



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 1 / LEVEL 2 CERTIFICATE IN
LATIN**

SUMMER 2019

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.

Unit	Page
9511	1
9512	5
9513	8
9514	10
9521	12
9522	16
9523	18
9524	20

LATIN
Level 1 Certificate in Latin
Summer 2019
9511 – CORE LANGUAGE

General Comments

This proved to be a challenging paper with plenty of scope to discriminate between candidates. However, most were able to follow the story line to the end even if there were areas of confusion part way through. Candidates should be encouraged to find their answers only from the Latin quoted in the lemma. Once again this year, some candidates lost marks because they were not looking at the correct part of the passage or did not refer to the passage at all and instead gave their own opinion. Two words that were commonly confused in this story were *domus/dominus*. Prepositions were also an area of weakness; more precise translation of these will lead to achieving higher marks.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** All answered this correctly.
- Q.2** Almost all answered this correctly.
- Q.3**
- i. Generally well done although some candidates mistook Macro for the master and vice versa, which did not necessarily affect their ability to answer this question, but often impacted on part ii.
 - ii. This is the first example of candidates seemingly giving their own opinion and revealed some misconceptions about slavery. For example, the idea that Severus was afraid that he would not find another job was relatively common. Several candidates who had looked at the Latin in the lemma, thought *omnia* agreed with *servus* and did not spot that *officia* was plural.
- Q.4** Errors included confusion between *cibus/cena*, giving singular rather than plural nouns, and making *magnas* superlative (or translating this as ‘huge’ which was not accepted).
- Q.5** Many candidates found this translation quite challenging. Despite being helped with *vis* with the *tu*, several candidates started ‘If I...’ and as *si* was glossed, this did not carry a mark. *habere* was often omitted entirely. ‘You owe’ was not accepted for *debes* in this context.
- Q.6** This was quite well done. Some candidates omitted ‘from the house’ and others made *hominem* plural.
- Q.7**
- i. The question word *quid* was not known by all. ‘Who are you?’ was the most common incorrect answer.
 - ii. Quite well done. Candidates seem to have dealt with this prohibition more successfully than in previous years.

- Q.8** Confusion between *festino/curro*, the number of *viam* and the preposition all caused difficulty to many candidates.
- Q.9** i. and ii.
- Both parts of this question caused difficulty to many candidates. A large number of answers to part ii were the opinions of the candidates and did not pick up on the clue in *sed* to answer the question why Macro's lack of fear might be surprising and instead gave their own opinions without looking at the Latin. Those who did look at the Latin, often did not translate *cives* correctly (civilians/people was not accepted). Others did not spot that *viis* was plural.
- Q.10** This was not done well in general.
statim was often either ignored or confused with *sto, stare*
hominem was often made the subject of an active sentence.
celeriter was sometimes translated as a verb (he ran etc) or as a comparative adverb.
 The meaning of *petivit* was not widely known.
- Q.11** i. As *saccus* was glossed, candidates were required to show an understanding that the bag belonged to the man; there was money in a bag received 1/2.
- ii. This was generally well done.
- Q.12** This was generally well done. The incorrect answer given tended to be 'A'.
- Q.13** This was not particularly well done. Again, the reason for this was sometimes because candidates read beyond the lemma and gave 'two young men' as their answer.
- Q.14** Generally well done. 'E' was an occasional incorrect choice.
- Q.15** i. Most candidates knew *sedebat*, but *solus* was sometimes confused with *sol* and once again, the number of *via* was a good discriminator.
- ii. Some candidates did not spot the neuter plural ending of *vulnera* and if so, omitted *multa* but most understood that the son had been wounded.
- iii. This was a good discriminator. A common incorrect answer was *portavit, he carried* and a number of candidates who correctly identified *lente* as the word describing how he went home did not give the correct meaning.
- Q.16** This was not done particularly well. The question word *quid* was widely mistranslated. Again, 'owe' was not credited for *debeo* in this context and was a common error. However, those who attempted to translate *facere* generally did choose the correct meaning in the context (do). The pronoun *eam* was only correctly translated by the very best candidates. It was often either omitted or made nominative. Therefore 'she asked' was credited for *rogavit* as a consequential error.
- Q.17** i. No mark was allocated to *nonne*, but some candidates mistook this for a negative and wrote that Macro said he was not brave, which was not credited. The superlative was required for the glossed *fidelissimus*.
- ii. This was generally well done.

