



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LEVEL 1/2 CERTIFICATE IN LATIN

JANUARY 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.

LATIN
Level 1/2 Certificate
January 2019
UNIT 9511

General Comments

Almost all candidates were able to get a good sense of the storyline. Some however, were rather too vague when answering the comprehension questions. In future, they should be encouraged to get their response directly from the Latin text, unless they are specifically asked for their own opinion. Present participles and verbs in the pluperfect tense seemed to provide a challenge to some. The imperatives as well as the one prohibition in this story were also problematic for several candidates. Overall, however, the standard was good.

- Q.1 All answered this correctly.
- Q.2 (i) As only two of the three possible points were required for this question, most candidates scored full marks.
- (ii) Generally quite well done, but several candidates simply gave the glossed word 'lazy' (she was lazy), which was only awarded 1/2.
- Q.3 This was quite well done, but each pair proved challenging for some owing to the lack of distinction between *dominus / domina*, some not knowing the word *sola* (confusing it with *sol*) and others who did not know *lente*.
- Q.4 *tamen*, as is often the case was regularly confused with *tandem* or omitted altogether. Those who wrote 'The mistress was not understanding about/of this' were not given the mark for *intellegebat* as they had misunderstood the meaning.
- Q.5 This was quite well done although some candidates looked beyond the lemma and others seemed to be giving their own opinion.
- Q.6 The genitive *puellarum* caused difficulties for some in this question. However, as long as the correct information was given, any incorrect details about the slave girls were ignored.
- Q.7 (i) Many candidates were not specific enough when answering this question. Some wrote friends were invited but as several also wrote that friends and their wives were invited it was difficult to tell whether 'friends' on their own was paraphrasing *amicum et uxorem* or whether the singular ending had not been recognised and *uxorem* unknown vocabulary. Consequently the singular 'friend and his wife' was required for full marks.
- (ii) All details were required for full marks, but this was generally well done.
- Q.8 (i) Much of the vocabulary was glossed and so most candidates scored 2/2.
- (ii) This was a very good discriminator. The imperative caused difficulties for all but the best candidates and as such, *Clodia* was often not recognised as being in the vocative case. *in + acc* was also not dealt with well.
- (iii) Generally well done. 'Clean the dining room' was awarded 1/2.

- Q.9 Some candidates went to great lengths to explain how they could tell Clodia was in a hurry and quoted the Latin in support of their answer. One mark was awarded for quoting all three Latin words *cucurrit*, *statim* and *celeriter* if they were correctly translated. However, as long as four of the five elements were present in the answer in English, no Latin quotes were required and full marks were awarded: candidates will always be asked specifically to give the Latin word if this is required in the answer. Several candidates mistranslated *cucurrit* as 'she hurried' but in this context, *statim* did not cause as many problems as it sometimes does.
- Q.10 *quaesivit* was possibly the least well known word on this paper.
- Q.11 Again, this translation question was a good discriminator. *simulac* was unknown to a few. Several candidates were confused by *eum*, making it nominative. However, provided the verbs were translated as third person singular, the mark was awarded for the verb (which should have been 'she saw... she approached'). Again, those who had made this initial mistake made *ei* feminine, which was also taken as a consequential error and not penalised. The present participle was challenging for many, but most answers had 'excellent food' as an accusative noun and so were awarded at least 3 marks.
- Q.12 Generally well done.
- Q.13 (i) A number of candidates failed to recognise the superlative although most knew the meaning of *pulchra*.
- (ii) One of the best discriminators on the paper. A good number of candidates wrote 'he did not love her'. This was credited with one mark but it fell outside of the causal clause and so did not fully answer the question. Those who did look to the Latin following 'quod' struggled to deal with the comparative successfully. Those who simply wrote 'she was lazy' did not get any marks as *ignavus* was glossed.
- Q.14 This was well done.
- Q.15 (i) The prohibition was only successfully translated by the best candidates.
- (ii) Some candidates simply repeated their answer for Q15.i. but the imperative was required to be credited.
- (iii) Some candidates clearly found this question challenging or did not know quite where to look in the Latin. However, it was pleasing to see that almost everyone translated *facere* as 'to do' rather than 'to make' recognising the meaning within this particular context.
- Q.16 Some candidates were not able to distinguish which the cases of Cynthia and the slave.
- Q.17 Most candidates showed some understanding of the general meaning of this sentence. Some however were not accurate enough to be credited fully. Failure to recognise the pluperfect *fecerat* was a common problem and *eos* was challenging for some, but *-que* was generally handled well.
- Q.18 This was well done.

