



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

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

SUMMER 2016

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.

Unit	Page
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9511	1
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9521	4
Roman Civilisation Level 1 – Unit 9512	8
Roman Civilisation Level 2 – Unit 9522	11
Roman Civilisation Levels 1 & 2 – Units 9513 & 9523	14
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9514	16
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9524	19

LEVEL 1 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2016

UNIT 9511

General Comments

Although the overall standard was high, weaker candidates had some difficulty following the storyline in places. Translations proved a stumbling block for all but the strongest candidates, as did some of the multiple-choice questions. Lack of vocabulary knowledge was a major issue for many candidates.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 weaker candidates generally omitted or mistranslated *puer*.
- Q.2 only the stronger candidates were able to give all the details; many weaker ones wrote that Cornelius' father was dead, but omitted to include his mother.
- Q.3 only the best gained all 6 marks, with the rest omitting one or more details because of ignorance of the relevant vocabulary.
- Q.4 most got (i) right, though many weaker candidates struggled with the meaning of *vivere*. In (ii) few knew the meaning of *pauci*!
- Q.5 similar vocabulary deficiencies caused many to choose the wrong statements here.
- Q.6 (i) nearly all included *satis cibi* in their answers, but most had to guess at the meaning of *accepit*.
- (ii) most answered correctly.
- Q.7 this proved to be the most approachable of the translation questions. Many did not know *duae* or *per*.
- Q.8 this was the best done of the multiple-choice questions.
- Q.9 only the best candidates scored all 7 marks. Many did not know *subito* and many omitted *eis* or made it singular.
- Q.10 there was much confusion about what the woman did; only the best could give complete answers.
- Q.11 (i) this multiple-choice question was poorly done; clearly most candidates were unable to identify the correct tense.
- (ii) only a minority chose correctly here.

- Q.12 this translation proved very difficult, mainly because of vocabulary weaknesses: *per*, *traxit*, *tandem* and *parvam* all proved elusive. Unfortunately for the large percentage of candidates who could not spell 'woman', 'women' was not accepted unless the addition of the indefinite article made it clear they meant one woman.
- Q.13 (i) half the candidates knew the meaning of *manebat*, which was all that was needed for the mark.
- (ii) most knew or guessed *exiit*, but only the more thoughtful included *e domo*.
- Q.14 (i) many did not know *ad* or *rediiit*.
- (ii) most knew that she was a mother, but very many omitted to mention *puellarum*.
- (iii) *cum ancilla stabat* was beyond the reach of half the candidates.
- Q.15 (i) many were ignorant of the meaning of *quis*.
- (ii) the great majority were able to think of a sensible answer to this personal response question. Weak candidates had completely lost the storyline by this point, and made wild guesses.
- (iii) only the best gained all 3 marks, because of widespread ignorance of *eas* and *statim*.
- Q.16 most chose correctly.
- Q.17 the first three words of this translation were probably the hardest items in the paper. Even many of the strongest candidates were unable to translate *quid tu vis*, with 'who are you' by far the most frequent rendering.
- Q.18 unfamiliarity with *noli* caused many to choose wrongly.
- Q.19 this was straightforward for most candidates.
- Q.20 this proved also to be one of the hardest questions in the paper, catching out many excellent candidates. Clearly few at this level are able to identify *venite* as plural.
- Q.21 an inability to recognise case endings caused some loss of marks here.
- Q.22 most chose correctly.
- Q.23 there were many errors here, with many candidates expressing and punctuating their translations as if *puellae* were vocative: 'girls,' he said, 'they are there'. There were numerous variations on this; the marking principle was that full credit would be given if it was clear that 'girls' were meant to be the subject, even if expressed wrongly. It is depressing to note that few candidates, even when they understand the Latin, can express this simple idea in correct English.
- Q.24 the first four alternatives required candidates to have a clear idea of the storyline; as a result there were many wrong choices.
- Q.25 this was straightforward for the majority who knew the meaning of *laudavit*.

