EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LEVEL 1 / LEVEL 2 CERTIFICATE IN LATIN

JANUARY 2020

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

CORE LANGUAGE

Level 1 Certificate

January 2020

9511

General Comments

Although this paper was taken by a much smaller cohort than previous years and all candidates demonstrated at least adequate knowledge of Latin, there was still a range of marks across the board. It was very encouraging to see that all candidates were able to follow the story line almost up to its conclusion; there was just a little confusion amongst weaker candidates as to how precisely the problem of Lucia's resistance to marriage was resolved. Knowledge of vocabulary was generally good; areas that provided the greatest challenge included sentences without a nominative, the comparative adjective, pronouns and distinguishing between singular and plural nouns.

Q.1 Universally correct

Q.2 Universally correct

Q.3 Universally correct

Q.4   **i**.   Most, but not all, recognized *taberna*. 'shop', 'inn' and 'tavern' were all accepted.~

       ii.   Some answered omitted *saepe*.

       iii.   Generally well done

Q.5 The common confusion between *tamen/tandem* again resurfaced in this translation, but most correctly translated it as 'however'. Possibly because the positive form of *divitior* was glossed, some candidates did not spot that this was a comparative. Only the best candidates placed *etiam* in its correct context, but so long as it was translated as 'even' credit was given as it is the first translation question of the paper. The irregular infinitive *esse* was dealt with well provided candidates did translate *volebat*, if not, it was rendered as a third person simple past form of 'to be'.

Q.6 Generally well done

Q.7   **i**.   Generally well done

       ii.   Some answers did not note that *maxima* is a superlative so dropped a mark, but otherwise this was well done.

       iii.   This was a good differentiator. A significant minority did not spot the plural ending of *credunt* and so mixed up the subject and object.

Q.8 This translation was well done. It was pleasing to see the imperative translated accurately in almost all the papers. However, several candidates did not look carefully at the second person ending for *debes* and so scored 3/4.

Q.9 i. Some candidates put all the required information in part (i) meaning they struggled to know what to write for part (ii). If this was the case, marks were transferred so they were not unfairly penalised. The majority of candidates knew *statim* and scored full marks.

ii. Candidates were required to translate the *que* for full credit here. 'The slave invited Marcus' family' therefore only scored 1/2.

Q.10 This translation was done well by the majority of candidates. It was encouraging to see the participle being translated accurately, although not all knew the meaning of *sedentem*. A small number confused the adjective *solam* with the noun *sol* (sun)*.*

Q.11 Those who did not score full marks confused the subject and object, scoring just 1/2.

Q.12 All candidates correctly identified A and D as correct answers. Those who did not score full marks on this question did not know the meaning of *nam* and chose E rather than F.

Q.13 This was a good differentiator. The adverb was not well done and only the best candidates recognised the meaning, tense and person of the verb *fecisti*. Another very common error was to confuse subject and object; 'Julia's daughter said' was the most common incorrect translation.

Q.14 Generally well done.

Q.15 i. This stumped many candidates; *taceo* has proven to be poorly known vocabulary in the past and this year was no exception. As with Q9 however, if they included detail required for part (ii) in part (i) their answer were credited.

ii. Most candidates received some credit for their answer and showed a good general understanding of this section of the passage. Only the best candidates were able to deal with the pronoun *ei*.

Q.16 Again, this translation question was a good discriminator. Over half the candidates translated *quis* as if it were neuter – 'What...?' The sentences without a nominative was also problematic for most candidates. Those who wrote 'The mother asked' scored 1/2.

Q.17 Generally well done. Candidates were required to give 'dinner/meal' for *cenam* and to spot that the preposition *in* was followed by the accusative and translate it as 'into' (not 'in' or 'to') in order to receive full credit. Most however did.#

Q.18 Quite well done. Just under half the candidates wrote 'friends of the sons and daughter' which was awarded 1/3.

Q.19 Both parts of this question were challenging to several candidates:

i. common errors were either to say that Quintus was unable to be pleased or that he was unable to please Lucius. If the latter error was made, any further reference to Lucius was considered a consequential error.

ii. Errors included; making *donum* plural, making the verbs passive so that Quintus was receiving the gifts and being praised, translating *laudabat* as 'laughing'. Only a tiny minority of candidates took this question as an invitation to offer their own opinion. However, students should be encouraged to look in the passage for the answers to all the questions.

Q.20 This was done well. The discriminating pair was C/D which tested candidates' ability to recognize the plural form of the imperative, which about a quarter of candidates failed to do.

Q.21 Although *ipsa* was glossed, some candidates translated it reflexively or as 'by herself' which, although not required at all to be fully credited, often then led to them misunderstanding the rest of the sentence.

Q.22 i. Very well done.

ii. Generally well done, but if the plural of *familias* was not given the maximum possible mark was 1/2.

Q.23 i. Although this participle generally caused more problems than *sedentem*, most candidates chose the correct answer.

ii. Generally well done, although not all included the detail 'also' (*quoque*).

Q.24 Only a small number of candidates incorrectly translated tradere as 'trade' but *eam* was a good discriminator. The question was generally translated well.

Q.25 The adverbs differentiated the best from the rest in this final question.

Conclusion

Candidates and teachers are to be congratulated; the overall standard was high and all candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of vocabulary, accidence and syntax and to follow the storyline to the end.

CORE LANGUAGE

Level 2 Certificate

January 2020

9521

General Comments

The entry was just nine, from three Centres, fewer than this time last year. These scripts were of vary varying standard, from sound through to excellent. Unusually, most candidates found Question 1 the hardest, while Questions 2 and 3 proved about equal in difficulty overall. Marks were lost for vocabulary deficiencies, although this was not exceptional. Prepositions and subordinate clauses also caused problems.