- Q.18** There were 7 possible points to make for 5 marks which allowed candidates to achieve a good mark on this question even if their answer was incomplete or not fully accurate. Despite similar sentences occurring in past papers, the comparative was a very good discriminator. Candidates should be advised that ‘as good as’ is not a correct rendering of the comparative *melior*. *habuit* was commonly confused with *habitavit*. *numquam* was often ignored or translated as a simple negative.
- Q.19** Another good discriminator. *subito* was not well known. *audiverunt* was sometimes translated as a pluperfect or as a singular verb if *hominem* had been mistranslated as a nominative noun. The meaning of *clamantem* was generally known, but not all candidates recognised it as a participle. However, it was given credit if it was translated as a participle and object of *audiverunt* even if it did not agree with the man.
- Q.20** This question simply tested the word *ingentem* as *ignem* was glossed. However, many candidates translated *ingens* as ‘big’ and then in question 21, *magnae* as ‘huge’ or ‘very big’.
- Q.21** See above for *magnae*. Candidates were able to paraphrase the Latin and still get full credit but *partibus* did not seem to be known by many candidates
- Q.22** As is often the case, many candidates did not recognise the vocative noun. This often led to a mistranslation of *es* which was frequently rendered as ‘is he’.
- Q.23** This seemed to be the most challenging multiple-choice question, which tested *num* and the ability to recognise an accusative ending on *ancillam*.
- Q.24** Many candidates were able to identify the fact that Macro had much water with him (*multa aqua*) but most lacked precision when dealing with the preposition *ad*.
- Q.25** *quaero* has been identified as a word that candidates have struggled with in the past and this year was no exception.
- Q.26** At this late stage in the paper, candidates were required to give a close translation of the word *traxit*. ‘take / lead / get’ were all considered too vague to be credited.
- Q.27** Only the very best candidates were able to translate this perfectly, although translations which gave an identical meaning without following the same structure were credited fully.
- Q.28** Many candidates did not appear to look at the Latin in the lemma for this question and gave a general answer stating that Macro saved him.
- Q.29**
- i. *ridebat* was not widely known, often being confused with *redeo*.
 - ii. Some acknowledgement of the verb *vivebat* was required: ‘Macro saved him’ was considered to be an obvious statement from the general story rather than a response from the lemma. ‘Macro saved his life’ was allowed.
 - iii. This was done well by candidates who had followed the story line right to the end.

Summary of key points

This paper worked well to discriminate between candidates, particularly with the translation questions and those questions that demanded a knowledge of noun endings or prepositions. It was pleasing to see that most papers showed a good understanding of the general storyline and the majority of candidates attempted every question and were thus able to demonstrate their knowledge of the accidence and syntax required at this level.

LATIN
Level 1 Certificate in Latin
Summer 2019
9512 ROMAN CIVILISATION

General Comments

As in previous years, Topic 3, The Roman Army proved to be much less popular than Topic 4, Entertainment and Leisure. However, there were a number of poor scripts in both options which is disappointing given that these are familiar topics and the areas of study are clearly set out in the specification. Even better candidates often failed to achieve high marks in section B, the mini essays. There were, however, very few rubric errors which is pleasing.

In Section A in both topics, there were some good answers although one or two ignored the wording to some of the questions (see details below). As has happened previously, in Section B, some succumbed to the temptation to write down everything they knew about the subject without reference to the title of the question or need for evaluation. Examiners found this very frustrating as teachers no doubt tell their students what is expected in these extended answers. Those who read the question carefully and answered in detail were able to gain high marks.

Comments on individual questions/sections

TOPIC 3: THE ROMAN ARMY

Section A:

- Q.1** There was confusion as to whether the wooden sword was lighter or heavier than the real thing but most were able to answer the other parts of the question correctly. However, “spear” was not allowed in (d).
- Q.2** Generally well answered apart from (d) where many candidates did not pay attention to the wording of section and gave answers which referred to duties **outside** the fortress. Most achieved at least two correct answers for (e) but occasionally candidates thought that money might have been deducted as a punishment for bad behaviour or used to bribe senior officers.
- Q.3** Many candidates ignored the introduction which told them that the picture was of a barrack block; the number of soldiers living there ranged from 50 to thousands. (b) was generally well done and most people got at least 1 mark for (c) although few gave the status of the centurion and optio as being a reason why they had superior accommodation.
- Q.4** Virtually everyone recognised Rufus Sita as a cavalryman – but there were few correct spellings. Candidates didn’t always seem to use logic when tackling the length of service and age at death questions. Answers to (c) were good although a description simply saying “I would describe Rufus Sita as a cavalryman because he’s riding a horse” received no marks! Some ignored the reference to an auxiliary soldier in part (d) and cited money and/or a plot of land as a reward on retirement.