- Q.26 (i) nearly all correctly wrote *optimus*, but many omitted the superlative.
- (ii) vocabulary weaknesses caused some wrong choices here.
- Q.27 many had no idea of the meaning of *visne*, and most omitted it. Also many failed to note the plurality of *nostra*.
- Q.28 even the weakest candidates usually answered this correctly.

Conclusion

Weaknesses of vocabulary and grammar knowledge were slightly more evident this year. However the fact that so many candidates scored above 90%, with a pleasing number attaining 100%, indicates once again a very good level of performance.

LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2016

UNIT 9521

General Comments

This year's paper proved challenging for many candidates. Weaknesses were manifold, including vocabulary deficiencies, lack of attention to norms of word order, ignorance of case endings and an inability to identify tenses. Although this means that there were many low-scoring scripts, there were also very many excellent scripts scoring in the mid- and high-nineties.

The momentum test appeared to perform its function well, with marks diminishing as each section drew to its climax, and with most candidates finding Section 3 the most difficult.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1
- (a) nearly all answered correctly.
 - (b) some weaker candidates made *magna* superlative; many others omitted *media* and simply gave 'in Italy'; since Italy was glossed, this was not enough.
 - (c) most answered correctly.
 - (d) only half the candidates scored all 4 here; most knew *fortis*; there was less certainty about *iuvenis*; most knew *miles* but many were unsure of *esse volebat*.
 - (e) a large minority gave at least one wrong answer here, because they could not work accurately through the Latin.
 - (f)
 - (i) most gave the correct 'sailed'; also frequent were 'navigated' and 'travelled', neither of which was accepted.
 - (ii) uncertainty over *novam* and *cupientes* prevented many from gaining both marks.
 - (iii) the Latin for this question was *multi hostes eos oppugnabant*; most candidates had no knowledge of the verb, though the related 'fought' was common; also most ignored *eos*, which should have given a clue to who the subject was.
 - (iv) this derivation produced disappointing results; whereas in most previous years nearly all candidates scored the mark, this time a good half did not understand the question, with many giving 'new'. Teachers are advised to alert their students to the inclusion of this type of question; at least then they should understand what they have to do. Another feature this year was the general inability to spell any of the derivatives: 'novel', 'novice' and 'novelty', the most frequent responses from those who did understand the question, were more often misspelt than correctly spelt. Fortunately this became clear at the outset, and so examiners took the decision to accept any spelling of these or similar words, provided that it was clear what the candidates were trying to spell. If this had not been done, only about 20% of candidates would have gained the mark.

- (g) most gained all 3 marks for the multiple-choice question. Those who made one wrong choice fell foul of the similarity between Pallas and Pallanteum (see below).
- (h) about half correctly chose A.
- (i) *eumque ad Evandrum duxit* defeated half the candidates, who did not know *eum* or *duxit*.
- (j) most candidates lost their ability to identify cases here, with *patrem* very often made the subject and *Aeneae* equally often the object. Only the strongest gained both marks.

Q.2 *Evander et Aeneas cenam consumebant.*

This sentence proved its value in being fully accessible to almost all candidates.

'volo te adiuvere,' inquit Evander. 'quid vis?'

This sentence discriminated very effectively. Almost all gained the 3 marks for *inquit Evander*, but many could not handle *te* or the meaning of *adiuvare*; only the best made sense of *quid vis*.

'ego omnes Troianos in Italiam duxi,' respondit Aeneas.

The main difficulties here were *in Italiam* ('in Italy' was very frequent); and the meaning and tense of *duxit*. (The many who wrote 'I lead all the Trojans...' had to be penalised for what for most was a misspelling, since we could only accept what they did write rather than what they might have intended.) Again nearly all gained full marks for *respondit Aeneas*.

'dei enim mihi imperaverunt ut hoc facerem.

This was probably found to be the most difficult sentence in the translation. The main reason for this was almost universal ignorance of *dei*. Very many were also unfamiliar with *impero*, and so usually failed to note the indirect command.

sed plurimi hostes nos oppugnant. Turnus, qui hostes ducit, me necare vult.'

Omission of the superlative was the norm rather than the exception. Very many, spotting *nos*, made it the subject of the sentence, with *hostes* the object. The commonest errors in the second sentence were giving past tenses for the two verbs.

