit. Virtually everyone mentioned the temples, shops and noticeboard. Others included the baths (sometimes with far too much detail about the bathing process) and election-related activities. A few thought that the theatre and amphitheatre were in the forum and that all the shops were there, too.

## Topic 2: Roman Britain

- Q.1 (a) Most achieved at least one mark although there were some wild guesses, such as the two daughters would outnumber the emperor and girls make better rulers.
- (b) Most made at least some attempt at evaluation here, mentioning the sack of Colchester and London and the killing of many Romans as successes for Boudica but her eventual suicide as the ultimate failure.

- Q.2 (a) and (b) were generally well answered although some put Sulis Minerva for both.
- (c) This was not particularly well done. There were some candidates who went into great detail about the whole bathing process in general but very little reference to the baths in Aquae Sulis or the town's other facilities. Many ignored the 'completely enjoyable' element of the question and produced purely descriptive answers. Better answers included the disappointment of not being healed, sacrifices (both positive and negative points) and the opportunity to curse an enemy.
- Q.3 (a) Done well.
- (b) Most achieved at least one mark, usually mentioning that Cogidubnus was made a Roman citizen.
- (c) Again, candidates tended to write down everything they knew about the palace without reference to the skill of the craftsmen. A number simply ended their answer with a variation of 'This shows that the craftsmen were very good' without linking skill to a particular feature. Most cited the mosaics, sometimes mentioning the Cupid mosaic in particular, the plasterwork and the gardens but for some, there was very little else.
- Q.4 (a) Not well done. Most felt slaves were badly treated but gave no details from the passage.
- (b) Most did well here.
- (c) The most popular answers were anti-flooding measures and access to markets. Some more fanciful suggestions included high land to be able to spot enemies or wild animals approaching and considering building a villa in Spain because the weather was better. In spite of the question, some mentioned a well or spring.
- Q.5 (a) This was not answered well. Some candidates may have been put off by the format of the question but if they made valid points in a different way, they were given credit.
- (b) There was a real mixture of responses here. Some were very good but quite a number did not mention the downside to Roman occupation so were unable to access the top mark (these candidates, however, often gave poor answers anyway). Most mentioned roads, trade and amenities of some sort (usually villas and public baths) but there was a lot of stuff that was just wrong, including a common currency, everyone speaking Latin and Britons enjoying Roman-style dinner parties after a visit to the baths. Of the negative points, taxes were most often mentioned along with Roman brutality, though not always specific. The better candidates made a good attempt at evaluation, concluding that for most people, life didn't change much at all.

## Conclusion

The enjoyment and enthusiasm of many students were evident, especially in the longer questions where there was plenty of factual knowledge with strong personal response. Most candidates have been well-prepared for the examination and know what is required when answering a question.

## LEVEL 1 & LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2017

### UNITS 9513 & 9523

#### General Comments

The overall standard of the work submitted for both Level 1 and Level 2 was very pleasing. Some candidates had used the suggested titles from the WJEC website but others had chosen to do assessments on some very different topics, with varying success. Many had very clearly enjoyed researching their chosen titles with most making good use of primary source material.

However, some centres had not submitted their proposed titles in advance to WJEC for approval. This should have been done by 31<sup>st</sup> October last year. A number of candidates were disadvantaged by tackling topics which were not suitable, either because they were not sufficiently focused or because they lacked scope for proper evaluation.

In a number of centres, several candidates chose identical titles for their assessments, some using exactly the same resources and source material. WJEC recommends that not more than two or three candidates should attempt the same title so centres should vary future titles as much as possible to avoid this overlap.

Candidates included such varied topics as the extent to which Roman women had any freedom, the importance of body image in Roman times compared to today and the similarities between Roman and modern entertainment. Although many of these accounts were well-argued, some were less convincing. In some cases, candidates seemed to have taken an aspect of modern life which particularly interested them, such as video gaming or fashion, and tried to link it to the Roman world. Candidates should be commended for trying to do something different but it still needs to be appropriate to the task. In examples such as these mentioned, there was often insufficient relevant evidence from the Roman world to produce a sound conclusion.