Section B:

From the very small number of candidates who chose to do Topic 3, questions 5 & 6 were the most popular choices (there were not many takers for 7). The overall standard was disappointing with many candidates failing to get half marks for this section. In spite of the bullet points which are designed to guide the candidate, some ignored these completely and focused on a phrase in the question, such as “legionary fortress” or “centurion”: they then wrote down as many facts as they could about these aspects. Unfortunately, some were not accurate and many were irrelevant. Evaluation in these answers was either minimal or completely missing.

TOPIC 4: ENTERTAINMENT AND LEISURE

Section A:

- Q.1** Overall well done. “Socialising”, a perennial answer to all aspects of entertainment and leisure, appeared in most answers but candidates presented a good range of the noises which were not appreciated by Seneca. (c) found candidates giving all the details of a visit to the baths from the *palaestra* or *apodyterium* onwards. “Getting clean” was almost an afterthought at times and few mentioned opening one’s pores.
- Q.2** There was evidence that more preparation had been done for this topic than in some previous years but Pappus and Manducus featured everywhere. Candidates were not given credit for saying simply that Roman audiences enjoyed comedies because they were funny or because they were not tragedies.
- Q.3** This was well done apart from (b) at times and in (d) “palm leaf”, “wreath” or “flower” were suggested as rewards.
- Q.4** The turning posts/*metae* were usually identified (spellings often approximate) for (a) but (b) saw some ingenious (but incorrect) answers such as “So that the emperor could get to his seat”, “For ladies to sit on the platform” and (frequently) it was the podium for the winner to receive his prize. As with all the stimulus material used in this paper, the image appears in the Resource booklet.

Section B:

Once again candidates enjoyed the selection of titles but often saw these questions as an excuse to write down pages of “facts”: consequently, many did not actually address the question and so evaluation was frequently missing. Others wrote at length without saying very much at all: if candidates want to score highly, they need to include relevant detail.

Question 5 was very popular although the reference to “useful” in the title was often ignored. Some of those attempting question 6 displayed the usual confusion about what the performances consisted of: a few remarked that the theatre was boring and lapsed into a description of gladiatorial events which they would much prefer to be watching. A number then attempted question 7 and repeated themselves.

Many of the responses to question 7 were unexpectedly disappointing and it was surprising how many candidates seemed unable to mention anything other than different kinds of gladiators, animal events and lots of blood. Often, answers were simply descriptive – for example, the different equipment used by gladiators – without reference to the enjoyment mentioned in the question.

Those attempting question 8 often tended to focus on a Roman's own experiences at the races rather than addressing the wording of the question.

Examiners were struck by the number of essays that were simply figments of the imagination with little attention to relevant facts. Maybe it is because the first word of all the essay questions is "Imagine"? One candidate mentioned a comedy about Caecilius going to the dentist, a production that the examiners have obviously missed.

Summary of key points

Topic 3 The Roman Army and Topic 4 Entertainment and Leisure will be offered again in 2020.

LATIN

Level 1 Certificate in Latin

Summer 2019

9513 ROMAN CIVILISATION (CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT)

General Comments

Although entries were down again on previous years, this remains a popular option for some candidates at both levels: it gives the opportunity to research and write about a topic not always covered elsewhere, but in which a candidate has a particular interest. Some titles attempted were adapted from those suggested on the WJEC website and there were fewer unusual titles this year. Old favourites, such as a comparison between Roman and modern entertainment or the lives of Roman and modern women, were much in evidence.

Not all centres had submitted their proposed titles in advance to WJEC for approval. This should have been done by 31st October last year. As in previous years, this meant that some candidates attempted titles which were not sufficiently focused or which were difficult to include sufficient evaluation. A significant proportion of marks at both levels are awarded for evaluation so some candidates were unable to achieve good marks here.

It was disappointing to see that some centres had ignored suggestions by the moderator to change their proposed titles and had used them anyway. Other centres had several candidates choosing identical (or virtually identical) titles for their assessments: 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.

By far the biggest concern this year at both Level 1 and Level 2 was the quality of the A4 primary source sheets. A few candidates provided a very good range of primary sources, both literary and visual, to support their assignment and referred to these throughout their work. However, in a significant number of cases, candidates did not appear to understand the difference between a primary and secondary source, listing websites and modern books as primary evidence.

