



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

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

JANUARY 2016

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.

LATIN LANGUAGE

Level 1 Certificate

January 2016

UNIT 9511

Principal Examiner : LUCY WEEDEN

General Comments

The overall standard was good, with most candidates following the story line to the end. As is often the case, the translation questions provided the greatest challenge.

- Q.1 All answered this correctly.
- Q.2 Almost all answered this correctly.
- Q.3 Not all candidates knew *olim* or *domus*, often confusing the latter with *dominus*. *cena* was occasionally confused with *cibus*. While many candidates dealt with this question well, a number did not recognise *servis* as dative.
- Q.4 Part (i) was dealt with successfully by most.
Part (ii): some looked beyond the lemma provided and chose *pulchra* rather than *laudabat*. Those who chose the correct Latin word generally translated it accurately.
- Q.5 Few candidates were able to pick up on *quam*.
- Q.6 Part (i) was answered well but candidates repeated their answers to Q5 for part (ii) and did not look to the Latin provided within the lemma to reach the correct answer.
- Q.7 (i) Some did not know the question word *ubi*.
(ii) Well done, although some candidates translated the superlative as 'great' which was not credited.
(iii) Not all gave full details but levels of general comprehension were good.
- Q.8 Most answered this correctly. Some did not know the verb *festino* and chose 'B' for their answer.
- Q.9 A good discriminator. The comparative provided the greatest challenge to most candidates with only a small percentage of candidates achieving full marks. Several did not know *numquam*.
- Q.10 Generally well done.
- Q.11 Mostly well done. Not all managed *sedentem*.
- Q.12 The final choice of answers (G/H) was the best discriminator in this question, where it was important to recognise the nominative/accusative case endings.

- Q.13 (i) Generally well done.
- (ii) Only the best candidates recognised the negative imperative. Many translated *noli* as 'I do not want' and some simply ignored it.
- Q.14 (i) The superlative was the issue here. Most knew the meaning of *iratus*.
- (ii) Some candidates did not translate the preposition *in* closely enough to be awarded full marks. Likewise, those who did not acknowledge the prefix *re-* were not fully credited.
- (iii) Most candidates achieved some of the marks for this question. Not all knew *hodie*.
- Q.15 Another good discriminator. Less than 5% of candidates recognised that *filios* is plural. The tense of *fuera*t was also only accurately translated by the very best candidates. Although *curo* was glossed, several candidates failed to translate the tense of the verb correctly and several made its subject Lucio.
- Q.16 Generally well done.
- Q.17 Some candidates did not give a full enough answer to be awarded 4 marks. *omnia* was a good discriminator.
- Q.18 (i) Generally well done.
- (ii) This was the most challenging of the multiple-choice questions. B and D were popular incorrect answers.
- Q.19 Quite well done.
- Q.20 A common incorrect answer was *to go to the forum*. However, the majority of candidates did get this right. A pleasing number knew *aliquid*.
- Q.21 This was well done especially considering how far it is into the paper. Those who got part (ii) incorrect generally stated that Vitellius was the friend and had clearly become rather confused about the story line.
- Q.22 Candidates who translated *debeo* as 'I owe' were credited with one mark. Some candidates struggled with this sentence without a nominative.
- Q.23 The most common mistake in this question was to ignore *liberare* and simply translate the glossed *emere*.
- Q.24 (i and ii). Generally well done by candidates who had a good grasp of the story line. *intellexit* caused the biggest problem.
- Q.25 (i) Several candidates translated *plurimos* as 'all'. Another common error was not to recognise the plural form of *ancilla*.
- (ii) Some interesting answers! One or two candidates were rather cynical as to Lucio's motivation; most candidates offered sensible suggestions.

Conclusion

This paper allowed all candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding. It was very pleasing to see how many candidates were able to follow the story line successfully and produce accurate translations.

LATIN LANGUAGE

Level 2 Certificate

January 2016

UNIT 9521

Principal Examiner: ASHLEY CARTER

General Comments

Entry numbers have remained stable.

Generally the momentum test worked as planned, with each section proving more challenging than the one before it. Standards were very high, with very few candidates scoring below half marks and very many scoring in the high 90s. Only one or two candidates omitted questions, and very few gave alternative responses. It is worth reminding candidates that it is unwise practice to give alternatives, as, if one is right and one is wrong, no mark is awarded; this is true of both comprehension and translation sections.

- Q.1 (a) nearly half the candidates gave the correct answer: 'commander' or 'general; 'emperor', although usually accepted even in a wrong context (because knowledge of Roman history is not required), was not accepted here because the introduction clearly stated that Marius was a commander. It would have been unfair on those candidates who took the trouble to read the introduction to have allowed 'emperor' as well.
- (b) (i) this was always answered correctly.
(ii) most answered correctly; occasionally a word was omitted.
- (c) (i) this was well done.
(ii) only a few did not know *legiones*.
- (d) most answered correctly; the commonest error was the choice of E instead of F, indicating that quite a number of candidates could not distinguish between subject and object (this was also apparent in Q2).
- (e) (i) & (ii) virtually all candidates answered both parts correctly.
- (f) (i) all answered correctly.
(ii) most answered correctly; the few who didn't failed to make it clear which of the two commanders they were referring to (i.e. they omitted *ipse*).
- (g) (i) & (ii) nearly all candidates answered both parts correctly.
- (h) (i) most noted the comparative.
(ii) all gained the first mark (for stating that the citizens praised Sulla); a substantial number, however, did not make clear the contrast with Marius.