When writing about Roman and modern society, candidates need to remember to give roughly equal weight to both parts of the comparison in order to gain good marks for evaluation. Several assessments dealt with attitudes to slavery, for example, where the focus tended to be on modern issues such as trafficking which has been much in our news. The more successful comparisons concentrated on features of Roman and modern life such as gladiator fights versus wrestling/boxing or the lives led by Roman and modern women.

Most candidates submitted a single A4 sheet containing their source material, notes and an essay plan but these varied in quality. Some included a very good range of primary sources, both literary and visual, and referred to these throughout their assessments. However, a few candidates either did not give a full list of sources or, where they gave a list, they failed to attribute quotations to the author. Bibliographies were often not included.

Centres should be reminded that the A4 sheet is the only resource candidates should have with them when they are writing their assignment. They should not have access to the internet or any storage facility: some assignments made detailed reference to sources which did not appear on their A4 sheet or wrote in a style which suggested that other materials were being used.

Teachers can view exemplar material of Roman Civilisation Controlled Assessment, including a good A4 sheet, on the WJEC secure website.

Most scripts were word-processed and well presented: one or two handwritten assessments were untidy and difficult to read. It always helps the moderation process if scripts are clearly presented. It is also appreciated when candidates observe and record the recommended word count for each level. One or two essays were far too long – and some Level 2 scripts contained fewer than 1000 words. Candidates do not need to write out lengthy quotations in their assignments if these appear on the A4 sheet and are clearly labelled. This wastes valuable time.

Candidates should also be reminded to keep to the title they have chosen for their work. Quite a number of candidates had chosen a specific topic but then saw it as an opportunity to write everything they knew about the subject. An example would be an assessment about the slaves who worked in the public baths, resulting in a list of the work all slaves did and the rights they had if they were set free. Other candidates chose to write about the merits or otherwise of life in the Roman army but spent much of their time describing the weapons in great detail - for example, the clever construction of the *pilum*.

## **Conclusion**

The vast majority of teachers wrote helpful supporting comments on their candidates' work, based on the assessment criteria, and they generally placed candidates in the correct rank order. Marks for factual knowledge and personal response were mostly allocated from the correct band. However, some teachers were too generous when awarding marks for the selection and use of primary sources (AC3). In some cases, candidates had included only secondary sources but were still awarded high marks.

To gain marks in the top band for AC3 a candidate should include a good selection of appropriate primary sources on the A4 sheet and make reference to all of these in the essay. Ideally these sheets should contain both pictures and quotations.

The teacher's final comments and marks should always be in ink and, if any changes have been made to the latter, these should be clearly indicated on the front cover and the addition carefully checked. Annotation on the scripts was generally excellent and this made the moderation process very straightforward and was much appreciated.

The controlled assessment gives candidates a chance to write in detail about a topic which interests them and there were many strong personal responses to the issues raised by the subject matter. It remains a valuable opportunity for students to develop their skills in this area and should encourage centres to enter candidates for Controlled Assessment in Roman Civilisation in the future should they wish to do so.



## LEVEL 1 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2017

### UNIT 9514

#### General Comments

In line with previous years, the standard was very high. Nearly all candidates were able to follow the storyline through to the end. Some individual words or phrases caused difficulty but more widespread was the inability to choose the correct meaning of a word within the context of this story (e.g. *ubi / debeo / facio*). A few candidates were reluctant to translate the Latin into a normal English word order; however, provided the sense was still correct, this was not penalised.

#### Comments on individual sections

*Marcus erat filius Gaii. Marcus in taberna patris laborabat.*

Although most candidates translated this well, a few did not change the ending of *Gaii* to *Gaius* which was not accepted. Some confused 'father' with 'brother'. A small number of candidates translated this and the following section into the present tense, but then shifted back into the past, correctly identifying the imperfect and perfect *numeravit* and *poterat* in section 3.

*laetus erat quod multi cives et servi tabernam visitabant et cibum consumebant.*

Generally well done. A few translated this in the present (see note above), but otherwise vocabulary did not present any difficulties. It was good to see almost all candidates translating *cibum* as 'food' and not 'dinner'.