Others listed as a source (for example) 'Plan of Roman baths' without including the actual plan: in the assignment, they might write something like 'there was a lot of variety in the baths and lots of rooms, *as can be seen on the plan*'. Many literary sources were not attributed to the author and Mary Beard was mentioned several times as a primary source.

As has been noted before, centres should be reminded that the A4 sheet is the only resource candidates should have with them when they are writing their assignment: some assignments made reference to sources which did not appear on their A4 sheet.

Virtually all the scripts were word-processed which made them easier to read. Very few candidates included a word count but moderators very much appreciate when candidates have done this.

Comments on individual questions/sections

The vast majority of teachers annotated the scripts very well and wrote helpful supporting comments on their candidates' work, based on the assessment criteria: candidates were nearly always placed in the correct rank order. Marks were mostly allocated from the correct band. However, a few centres did not annotate their students' work at all and this made it difficult for moderators to see where credit had been given for the various assessment criteria.

In the scripts from a number of centres, moderators felt that the outcomes were too generous particularly in the awarding marks for the selection and use of primary sources (AC3). As has been mentioned above, candidates had in some cases included only secondary sources but were still awarded high marks. Moderators were obliged to lower the marks submitted by some centres, particularly where over-inflated marks had been awarded for these poor, or occasionally non-existent, primary sources.

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.

Summary of key points

Controlled assessment remains a valuable opportunity for students to develop their research skills into topics which particularly interest them and this will continue to be an option for the remaining life of the Level 1 & 2 qualifications.

LATIN

Level 1 Certificate in Latin

Summer 2019

9514

General Comments

Candidates dealt with this paper very well with the vast majority following the story-line through to its completion. As is often the case, sentences without a nominative were good discriminators, but the overall standard was high.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- S1** Most candidates made a strong start with only a small minority not knowing *iuvenis*. There was however some confusion between *habitabat* and *habebat* (in sections 2 and 3).
- S2** *tamen* needed to be in context to be credited; some candidates placed it with the second clause and were therefore not credited. *solus* was sometimes confused with *sol* and the infinitive *esse* was not translated accurately by all, although most rendered it as an infinitive.
- S3** A surprising number of candidates thought *civis* was plural, or mistranslated it or simply omitted the word altogether. *nomine*, while glossed, seemed to have been mistaken for a verb by some candidates who translated the phrase *Harpax nomine* as 'Harpax called'. Other common errors included the meaning of *domum* (confused with *dominus*) and *habebat* (confused with *habitabat*) and omitting the superlative.
- S4** 'But he was living in the countryside' was a very common translation, which only scored 1/3 for *sed*.
- S5** Only the strongest candidates read ahead to see that Harpax was the subject of this sentence.
- S6** A pleasing number of candidates did recognise the vocative *amice*. This led to them naturally using the second person for the verb, but often this was 'do you see' which was only awarded one mark for the meaning of *videre*. A number of candidates had not fully understood the story line and translated *meum* as 'your'. *eam vendere volo* raised the same problem as section 4 and the first part of this section, where candidates missed the modal verb (*volo*) and translated the infinitive as the main verb, losing the mark for *volo/vis* and for the ending of the infinitive.
- S7** A number of candidates correctly identified *iuvenis* and *Harpax* as nominative but then incorrectly made them both the subject of *consensit*. Those that did this, then struggled to make sense of the second clause, often confusing *duxit* with *dixit*.
- S8** *postquam* proved difficult for several candidates and very many did not know *tacebat*.
- S9** Although this type of sentence has occurred regularly in past papers, the irregular comparative was challenging for many. A common error was to confuse *maior* with *melior*, but several candidates struggled more generally with the syntax.