Comments on individual questions

Q.1 **(a)** Question 1 (a) was answered correctly by all candidates.

(b) This question caused difficulties for most: few saw that *multis* qualified *bellis*; also several translated *in bellis* as 'into war'.

(c) Both parts of Question 1 (c) were answered correctly.

(d) Most answered Question 1 (d) correctly, with just a couple choosing E instead of F.

(e) **(i)** In this question, all bar one gave correct answers.

(ii) This contained one major difficulty: *convocatas*, which no candidate grasped.

(iii) This question was generally answered correctly, the only uncertainty being who defeated whom.

(f) Few gained all three marks for Question 1 (f), because few recognised the indirect questions.

(g) **(i)** This was answered correctly.

(ii) Hardly anyone knew *coegit*.

(h) All correctly chose D.

(i) In Question 1 (i), it was often unclear who wanted to expel whom.

Q.2   *Agricola tres legiones itinere celeri in Caledoniam duxit.*

Most handled this well; the only significant problem was *celeri*: two did not know the meaning, while only one realised it was an adjective qualifying *itinere*. A couple could not handle the preposition *in*.

multas quoque naves trans mare misit, ut sibi cibum auxiliumque ferrent.

The weakest candidates made *multas* the subject, with or without *naves*. Only half handled *misit* correctly, with several giving wrong meanings, while others took it as passive. Only a minority handled the purpose clause correctly. Half did not recognise *sibi* as dative. Several misplaced *-que*, confusing the word order and structure. Several treated *auxilium* as a verb.

Caledonii, cum haec cognovissent, castra Romana oppugnare coeperunt.

One candidate translated *haec* as 'that', which is not acceptable. Two kept *castra* as plural. One or two failed to take *Romana* with *castra*. Several did not know *coeperunt*.

in castris milites Romani tam perterriti errant

Several separated *Romani* from *milites*. Few knew how to handle *tam*, even though all knew its basic meaning.

ut Agricolam orarent ut Caledoniam relinquerent.

Several made *Agricolam* the subject. Most failed to identify the result clause or, if they did, could not express it correctly. There was more success with the indirect command, but several did not know *relinquerent* and, more surprisingly, most could not handle the case or meaning of *Caledoniam*.

'nobis statim fugiendum est,' legato dixerunt.

Half recognised the gerundive of obligation, though one confused *nobis* with *non,* while another did not know *fugio*. The commonest error was in handling *legato dixerunt*, where most made *legato* the subject and *dixerunt* singular.

milites Romani, postquam maxima cum difficultate Caledonios castra oppugnantes superaverunt, fortiores erant.

Most correctly linked *Romani* with *milites* and made them the subject of at least one of the two verbs. Half failed to note the superlative, with a similar proportion missing the comparative. Several failed to make *difficultate* dependent on *cum*. Scarcely any could locate Caledonios within its syntactical context; several made them the object of *oppugnantes*; this participle was often converted into the noun 'attack', which lost the sense.

'nos' inquiunt 'omnes hostes vincere possumus. nemo nobis resistere potest.'

Only one candidate failed to handle this sentence successfully. Although *omnes* was intended to qualify *hostes*, those who took it with *nos* were not penalised. The main errors were with tenses and moods of the two verbs, *possumus* and *potest*.

hostes tamen, qui, ut putabant, non a melioribus militibus sed optima arte legati superabantur, iterum pugnare volebant.

'Which' is not acceptable for *qui* when referring to a person or people. None knew the meaning of *ut* with the indicative, and several did not know *putabant*. Although several translated *superabantur* correctly (while others made it active), only one saw that it governed both *non ... militibus* and *sed .. legati*. Half identified the comparative and made it agree with *militibus*. Most tried to make *optima arte legati* a single idea: 'a most skilful general' was the best of these.

interea parvus filius Agricolae periit;

Almost half the candidates translated this sentence correctly. Most did not know *interea*, and several did not know *periit*.

qui nec lacrimabat nec cum uxore manebat, sed ad hostes festinavit ut eos oppugnaret.

Only a couple grasped how to translate *qui* as a connecting relative ('who' was not accepted). Nearly all were familiar with *nec ... nec*. The rest was handled well.

Q.3 **(a)** **(i)** Answers varied from thirty to thirty million.

(ii) In (ii) most gave correct derivations; only one answered with a translation.

(b) **(i)** In Question 3 (b i) some did not understand *inter eos*, while two thought *primus* meant 'best'.

(ii) In this question most knew *pro.*

(c) Most chose correctly; a couple preferred C to D.

(d) **(i)** Most answered Question 3 (d i) correctly.

(ii) Most made *portus* singular.

(e) This was answered well, apart from a couple who confused *servare* with *servire*.

(f) **(i)** Almost all noted the superlative, but some confused *Britannorum* with *Britannia*.

(ii) All answered (ii) correctly.

(g) This was answered correctly.

(h) In (h), few gave completely correct answers; some treated *pugnare* as if it were another subjunctive parallel to *essent*; others did not know what to do with *omnibus viribus.*

(i) & (j)

Question 3 (i) was answered well, as was Question 3 (j), where only two gave wrong translations of *in*.

(k)   **(i)**   most noted the superlative.

          (ii)   In Question 3 (k ii), several did not know *quot*.

Conclusion

All candidates made a serious attempt at this paper, and all followed the storyline to the end.

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