- Q.19 (i) *postquam* was known to almost all candidates. It was a shame that some did not use the words in the vocabulary list.
- (ii) Some answers did not look at the ending of the verb, translating it as a second person which then meant the question word '*quis*' was also mistranslated. However, many candidates scored full marks.
- Q.20 As is to be expected in a translation question towards the end of the paper, only the very best candidates scored 5/5. The present participle provided a challenge to many students and *timebat* was often rendered as if it were an adjective. Again, the pluperfect tense also provided a challenge to several candidates.
- Q.21 Many candidates only provided one of the two pieces of information required.
- Q.22 Again, a good discriminator. *num* was confused with *nonne* and several answers ignored the second person ending of the verb.
- Q.23 (i) This was generally well done. The English idiom 'have food' was allowed.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to understand the general sense of this last section. A small minority confused *cena* with *cibum* but more common mistakes were to omit either 'all' or 'other' or to only give either 'slaves' or 'slave-girls'. Only a few wrote 'very big' for *magnum* which was not credited.

Conclusion

Nearly all candidates attempted every question, following the storyline to its conclusion. Questions which tested candidates' understanding of participles and imperatives acted as good discriminators but most papers demonstrated a good knowledge and understanding of the vocabulary and syntax required at this level.

LATIN
Level 1/2 Certificate
January 2019
UNIT 9521

General Comments

The entry was fourteen, from three Centres, the same as this time last year. These scripts were of varying standard. Half the candidates found Question 2 the most challenging; the others found all three sections to be equally accessible. Noticeable trends were weak vocabulary knowledge and a struggle to identify subordinate clauses. Another common tendency was to treat whichever noun appeared first in a clause as the subject, regardless of case ending.

Comments on individual questions

Q.1 Questions 1 (a) and (b) were answered correctly by nearly all candidates. Question 1(c) caused difficulties for most, with the comparative often not recognised and *etiam* omitted by most; those who didn't spot the comparative also did not know what to do with *quam*. Most answered Question 1 (d) correctly. In Question 1 (e i), most failed to note the superlative; since the adjective was glossed, the mark was purely for the superlative. Question 1 (e ii) caused few problems. Question 1 (e iii) was understood, but *saepe* was often omitted. Few gained all three marks for Question 1 (f), the key word *agere* being generally unknown. In Question 1 (g i), few knew the meaning of *quaerebant*. Question 1 (g ii) was answered well. For Question 1 (h), half the candidates did not know their tenses for the first pair of alternatives.

Q.2 *Druidae Britannis saepe persuadebant ut bellum contra Romanos gererent.*

This proved to be one of the more accessible sentences. *saepe* was sometimes omitted or confused. *gererent* was sometimes unknown but guessed reasonably.

multi milites Romani ab eis interficiebantur.

Most recognised the passive, but many made the verb pluperfect, and over half had no idea what *ab eis* meant.

legatus Romanus, Veranius nomine,

As usual, few knew the meaning(s) of *legatus*, with 'legion' and 'leader' equally popular; neither was acceptable. Some failed to make *legatus* the subject of *poterat*, having lost sight of the sentence structure before then.

quamquam Britannos oppugnabat, eos vincere numquam poterat.

Most knew *quamquam*, but as usual *oppugnare* was confused with *pugnare*. The rest was well done by most.

Britanni enim semper in silvas transque montes fugerunt.

Enim was rarely known and sometimes confused with the dative. Some gave 'to the woods' for *in silvas*, which is not accurate enough. Most handled *-que* correctly.

in illis locis facile erat Britannis se celare. deinde Veranius subito periit.

Few recognised *illis* ('these' was not accepted). Almost all translated *facile erat Britannis* correctly. Many did not know *celare*.

legatus novus erat Suetonius, vir maximae virtutis.

Half did not know *novus*. Most made reasonable guesses at *vir maximae virtutis*

tam grave erat periculum belli ut Suetonius Britannos omnino superare statim constitueret.

Hardly anyone knew *tam*. All were defeated by *periculum belli*, with *periculum* treated as an adjective and the case of *belli* not recognised. Some took *statim* with *superare* instead of *constitueret*, despite the word order. Few identified the result clause.

per Britanniam duabus cum legionibus processit, ut hostes oppugnaret;

Most made *duabus legionibus* the subject. Few handled *processit* sensibly; half converted it into a noun. Most recognised the purpose clause.

qui, cum legionibus resistere non possent, in montes iterum fugiebant.

None could handle the connecting relative correctly. Many misconstrued *cum*, and *legionibus* was made the subject by most.

Suetonius nesciebat quo modo hostes vincere posset.

Few knew *nesciebat*. Many made *hostes* the subject.

- Q.3 In Question 3 (a i) few knew *comitibus*; in (ii) some made *Britannos* the subject; (iii) was answered well. In Question 3 (b) most appeared to handle the gerundive adequately, but few knew *sine*. Both parts of Question 3 (c) were answered well, with 'military' being the standard response in (ii). Most answered Question 3 (d i) correctly but in (ii) many did not know the vocabulary. Question 3 (e i) was answered well, but in (ii) *diram* was often omitted. In Question 3 (f) few gave all the details, with *inter viros* the most frequently omitted phrase. In Question 3 (g) many did not know *turba*. Most answered Question 3 (h) correctly. Question 3 (i i) was well answered by half, but very few managed to get all three part of (ii); most thought it was Suetonius that attacked and defeated the Britons, rather than his men.

Conclusion

All candidates made a serious attempt at this paper, and nearly 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