'Turnus me quoque interficere cupit,' Evander dixit.

The only problems here were the meanings of *interficere* and *cupit*.

'ego tibi quadringentos milites dare possum.'

Many omitted *tibi*, because its position prevented them from locating its role in the syntax. The combination of *dare possum* was enough to reduce severely the marks of more than half the candidates.

Aeneas, cum verba regis audivisset, gaudebat.

This was mostly handled well, with a minority of candidates treating *verba* as singular or wrongly guessing the meaning of *gaudebat*.

etiam laetior fuit, ubi rex Pallantem iussit milites suos ducere.

Most candidates failed to note the comparative. Many did not recognise *fuit*. For the majority of candidates *rex Pallantem* was 'king Pallanteum' or 'the king of Pallanteum'. Examiners were aware of the scope for confusion over the two similar names when setting up the paper, but it had been hoped that the information given in Question 1 would be sufficient to avoid confusion: Pallas was clearly a person and Pallanteum clearly a city. Here and in the next sentence most candidates ignored either common sense or the endings. A further difficulty was that few knew *iussit*. This regularly gave rise to 'the king led his soldiers'. Also very many candidates had no idea what to do with *suos*.

deinde Evander Aenean oravit ut Pallentem artes belli doceret et vitam eius servaret.

Probably at least a third of candidates left *Aenean* in the accusative case, and almost as many did the same with *Pallentem*. The principle adopted by examiners is to ignore retention of oblique case endings in the comprehension sections but to penalise it in translation. Very many candidates failed to recognise the indirect command. Most treated *artes* as singular and many did not know *doceret*. Most had no idea whose life was to be saved.

Evander, ubi filium cum Troianis ex urbe discedentem spectabat, lacrimabat.

This sentence caused fewer problems, with most identifying Evander as the subject of *lacrimabat*; weaker candidates made *filium* the subject of *spectabat*. Many also made *filium* rather than *Troianis* dependent on *cum*. Many did not know *ex*.

intellegebat enim in quanta pericula filium mitteret, et quam senex ipse iam esset.

Scarcely any candidates got this sentence completely correct, though there were very many who understood the gist of it and gained most of the marks. The main difficulties were the identification of the two indirect questions (which very few candidates recognised), the meanings of *quanta* and *quam*, and the plurality of *pericula*. Many omitted *ipse* or *iam*.

- Q3 (a) (i) many candidates did not know *discedebant*.
- (ii) only the strongest separated *Pallante* from *militibus*; the rest gave 'Pallanteum soldiers' or similar.
- (iii) few gained more than 2 of the 4 marks; most were defeated by the meaning and construction of *relictorum*.

- (b) all four options were equally popular; this suggests that many did not recognise the gerundive construction.
- (c)
 - (i) the main difficulty here was *nostra*, omitted by most candidates.
 - (ii) most answered correctly; a minority made *perierunt* imperfect. (Usually there is more latitude with tenses in the comprehension sections than in the translation, but here the imperfect changed the meaning too much.)
- (d)
 - (i) nearly all correctly quoted *timebat*, but a significant minority did not know what it meant.
 - (ii) only a minority knew the meaning of *reliquerat*.
- (e) most answered correctly; the rest did not know *paucas*.
- (f) inability to distinguish case endings led many to make wrong choices here.
- (g) the only constant here was 'delay' (glossed), usually treated as a verb: 'to delay the enemy attack' was the most frequent answer.
- (h)
 - (i) nearly all correctly chose B.
 - (ii) nearly all gained at least 1 of the 5 marks, but fewer than half gained them all. The main problem was *pugnauerunt*.
 - (iii) nearly all answered correctly.
- (i) most candidates took *Pallantem* as the subject, making him the victor. Others wrote something ambiguous, typically 'he saw him ... and killed him'. A maximum of 3 marks was allowed for such answers, the 4th mark being reserved for those who clearly stated that it was Pallas who was killed.