- S10** This sentence without a nominative was a good discriminator. Those who wanted to make Harpax the subject of the sentence did not tend to make *dedit* passive and so typically lost out on the meaning for the verb. *–que* was widely known to mean ‘and’ but only the more able students were able to translate it in the correct context. *discessit* was often translated as ‘discussed’.
- S11** This short section was quite well done. The meaning of *rediit* was occasionally confused with *risit*.
- S12** *alium* was often omitted entirely, but generally this challenging sentence was tackled successfully. Weaker candidates did not see that *hominem* was accusative and some made it plural, but the participle was dealt with quite well.
- S13** The question words caused some difficulties with candidates, with many not making any distinction between *quis* and *quid*. A good number, however, were able to identify the second person verbs without any help from a pronoun. *facis* was confused with *facile* by weaker students.
- S14** As the verb *discedo* had already appeared, candidates only needed to recognise that *discede* was an imperative and many did. Not all successfully translated the tense of *emi* owing in part to a mistranslation of *heri* as ‘today’. The second sentence was generally very well done, with only a few candidates omitting the subject.
- S15** This section proved to be a good discriminator. *tandem* was commonly confused with *tamen* or simply omitted. The majority of candidates did not know the meaning of *intellegebat* and then made *omnia* agree with Clemens (e.g. ‘Clemens was all intelligent’ was a very common translation). Only the most able candidates recognised the particular use of *quam* in the second sentence and *fuera*t was also challenging for many.
- S16** Another good discriminator: *quamquam* was not dealt with by many candidates and over half made Harpax the subject of the sentence. Generally, however, the verbs were identified as pluperfect and the pronoun *eius* was also translated well in a pleasing number of scripts.
- S17** The majority of candidates understood the general idea that Clemens now had nothing, but some were let down by not giving a precise translation; for example, some did not repeat *nullam* and others did not make *domum* the object of *habebat* because they had mistranslated the verb as ‘he lived’.

Summary of key points

The majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the story and were able to follow the narrative to the end. It was very encouraging to see candidates successfully translating all the different grammatical structures required at this level.

LATIN
Level 2 Certificate in Latin
Summer 2019
9521

General Comments

The entry was again small, but there was a wide range of marks, including a good number achieving full or almost full marks. The great majority of candidates were at least adequately prepared for the examination. Centres were split between those whose candidates found the translation more approachable than the comprehensions, and those whose candidates found the translation the most challenging part of the paper; overall, however, Question 3 generated a lower mean.

One noticeable feature this year was the omission of one sentence or another from the translation, often by strong candidates. This shows the importance of reading through the translation and matching it to the Latin before finishing.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1**
- (a)** all answered correctly.
 - (b)** all answered correctly.
 - (c)** nearly all chose correctly.
 - (d)** this was the first question to differentiate; many did not know *postulaverunt* and guessed it to mean 'took'. A few also omitted *totum*.
 - (e)**
 - (i)** some did not know *noluit* and omitted it.
 - (ii)** most answered correctly.
 - (f)**
 - (i)** there were many wrong choices here, including a good number getting all three wrong (a rare occurrence with a multiple-choice question). Generally, these wrong choices were the result of insufficiently close attention to all the words of the relevant Latin sentences.
 - (ii)** nearly all correctly chose 'ferocious' or its adverb; the few who gave 'fierce' lost the mark, as that word derives from a different root.
 - (g)** there were two errors here among weaker candidates: some omitted 'all', but the most frequent error was to disregard the prefix on *abstulerunt* and write simply 'took'; this did not gain the mark.
 - (h)** again the only frequent error was the neglect of the prefix, this time on *abducebantur*.

- (i) most correctly chose A.
- (j) the great majority answered correctly.

Q.2 *'Iceni, postquam tantas iniurias acceperunt, tam irati fuerunt ut statim gladios raperent.'*

Many did not know *tantas*. Some treated *postquam* as an adverb. The most frequent error, however, found in over half the scripts, was a lack of understanding of result clauses, leading to incorrect translations of *tam* and *ut*.

'multis aliis quoque persuaserunt ut bellum contra Romanos gererent.'

The word order prompted most candidates to write 'many others were persuaded'; this would have been fine if they had added 'by them', but none did. The rest was done well.

'plurimi enim Britannorum Romanos e Britannia agere volebant, quod saevissimi erant.'

Half the candidates were unfamiliar with *enim*. Few realised that *plurimi* is a superlative. Weaker candidates could not cope with the juxtaposition of the three proper names, and linked them in many different ways. A good number knew 'drive' for *agere*, though many did not. Many omitted the superlative again with *saevissimi*.

'brevis tempore multa milia armatorum ad Boudiccam festinaverant.'

Most handled the time phrase correctly, though many treated it as if it were accusative of duration of time. Many did not know *milia*, usually guessing 'soldiers'. Most failed to note the pluperfect tense.

'ut Romanos oppugnarent.'

Only a few gave 'fought' for *oppugnarent*.

'Boudicca gaudebat quod tot Britanni pugnare volebant.'

Half did not know *gaudebant*, and many did not know *tot*.