*ubi pecuniam numeravit, aliquid intellegere non poterat.*

'Where' was not accepted for *ubi*, but otherwise the subordinate clause was well done. Most answers understood the gist of the main clause, but answers such as 'something was not right' were not close enough to be fully credited.

*quamquam multam pecuniam acceperat, duos denarios solos habuit!*

*solos* proved very problematic to many candidates. 'Solo' was not accepted as a translation, but the meaning of a word is only penalised once. Many candidates changed the whole sentence, making the coins the plural subject of the sentence, which was more heavily penalised.

*'quid facere debeo?' Marcus uxorem rogavit. 'num fur in urbe habitat?'*

There were several tricky words here; 'to make' was not accepted for *facere* and 'owe' was not the correct meaning in this context for *debeo*. *num*, as ever, was also a discriminator.

*'servis credere non potes.' illa respondit.*

Vocabulary was well known here; some however either made the slaves the subject of the sentence or did not recognise the ending of *potes* and translated it as a first person verb.

*omnes servos, qui tabernam intrant, inspicere debes.'*

Again, the second person ending (*debes*) was often confused with the first person. However, most candidates translated the meaning of the word correctly here. It was pleasing to see how many candidates were unfazed by the lack of a nominative, although several made the whole sentence passive, which was accepted provided the agent ('you') was supplied.

*postridie Marcus omnes servos e taberna discedentes inspexit.*

*discedentes* was a discriminator both for its meaning (many rendered it as 'entering') and for the present participle. Several different translations were acceptable but those who wrote 'who left' did not convey the simultaneous nature of the action and were thus not fully credited.

*nullum furem invenit sed postquam omnes exierunt, solus erat unus denarius!*

Here the lack of nominative at the beginning of the sentence did prove problematic for some. *solus* again was often incorrectly translated, but if it was made to agree with *unus denarius* an incorrect meaning was not penalised for a second time.

*tabernarius iam iratissimus erat.*

Very well done. Almost all recognised the superlative and knew the meaning of *iratus*. Some omitted *iam*.

*subito Marcus civem Romanum, qui tabernam saepe visitabat, e taberna festinantem conspexit.*

The subordinate clause couched in the middle of the main clause was a good discriminator. Some translated *conspexit* twice although this was not penalised. Others could not identify the correct antecedent for *qui*, making Marcus the subject of the relative. The preposition (as in section 8) was ignored by many who translated *e taberna* as 'into the inn'. However, the present participle was generally translated more accurately this time.

*'huc veni! noli fugere! tu es fur!' Marcus clamavit. homo tamen in viam celeriter cucurrit.*

A few candidates did not recognise the first imperative ('Over here' was not credited), but more struggled with the prohibition. The meaning of *fugere* was occasionally incorrectly given as 'to escape'. The rest of the sentence was generally well done; *tamen* was correctly translated by most candidates although some ignored it. Candidates were required to recognise the accusative ending of *viam* – it was felt that 'in the street' did not adequately convey the meaning of *in* followed by the accusative. Some made *viam* plural.

*difficile erat tabernario eum capere, quod multi cives in viis urbis erant.*

This was generally well done; only a few confused *tabernario* and *eum*. Most recognised that *viis* was plural this time.

*sed quinque amici Marci furem quoque petebant.*

A number of candidates either mistranslated *quinque* or completely ignored it. Those who did not translate it at all often fell into the trap of translating *amici* as singular. Most recognised the genitive *Marci*.

*tandem amici furem ceperunt et iudici eum tradiderunt.*

*tandem*, as is often the case, was confused with *tamen* by some, although a good number did translate it correctly. *amici* continued to be translated as a singular noun if this mistake was made in section 14. It was pleasing to see most candidates give a good translation for *trado* but some made the judge the subject of this verb.

*iudex amicos fortes laudavit furemque ad carcerem misit.*

As in previous sections, a number of candidates still did not recognise or ignored the plural ending of *amicos*. *-que* was also a good discriminator as several candidates did not place 'and' in the correct place within their English sentence.

## **Conclusion**

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the high standard achieved.

## LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2017

UNIT 9524

### General Comments

This examination produced a very wide range of marks, but with a pleasing proportion in the high 40s. Marks were rather better on average for the comprehension than for the translation. Vocabulary was a major issue for many candidates; also very problematic were ablatives absolute and indirect statements.

### Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 (a) since misspellings were allowed for Argos, nearly all candidates scored both marks.
- (b) almost all answered correctly.
- (c) most correctly chose B, D and E, but there were many who scored two and a few who gained only one mark. The most popular incorrect choices were A and F.
- (d) marking for this 8-mark question was generous, in that ten points were identified, and candidates could earn full marks for any eight. This meant that only the very weakest failed to gain at least half of the marks, while very many scored all 8 despite making errors.
- (e) nearly all gained the mark for 'the god returned'; most gained the credit for 'gave a message'; but many omitted 'to him' or 'the same' or both.

Q.2 *deus Myscelo promisit etiam maiores poenas.*

Most began well, though a surprisingly large number (including strong candidates) failed to change the dative ending on the name. Only half the candidates knew *etiam* (both 'also' and 'even' were accepted). Very few recognised *maiores*, though many realised it was a comparative; 'worse', 'better' and 'more' were more frequent than 'greater'. Only a very small percentage noted that *poenas* was plural.

*hic tam perterritus fuit ut postridie omnes suas res in navem ponere coepisset.*

A small minority took *hic* to mean 'he'; the rest translated it as 'here', 'in this' or similar. 'This made him so terrified' was by far the commonest rendering of the first four words, gaining four of the six marks. Fewer than half identified the result clause (many took *ut* to be a misprint for *et*). Because of the unusual nature of the verb, both 'he began' and 'he had begun' were accepted for *coepisset*; this enabled most candidates to gain full marks for the second half of the sentence.

*cives tamen quidam, qui Myscelum navem ingredientem conspexerant,*

Very few knew *quidam*. Most failed to note the pluperfect tense. The participle was handled well.

*eum raptum ad iudices traxerunt.*

Most coped well with the participle and the pronoun.

*Myscelus, cum se defendere non posset, ad\_mortem damnatus est.*

This proved the most straightforward sentence in the translation. The only frequent error was treating *damnatus est* as pluperfect. For once *se* did not create havoc.

*statim, manibus ad\_caelum sublatis, Herculem oravit ut se adiuveret.*

Few handled the ablative absolute correctly (i.e. by leaving it literal or converting it into a subordinate clause); very many ignored the standard meaning 'hand' for *manus* and introduced bands of men, which somehow had to come down from the sky; very many did not know *sublatis*. Many made *Herculem* the subject of *oravit*, while *adiuveret* was regularly confused with *audiret*.

*subito iudices putaverunt se vocem dei audire,*

Many did not know *putaverunt*. Very few recognised the indirect statement, while *se* reverted to normal and caused mayhem.

*quae eis persuasit ut Myscelum liberarent.*

Many took the antecedent of *quae* to be *dei*. The rest was done well.

*hic magno gaudio gratias deo egit.*

As in the second section, *hic* caused many problems. Few understood the force of the ablative phrase. On the other hand, the phrase *gratias agere* was well known.

*deinde, omnibus civibus spectantibus, Myscelus e portu solus profectus est.*

Few handled the ablative absolute correctly (see note above). Very many took *e portu* to mean 'to the harbour', while others confused *portu* with *porta*. Many omitted *solus*.

*paucis diebus ad\_Italiam tutus pervenit.*

About half handled the time phrase correctly; some treated it as expressing duration of time; most however did not identify it as a time phrase at all. Many did not know *tutus* and simply omitted it.

*ibi locum ad novam urbem aedificandam quaesivit.*

Very many failed to link *locum* to *quaesivit*. Few identified the gerundive of purpose. As many took *novam* with *locum* as with *urbem*.

*primum in\_urbe aedificium erat templum Herculis.*

Many candidates treated *aedificium* as a verb ('he first built...'). Most however translated this sentence correctly.

## Conclusion

Centres are once again to be congratulated on the high level of attainment.

Level 1 and 2 Certificate is in Latin Language and Latin Language and Roman Civilisation Examiners Report Summer 2017/LG



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