Conclusion

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

LEVEL 1 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2016

UNIT 9512

General comments

It is pleasing to report that once again candidates achieved a high standard of performance and there were very few poor scripts.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society was much more popular than Topic 2: Roman Britain. The candidates had been well prepared for the examination and most candidates had studied the source material, on which the questions in Section A are based, carefully. There were several examples of candidates attempting to answer the questions on both topics, possibly because they had the time to do so rather than that they knew either topic well.

In Section B there were some very good detailed answers, although a number of candidates either omitted to focus on the question and wrote down everything they knew on the subject or, if making a comparison, did not give roughly equal weight to both parts of the argument. Some answers were far too long for the marks allocated to the question.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

Section A

- Q.1 For part (a), the venue was not recognised by some candidates, although it appeared in the source material for this paper. Incorrect answers included a temple and public toilets. In (b), most gave the Latin word, correctly spelled. A few hadn't read the question and gave the English word amphoras. (c) and (d) were generally well answered, but in (e) many candidates struggled to give a second reason for the popularity of this type of building.
- Q.2 In (a) virtually all the candidates identified the blocks of flats correctly and used the passage quoted to score full marks in (b) and (c).
- Q.3 In (a) no one had a problem identifying the figures in the picture correctly, but a few thought that the object, which the student was holding, was a wax tablet. For part (c) not everyone realised that answers had to be based on evidence from the picture. Candidates therefore could write that there were no girls in the class, but not that the range of subjects taught was different.
- Q.4 Although there were some incorrect answers to (a), most candidates scored full marks for (b). They were generally able to score one mark for (c) by mentioning the shade the colonnades provided, but struggled to find a second reason. (d) was very well answered.

Section B

- Q.5 This was a very popular question. Candidates were asked to imagine they were a Roman businessman, who had moved into a new town house, but many failed to discuss where he would wish to live and what rooms of the house he would use in connection with his business. This was disappointing as guidelines for the answers had been given on the question paper. Many candidates simply gave a list of all the rooms in the house, whereas the best candidates, in addition to discussing the location of the house and the useful rooms, mentioned the need to impress guests and to show off wealth in the *atrium*.
- Q.6 This was probably the least popular question, but those who chose it wrote well about the activities going on in the forum. Once again many tended to give a list of the buildings there, sometimes listing five temples! As the question asked for an account from a Roman citizen, it was not appropriate to write from the point of view of a woman.
- Q.7 This was probably the least well answered question. There was confusion about the freedman's right to vote and those who chose to write as a freedwoman found it difficult to make many relevant comments.
- Q.8 This was quite a popular question and was very well answered by the abler candidates in particular, many of whom brought in references from Petronius' extravagant dinner party. Some however gave lists of food and different types of entertainment without considering the demands of the question.

Topic 2: Roman Britain

- Q.1 For (a), although the objects in the picture featured in the source material for Level 1, many candidates failed to identify them correctly and in (b) did not know what they were made of. (c) however generally produced the correct answer that Agricola was governor of Britain. Just a few referred to him as emperor.
- Q.2 (a) and (b) were both well answered.
- Q.3 In (a) most candidates named the two gods mentioned in the temple dedication and also answered (b) correctly. Some, in addition to citing Cogidubnus' three names, added that he had also taken the names of the emperor. (c) was generally well answered and most candidates had noted that they had to give evidence for a splendid building. It was insufficient just to say that it had mosaics and paintings. The best candidates included the audience chamber and grand entrance hall as well as details of the decoration and the Italian-style gardens as evidence of the owner's power and wealth.
- Q.4 Most candidates correctly gave Colchester as the answer to (a), and had no difficulty in gaining full marks for (b) and (c). Boudica's suicide was not always mentioned in (e), although most referred to her defeat by the Roman army.
- Q.5 In (a) there were plenty of correct answers for the distance people could travel by cart and many candidates also gained full marks for (b) and (c).

Section B

In this section there was some good personal response to all the questions, although the weaker candidates found it harder to imagine life in Roman Britain than those who imagined life in Pompeii in Topic 1.