'omnes iter fecerunt ad urbem proximam.'

This was mostly done well, with only very weak candidates not knowing *iter facere* or *proximam*. Oddly there were a few who did not know *omnes*.

'Romani, qui nihil fecerant ut urbem defenderent, perterriti erant.'

The only frequent error here, in half the scripts, was the failure to render the pluperfect tense; the great majority recognised the purpose clause.

'nemo sciebat quid facere possent.'

This sentence was omitted more than any other. Those who did attempt it nearly always translated it correctly. Only a few did not know *sciebat*.

'Britanni omnes domus incenderunt civesque interfecerunt.'

This was generally handled well. Some otherwise strong candidates switched the order of the two clauses, sometimes thereby losing the point for -que.

'mox magnum templum solum stabat, in quod milites Romani fugerant.'

The first part was generally correct; few however translated in quod correctly ('in which' was not accepted). Also, again the pluperfect tense was ignored by most.

'duobus diebus tamen Britanni milites occiderunt templumque deleverunt.'

This time only a minority handled the time phrase correctly. Britanni and milites were often conflated into 'British soldiers', leaving occiderunt without an object.

- Q.3**
- (a)** nearly all correctly gave 'three'.
 - (b)**
 - (i)** all gained the mark for this, as 'Roman emperor' (by far the most common response) was allowed.
 - (ii)** most correctly chose B and D.
 - (iii)** all answered correctly.
 - (c)**
 - (i)** this proved more challenging, as there were a number of details to be included, as the mark allocation (5) indicated. The commonest error was omission of the superlative; others omitted ad eas.
 - (ii)** some inverted this and had the Romans wanting to defeat Boudicca.
 - (d)**
 - (i)** most correctly chose A.
 - (ii)** nearly all answered correctly.
 - (e)** most correctly chose B and D, but many were induced by the word order to choose B and C.
 - (f)**
 - (i)** most answered correctly.
 - (ii)** this was one of the hardest questions, because few knew num and many misconstrued the ending of vultis.
 - (iii)** over half failed to represent the gerundive of obligation, while nobis was usually thought to mean 'noble'.
 - (g)**
 - (i)** some gave 'fought' for oppugnaverunt. Many omitted Romanos.
 - (ii)** most omitted reference to non difficile erat, gaining only one of the two marks.
 - (h)**
 - (i)** nearly all answered correctly; the few who wrote 'she drank poison' did not gain the mark, as that act might not have led to her death.
 - (ii)** weaker candidates did not know victos.

- (iii) this was answered correctly by a very small percentage of candidates, as most were unfamiliar with one or both words.

Summary of key points

Although the standard was high, it did reveal some weaknesses:

- Many did not read through their translations again to check for omissions.
- Vocabulary was a major weakness in all but the strongest candidates.
- Superlatives and pluperfect tenses are rarely recognised.
- Compound verbs need to be translated with something for the prefix.

LATIN
Level 2 Certificate in Latin
Summer 2019
9522 ROMAN CIVILISATION

General Comments

Entries were slightly up this year and candidates seemed to have enjoyed studying the topics. Most knew the subject matter well.

The Roman Army has always proved to be a much less popular than Entertainment and Leisure, but this summer, those attempting Topic 3 were in single figures: the standard of responses was variable.

Candidates should be reminded that they will lose marks if their writing is cannot be deciphered. Most work was well presented, but occasionally, virtually illegible scripts still caused problems for the examiners.

As always, the longer questions which required evaluation were the discriminators between the weaker and best candidates. Some candidates did not read the question carefully enough and answered a question which was not being asked. This is a recurring problem and one that examiners find frustrating. Those who write everything they know about the subject, whether relevant or not, are not likely to gain good marks.

Comments on individual questions/sections

As mentioned above, very, very few candidates chose this topic.

- Q.1** Generally well answered apart from (c).
- Q.2** Well answered, although some thought IVL was a Roman numeral and came up with several possibilities.
- Q.3** (a) This was usually done well.
- (b) In (b), however, most ignored the reference to work and focused on what a Roman soldier could do in his leisure time, perhaps thinking about a question from a previous paper.
- Q.4** Some thought (a) referred to weapon training and wrote about wooden swords and the like. In (d), most answers consisted of descriptions of weapons and very little else.
- Q.5** Questions about auxiliary soldiers have sometimes caused problems in the past but there were generally good answers on this occasion. Candidates mentioned the skills for which the auxiliary troops were admired but also the fact they were poorly paid and often sent out to battle first.
- Q.6** Most gained one mark for (a) but didn't seem to know why soldiers would use the testudo. The rest of the question was generally answered well.