- Q.2 Most candidates followed the storyline quite closely. The first half was handled very well by the great majority of candidates, whereas the second half was fully accessible only to the strongest. As stated earlier, the distinction between the nominative and accusative cases was unclear to weaker and some stronger candidates.

nunc Sulla et Marius inimici erant. multi cives Sullae, multi Mario favebant.

The first half of this section was translated correctly by all candidates. The great majority grasped the parallel syntax of the two datives; only the weakest took *Sullae* to be genitive. A few candidates retained the oblique case endings.

in viis Romae cives pugnabant.

The first two words puzzled many candidates, for whom the usual rendering was simply 'in Rome'. *Romae* was intended to mean '(in the streets) of Rome, but the many who translated it as 'in Rome' or '(the citizens) of Rome' gained full credit for the word.

sed ubi hostes Romam oppugnaverunt,

The only troublesome word here was *Romam*, which many took to be genitive ('the enemies of Rome') or an adjective ('the Roman enemies').

necesse erat Sullae Marioque una urbem defendere.

Nearly all translated this sentence correctly.

ambo fortiter pugnauerunt; sed Marius, cum iam senex esset, festinare non poterat.

Nearly all handled the first clause correctly. In the second part, *cum* was frequently translated as 'when', which gives no sense in the context and gained no credit; candidates need to be made aware that the word can also mean 'since'. Many omitted *iam*.

itaque Sulla, non Marius, hostes vicit.

Nearly all translated this correctly.

Marius militibus suis persuadere coepit ut Sullam oppugnarent;

All but the strongest translated the first part as 'Marius persuaded his soldiers', and then had to invent something for *coepit*; this was perhaps the least well-known word in the passage. As always, there were many who misconstrued the indirect command as a purpose clause.

illi tamen, simulac Sullam conspexerunt, Marium reliquerunt et Sullam laete salutaverunt;

The opening pronoun defeated half the candidates. Nearly all knew *simulac*. Many made *Sullam* the subject of *conspexerunt*, and similarly *Marium* the subject of *reliquerunt*. Weaker candidates made *reliquerunt* intransitive ('Marius left and...'), thereby changing the meaning and losing the mark.

statim Sulla cum militibus Romam festinavit, ut Marium in urbem redeuntem caperent.

Most knew *statim*. Half the candidates were unfamiliar with the use of the accusative case of proper nouns to express goal of motion. Most identified the purpose clause. Half identified *redeuntem*, but often failed to make it agree; *caperent* was often unknown. A third of candidates rendered *in urbem* 'in the city', and another third as 'to the city'; neither received credit.

Marius, de vita desperans, fugit. Sulla milites misit ut eum quaererent atque occiderent.

Weaker candidates could make no sense of *de vita desperans*. Most identified the purpose clause.

ille miles tamen, qui Marium invenit, tam perterritus erat ut eum necare non posset.

Very few candidates gave the correct translation of *ille miles* ('the soldier' or 'that soldier'); most made the phrase plural (but were only penalised once for the continuing consequent number errors). *qui* was often 'when'. The rest was handled well.

ita Marius effugit.

'Therefore' and 'And so' were not acceptable for *ita*. Most distinguished correctly between *fugit* and *effugit*.

- Q.3
- (a) (i)-(iii) the only error here was the meaning and function of *aliud*.
 - (b) nearly all chose the correct three statements.
 - (c) all answered correctly.
 - (d) (i) nearly all correctly gave *iratus*.
(ii) only the strongest gained all four marks; many omitted *intellexit*; and equally many had to guess at *quot*.
(iii) most correctly gave C; the many who gave D clearly did not identify the cases.
 - (e) (i) weaker candidates made *nomina* or *inimicorum* (or both) singular.
(ii) *milis* was the problem word here, which very many could not distinguish from *milites* (very common was 'the citizens were being killed by many soldiers').
 - (f) this was answered well.
 - (g) (i) many candidates were unsure who wanted to kill whom.
(ii) only the strongest gained all three marks; many could not handle *quid*; others struggled with *facere*.

- (h) (i) candidates were asked to pick two of the three things that Sulla did; this degree of choice made it possible for most candidates to score 4 marks; the commonest errors were omission of *suam* and uncertainty over the meaning of *iter fecit*.
- (ii) most thought of a sensible response. Those that did not usually failed to make it clear that the citizens would not have expected a man so powerful to willingly give up his power. The purpose of this question was to test how much candidates had grasped the storyline in the third passage. It was very pleasing that so many did.

Conclusion

The errors that were remarked upon last year were less apparent this year. Vocabulary was mostly well known and (with the exception of *ille miles*) there were few mistakes of number.



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