- Q.6 Candidates wrote lively descriptions of the town of *Aquae Sulis*, answering both parts of the question in detail. There was a tendency however to concentrate on the spring and the baths with little mention of the temple. Most enjoyed warning prospective visitors about the curse tablets.
- Q.7 The standard of the answers to this question varied considerably. There were some mistakes from the weaker candidates in the choice of goods for import and export. The best candidates, however, gave some excellent answers, revealing a very good knowledge of the geography of Roman Britain. One travelled to Eboracum along Ermine Street with a load of wine and pottery.
- Q.8 This question also produced some good answers. Candidates frequently mentioned the brutal treatment of the Britons, their loss of independence and slavery. They noted that on the other hand the Roman built towns with many new amenities, but that by no means everyone benefited from these.
- Q.9 This question was fairly popular, but was probably the least well answered. Some candidates described a Roman town house instead of a country villa or wrote about villas that were clearly based on Fishbourne Palace, with an audience chamber and a grand entrance hall. Candidates did not always focus on the question, which asked them to consider how comfortable the villa was to live and work in and what worries they had. The best answers included references to heating and baths and mentioned problems with the weather, crops, and uncooperative slaves.

Conclusion

Centres are to be commended once again this year on the high standard achieved by the candidates. The answers showed a strong personal response and there were some lively and imaginative accounts of life in Rome, Pompeii and Roman Britain. Candidates had been well prepared for both topics and had clearly enjoyed studying them.

LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2016

UNIT 9522

General comments

The standard achieved this summer was once again extremely pleasing. Candidates had been well prepared for the examination and many made reference to Latin writers such as Petronius, Ovid and Martial.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society was much more popular than Topic 2: Roman Britain, but there were some excellent answers to both topics.

There were very few rubric infringements indeed this year, which was pleasing, and in general candidates' work was very well presented. In some cases however legibility and spelling still caused problems for the examiners. Candidates should be reminded that they can lose marks if their writing is illegible.

Topic 1: Daily Life in Roman Society

- Q.1 (a) was generally well answered but in (b) a few candidates thought that *stili* were pens and were dipped in ink. In (c) they then wrote about wax tablets. (d) was invariably well answered and candidates covered a wide range of points.
- Q.2 In (a) most candidates gained full marks. (b) was well answered by the best candidates but a surprising number made no mention of a freedman's right to vote in elections or the fact that he became a citizen with three names. Some even said that he could not vote, although his children could. There was further confusion between freedmen and clients. Many candidates assumed that freedmen automatically became clients and listed the duties they had to perform for their former masters.
- Q.3 (a) was very well answered and a pleasing number of candidates gave the correct spelling of *impluvium*. (b) and (c) were also well answered but (d) was often misread and some candidates omitted to concentrate on the design of the house and wrote at length about the furnishings and decoration. The best candidates mentioned that the design of the Roman house, with its few high windows, was suited to the hot Mediterranean climate, keeping the house cool in summer and warm in winter. This was in contrast to a modern house which has larger windows and often central heating.

Most candidates mentioned that another major difference between a Roman and a modern house was the fact that in a Roman house the garden was enclosed within the walls of the house.

- Q.4 (a) was not particularly well done. Among the weaker candidates there was a wide variety in the number of aediles given, but (b) was generally well answered. In (c) most candidates gained one mark for mentioning fame or power as a motive for standing for election, but some struggled to get the second mark.

- Q.5 In (a) almost everyone gained one mark by mentioning the slaves' role as entertainers at a dinner party. However, it was not enough simply to give two types of entertainment such as singing and dancing. For full marks candidates had to give another different part the slaves played. There was a real range of responses to (b), which proved a very good discriminator. Most mentioned the food, entertainment, the social aspect and reclining to eat, but not always with much detail. The weaker candidates tended to focus on the more unpleasant side of such parties, such as vomiting to make room for more food. There were excellent answers from the best candidates, who gave details of the food served for the three courses of the meal and the quality of the wine. One candidate wrote a very good account of dinner at Pliny's house and another mentioned his reference to different grades of food and wine for different classes of guest.