TOPIC 4: ENTERTAINMENT AND LEISURE

- Q.1** Generally well answered although **A** was not always correct. Virtually all candidates gave an acceptable use for **X**. Answers to (b) were good although questions about pantomimes have caused difficulty in the past, but the answers to (c) tended to be rather thin. “It was funny/amusing” was not enough to get any credit.
- Q.2** Many candidates relied too heavily on the passage in (a) and simply paraphrased it. (b) was generally well done except by those who described different ways in which a charioteer could crash – not necessarily at the turning post. (c) as ever tended to lack evaluation. Surprisingly few facts about the races were apparently known apart from the colours of the teams and the danger of the whole event. The examiners would have expected more references to the crashes and the crowd atmosphere but there were some very short answers which scored only two or three marks.
- Q.3** (a) usually correct although there were some coal-fired furnaces. The explanations were not always well expressed and some thought the area shown in the picture was a bath which produced hot steam to heat the baths. In (b), the essay was often well done although some candidates simply wrote about a visit to the baths. Most candidates referred to Seneca’s dislike of the noise to justify the closure of the baths; others worried that the slaves would be unemployed if the baths were to be shut down; very few mentioned that other places were available for meeting friends, doing business, buying food etc.
- Q.4** Although this question was well answered on the whole, a significant number of candidates thought that **X** was a drain for the blood or a pit for dead bodies. In (b) because there is a (modern) fence in the picture, the odd candidate would refer to this as a safety feature: others mentioned “rollers” to protect the crowd and this was not given credit. (c) was always correctly answered. Many attempts at (d) were surprisingly poor. The description of the events lacked detail and some students seemed unsure of the meaning of “appalled” which meant that their evaluation tended to be weak.

Summary of key points

- Topic 3 The Roman Army and Topic 4 Entertainment and Leisure will again be offered in 2020.

LATIN

Level 2 Certificate in Latin

Summer 2019

9523 ROMAN CIVILISATION CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

General Comments

Although entries were down again on previous years, this remains a popular option for some candidates at both levels: it gives the opportunity to research and write about a topic not always covered elsewhere, but in which a candidate has a particular interest. Some titles attempted were adapted from those suggested on the WJEC website and there were fewer unusual titles this year. Old favourites, such as a comparison between Roman and modern entertainment or the lives of Roman and modern women, were much in evidence.

Not all centres had submitted their proposed titles in advance to WJEC for approval. This should have been done by 31st October last year. As in previous years, this meant that some candidates attempted titles which were not sufficiently focused or which were difficult to include sufficient evaluation. A significant proportion of marks at both levels are awarded for evaluation so some candidates were unable to achieve good marks here.

It was disappointing to see that some centres had ignored suggestions by the moderator to change their proposed titles and had used them anyway. Other centres had several candidates choosing identical (or virtually identical) titles for their assessments: 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.

By far the biggest concern this year at both Level 1 and Level 2 was the quality of the A4 primary source sheets. A few candidates provided a very good range of primary sources, both literary and visual, to support their assignment and referred to these throughout their work. However, in a significant number of cases, candidates did not appear to understand the difference between a primary and secondary source, listing websites and modern books as primary evidence.

Others listed as a source (for example) 'Plan of Roman baths' without including the actual plan: in the assignment, they might write something like 'there was a lot of variety in the baths and lots of rooms, *as can be seen on the plan*'. Many literary sources were not attributed to the author and Mary Beard was mentioned several times as a primary source.

As has been noted before, centres should be reminded that the A4 sheet is the only resource candidates should have with them when they are writing their assignment: some assignments made reference to sources which did not appear on their A4 sheet.

Virtually all the scripts were word-processed which made them easier to read. Very few candidates included a word count but moderators very much appreciate when candidates have done this.

Comments on individual questions/sections

The vast majority of teachers annotated the scripts very well and wrote helpful supporting comments on their candidates' work, based on the assessment criteria: candidates were nearly always placed in the correct rank order. Marks were mostly allocated from the correct band. However, a few centres did not annotate their students' work at all and this made it difficult for moderators to see where credit had been given for the various assessment criteria.