Topic 2: Roman Britain

- Q.1 Candidates generally gained good marks for (a), although some concentrated on the cracks between the paving stones, which they saw as faults. Most however cited the difference in surfaces and the fact that most Roman roads were straight as important differences. Those who mentioned drainage and kerbstones overlooked the fact that many modern roads have both of these features. (b) and (c) proved very straightforward questions where many candidates were able to score full marks. (d) proved a good discriminator, as the weaker candidates did not always manage to include the difficulties of travel in Roman Britain as well as the dangers. There were some very good answers from the better candidates on the problems and dangers of travel by sea. A few candidates did not read the question carefully and wrote about journeys to Britain from the continent.
- Q.2 Virtually everyone who did this question gave the correct answer to (a) and used the correct spelling. Most candidates achieved at least one mark for (b) but there was a real mixture of answers to (c). The best candidates mentioned Agricola's achievements as governor and quoted Tacitus' comments on the conquest of Britain. The question required candidates to discuss the downsides of the Roman occupation, such as slavery, brutal treatment and taxes, as well as its advantages for the Britons. If they failed to do this, they were unable to score marks in the top band.
- Q.3 (a) Most candidates could locate the baths and the entrance to the palace on the plan, but the guest quarters were more elusive. Some hedged their bets and ticked multiple boxes! (b) proved a good discriminator, as it required the candidates to focus on the archaeological finds and to link these to the importance and wealth of the owner. There were some excellent answers from candidates who commented on the audience chamber as evidence for the former and the variety and origin of the materials used in the palace decoration for the latter.
- Q.4 (a)-(c) were all well answered, although (b) contained a few unlikely answers such as coins and jewellery. One candidate in answering (c) commented on the difficulty of cleaning the amphorae, a point mentioned by Mary Beard in her latest book.
- Q.5 (a) and (b) were both well answered. (c) was probably the least well answered question on this topic. Many candidates treated it as an extension of the previous question and gave reasons for choosing the site for a villa. There were, however, some good answers from the best candidates, who mentioned the cold weather, the problems with slaves and the need to find a good bailiff, who would be responsible for organising the villa, particularly in the absence of the owner.

Conclusion

Candidates are to be congratulated on the high standard of their answers this year. It was pleasing to see many references to Latin writers such as Ovid, Martial, Petronius and Tacitus in the answers to the longer questions. Candidates responded strongly to the issues raised in these questions, which provided good differentiation between the weaker and the stronger candidates.

LEVEL 1 & LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2016

UNITS 9513 & 9523

General comments

Candidates submitted a pleasingly wide range of interesting titles for Roman Civilisation Controlled Assessment. They had clearly made the most of the material at their disposal and the essays at both levels generally reached a very high standard.

In their essays candidates included such varied topics as the extent to which the Romans had a liberal attitude to prostitution, a comparison between the fairness of the Roman justice system and modern British law courts, the influence of Roman architecture on British architecture and the differences and similarities between Roman medicine and modern medicine. Many of these accounts were a pleasure to read.

There were many excellent comparisons between Roman and modern society. Candidates need to remember, however, to give roughly equal weight to both parts of the comparison, if they are to gain good marks for evaluation. They also need to make sure that the comparisons are appropriate. Chariot racing and gladiator fights, for example, should be compared to similar modern sports such as Formula One racing and boxing respectively.

It is pleasing to record that this year a majority of candidates submitted a well-presented A4 sheet containing primary source material, notes and an essay plan. This material should be on a single sheet, which is all candidates should have with them when they are writing their assignment. They should not have access to the internet or any storage facility. 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. Teachers can view exemplar material of Roman Civilisation Controlled Assessment, including a good A4 sheet, on the WJEC secure website.

This year scripts were generally very well presented, apart from one or two which were handwritten and untidy. It always helps the moderation process if scripts are either word processed or hand written clearly and legibly in ink. It is also appreciated when candidates observe the recommended word count for each level and record this at the end of their assignment. One or two essays were far too long.

Candidates should also be reminded to keep to the title they have chosen for their work. Several candidates gave a title about life in Rome and then gave source material from Pompeii or chose to write about gladiators and then switched to the theatre.