In the scripts from a number of centres, moderators felt that the outcomes were too generous particularly in the awarding marks for the selection and use of primary sources (AC3). As has been mentioned above, candidates had in some cases included only secondary sources but were still awarded high marks. Moderators were obliged to lower the marks submitted by some centres, particularly where over-inflated marks had been awarded for these poor, or occasionally non-existent, primary sources.

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.

Summary of key points

- Controlled assessment remains a valuable opportunity for students to develop their research skills into topics which particularly interest them and this will continue to be an option for the remaining life of the Level 1 & 2 qualifications.

LATIN
Level 2 Certificate in Latin
Summer 2019
9524

General Comments

Entry numbers were slightly higher than those of last year. A full range of marks was awarded, from the low teens to almost full marks. As many candidates found the comprehension harder as found the translation harder. Vocabulary was again a major issue for very many candidates.

Most succeeded in following the storyline more or less to the end, though there were many individual sentences and clauses that caused deviations.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1**
- (a)** few candidates knew *acre*, but many produced acceptable guesses.
 - (b)** this proved beyond the reach of all but the strongest candidates; this was not so much because they were unfamiliar with *aliae* ... *aliae*; rather they were unsure of *favebant* and, even more, struggled with the fact that the verb needed to be read twice.
 - (c)** most answered this correctly.
 - (d)** the great majority correctly chose A and D; those who chose B did not distinguish between *adiuvare* and *audire*.
 - (e)** many chose wrongly here, with B, C and D equally popular. This of course is because most did not know *nonnulli*.
 - (f)**
 - (i)** most answered correctly.
 - (ii)** only the strongest candidates scored all 3 marks; the main problems were the function of *captum* and the case of *Carthaginensibus*.
 - (g)** Many wrote of Nicias' daughters instead of sons.

Q.2 '*cives in urbe tres deas colebant;*'

The most frequent error here, made by most of the candidates, was to translate *deas* as 'gods' rather than 'goddesses'.

'sperabant enim has deas urbem suam servaturas esse.'

Many made *enim* dependent on *sperabant* ('were hoping for the gods'). Many omitted *has* or *suam* or both. The tense of *servaturas esse* was not recognised by many.

‘Nicias autem civibus convocatis ‘ego’ inquit ‘credo deas nostram urbem odisse;’

Few worked out the meaning of *convocatis* (‘called together’), despite this being a regular compound, which candidates are expected to be able to handle. Some took the phrase to be an ablative absolute, while others took it as a dative; both were accepted. Many did not know *nostram*. Most did know *odi*.

‘nolite eis sacrificia offerre.’

Few were familiar with this use of *nolite* to express a prohibition. Most made *sacrificia* singular. Many did not know what to make of *eis*.

‘inimici Niciae, simulatque haec verba audiverunt, gaudebant;’

The great majority took *inimici* to be singular, despite all the plural verb endings. Many did not know *simulatque*.

‘iam enim eum sacrilegii accusare poterant.’

This was handled well, except that again most took *poterant* to be singular.

‘ubi tamen in forum contenderunt ut eum raperent, Nicias subito se ad terram iecit;’

Few knew the meaning of *contenderunt*. Very many failed to take *se* with *iecit*.

‘ibi iacebat magna voce clamans.’

Many did not know *ibi*. Many made *clamans* a main verb, without correct compensation.

‘deinde surrexit et, manus ad caelum tollens, exclamavit deas se sequi.’

Few knew *surrexit* (‘surrendered’ was the preferred guess). Most took *manus* to be singular, while *tollens* was rarely known. Very few indeed realised that *deas se sequi* was an indirect statement.

‘tandem e foro cucurrit.’

Most translated this correctly.

‘cives hoc viso tam perterriti erant ut nemo ei obstare auderet.’

About half recognised the ablative absolute and handled it correctly. Few knew the meaning or use of *tam*, as a result of which few represented the result clause acceptably. Most knew *auderet*.

‘mox Nicias, ex urbe in agros progressus,’

Few kept *progressus* as a participle, and few of those who changed it did so in an acceptable way.

‘uxorem liberosque, qui iam effugerant, conspexit.’

Many took *uxorem liberosque* to mean ‘and his free wife’. Very many kept the Latin word order, writing variations of ‘the wife and children, who had escaped, he saw’. Such tortured English word order is not to be encouraged.

‘omnes ad Romanos tuti pervenerunt.’

Many made *omnes* agree with *Romanos*; many of these ignored *ad*. Many did not know what to make *tuti* agree with.

Summary of key points

- Clearly vocabulary and word order are a major hurdle for many candidates. Overall, however, the standard was high.



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