Conclusion

All teachers wrote helpful supporting comments on their candidates' work, based on the assessment criteria, and they generally placed candidates in the correct rank order. They allocated marks from the correct band for factual knowledge and personal response, but it was often clear, however, that some teachers were too generous when awarding marks for the selection and use of primary sources. To gain marks in the top band for AC3 a candidate should include a good selection of appropriate 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 overall standard of the work was once again very pleasing. Candidates had clearly enjoyed researching their chosen topics. They incorporated a wide range of primary sources into their essays and gave a strong personal response to all the issues raised by the subject matter. This 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 2016

UNIT 9514

General Comments

The standard, as in previous years, was extremely high, with just a small percentage of candidates clearly unprepared for the examination. Apart from these few, all followed the storyline to the end, with occasional lapses in the middle. A surprising number of candidates, including many very good ones, started off by using the present tense for the verbs in the past narrative; marks were lost for this each time; fortunately all sooner or later switched to the past tense, without it occurring to them that this created an anomaly. A few candidates seemed unable periodically to disentangle the Latin word order, and wrote down the English meanings for each word in the order it appeared.

A very frequent phenomenon was the confusion of *cena* and *cibus*, both of which occurred frequently in the passage. When the passage was being composed, care was taken to ensure that the context made clear which word was which the first time they appeared. As a result, all candidates got these first occurrences right. Unfortunately very many subsequently ignored the Latin words and wrote 'dinner' or 'food' indiscriminately. Since the Mark Scheme was very generous, it was decided to penalise each wrong translation of these words; the alternative would have been to allow carelessness to go unpenalised, which would not have been fair to the many candidates who took care to get these words right. As a result, some candidates lost up to two marks out of 50 for this error.

Comments on individual sections

Felix erat coquus. dominus Felicis erat Cornelius.

This was nearly always correct.

'Felix!' Cornelius clamavit. hodie homines notissimos ad cenam invitavi.

Some omitted *hodie*. The commonest error, however, was the omission of the superlative.

'necesse est tibi multum cibum parare. bonam cenam habere volo.'

Some did not know *habere*. Many wrote 'good food' (see above).

Felix erat anxius, quod difficile erat domino placere.

Most translated this correctly.

Cornelius, qui erat homo crudelis, Felicem saepe vituperabat.

Many omitted *qui*. Many confused *saepe* with *semper*.

etiam uxorem Cornelius terrebat.

This was the first sentence that caused real difficulties for the majority of candidates. It was the word order that confused them, with the object preceding the subject. There was also much confusion between *terreo* and *timeo*.

Felix dominam conspexit in atrio sedentem.

More than half the candidates failed to note the feminine ending on *dominam*. The participle was handled well.

illa, simulac coquum vidit, eum ad tabernas cum multa pecunia misit.

Only the strongest candidates could make anything of *illa*. Many did not know *simulac* or *misit*. Most made *tabernas* singular. Weaker candidates did not understand *eum*.

Felix multum cibum portans ad domum lente rediit. statim cenam parare coepit.

Very many candidates could not cope with this participle; mostly it was made the main verb. Similar numbers did not recognise *rediit*, often omitting it. A large number gave 'to his master' for *ad domum*. Many did not know *statim*.

postquam amici advenerunt, Cornelius servum ad culinam misit.

A significant number made *amici* singular. Many had to guess *misit*.

'dominus cenam nunc expectat,' servus Felici dixit. festinare debes.'

Many did not recognise the dative ending on *Felici*, giving 'the slave Felix said'. Some confusion was caused by *debes*.

sed cena nondum parata erat.

Apart from *cena*, this was generally correct.

ubi Felix tandem cibum in triclinium tulit, Cornelius erat iratissimus.

Many did not know *ubi*, usually giving 'then'. Some did not know *tulit*. Most noted the superlative.

'tu in culinam redi,' coquo inquit. 'ego te punire debeo.'

Many, ignoring logic, wrote 'the cook said'. Again *debeo* caused some difficulties.

Felix in culina manebat perterritus.

Most translated this correctly.

ubi dominus tandem culinam intravit, coquum non vituperavit sed laudavit.

Many confused *tandem* with *tamen*. The rest was translated well.

'tu bene fecisti,' inquit ridens. 'cena fuit optima.'

Some did not know *fecisti* or *ridens*. Many had to guess *fuit*. Many failed to reproduce the superlative.

Conclusion

The above comments have focused on errors and weaknesses. In reality most candidates maintained a high level of accuracy.

LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2016

UNIT 9524

General Comments

There was little difference between the comprehension and the translation in terms of difficulty. In the comprehension it was an inability to fit the words together to give a sensible storyline that cost most marks. In the translation it was mostly vocabulary deficiencies, particularly in relation to words in the additional list, that caused most marks to be lost.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 (a+b) all but the very weakest candidates answered both questions correctly.
- (c) (i) although nearly all candidates knew the meanings of the relevant words (*erat inter milites Graecos fortissimus*), only the strongest could make sense out of them. Common were 'he was between very famous Greek soldiers', 'he was the bravest soldier among the Greeks' and 'he was a very brave Greek soldier'.
- (ii) because *maledixerat* was glossed, candidates could only score a mark if they included *valde*, which many failed to do. There was also some confusion about who had insulted whom.
- (d) there was the perennial confusion between *pugno* and *oppugno*, for both of which translations must be precise to gain the mark. The third mark was for *in loco tuo*, which many failed to understand or omitted entirely.
- (e) few candidates gained all 4 marks here, because of omissions or lack of precision. Most grasped that the plan was for Patroclus to wear Achilles' armour; however care was not always taken to indicate which character was which: 'he would wear his armour' was not clear enough to gain the mark. Most failed to recognise and reproduce the future tense in *agnoscent*. Many omitted *putabunt*. Most managed to express the switch of characters indicated by *me non te pugnare* to get the fourth mark.
- (f) vocabulary deficiencies led to some wildly inaccurate answers here, or induced many to resort to vague generalisations instead of focusing on the Latin of the lemma.
- Q.2 *Achilles, qui timebat ne amicus necaretur, eum e castris proficiscentem invitus spectabat.*

Most began well, recognising the fearing clause; only the weakest took *ne* as a negative. The difficulty was identifying *eum* as the object of *spectabat*, which only the best could do. Most recognised the present participle, but many made it agree with *Achilles*.

Patroclus contra Troianos impetum fortiter fecit plurimosque occidit.

Few understood *impetum fecit* ('fought against' was the most usual rendering). Most placed *-que* correctly. Most omitted the superlative.

Troiani, cum eum Achillem esse crederent, ad urbem suam fugerunt perterriti.

Most handled the *cum* clause and embedded indirect statement competently. Many omitted *suam*.

Patroclus eos acriter secutus est, ceteros Graecos hortans ut secum contenderent.

A common pair of errors here was to convert *secutus est* into a participle and *hortans* into a main verb. Most knew *hortor* (only a few gardens appeared). Many did not know *secum*. Many treated the indirect command as if it were a purpose clause.

'hostes in urbem regressi sunt,' magna voce clamavit.

Many treated *regressi sunt* as present. Probably the single most common error in the translation was 'a great voice shouted', ignoring the ablative.

'nunc finem belli facere possumus. muros urbis oppugnate!'

Despite the clarity of the single gloss, many took *finem* to be a verb. Many made *muros* singular.

Patroclus ex omnibus Graecis fuit ille qui primus muros ascendere conatus est.

Most candidates made a very good attempt at this complex sentence, with the simplified but correct 'was the first to...' appearing with pleasing frequency.

tam fortis erat ut paene ad summum murum ascenderet.

Most coped well with this, though a large minority did not know *tam* or its role in introducing a result clause. Some did not know *paene*.

de muro tamen a Troianis deiectus, hasta necatus est.

This proved more difficult than the neighbouring sentences. Very many thought the spear rather than Patroclus was thrown down. Many made *hasta necatus est* active, which was given full credit if done correctly.

Achilles, ubi ei nuntiatum est amicum mortuum esse, et iratissimus et tristissimus erat.

Most handled this remarkably well, with even quite weak candidates gaining nearly all the marks. The commonest error was the omission of *ei* and the first *et* ('both'), often the only two mistakes made in the section. Nearly all noted the superlatives.

Conclusion

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



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