

LATIN

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 15	16 - 32	33 - 45	46 - 57	58 - 68	69 - 80	81 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 45	46 - 58	59 - 71	72 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 17	18 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The choice of topics was excellent and broad, covering literature, history and social conditions. Teachers should be commended on encouraging their students to choose such a satisfactory variety of topics.

Candidate performance against each criterion

The performance against criterion A was excellent throughout this session's candidates, as was the performance against criterion B, where most attracted excellent marks, though, it has to be said, at least one candidate presented a rather thin argument. It is important that the arguments presented are strong enough, so they can be reasonably substantiated.

The performance against criterion C was universally good.

The performance against criterion D was generally excellent, but in some cases there seemed to be a lack of real engagement between the candidate and the topic chosen. It is important to remind the candidates that they should choose a topic they find particularly

interesting and hopefully engaging, otherwise, the resulting work will certainly reflect this detachment.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

In general, it is clear that the great majority of teachers are doing a good job.

It is recommended that the teachers try to guide their students towards more controversial topics, thus allowing the candidates the opportunity to come up with interesting arguments that can, in turn, be sustained by appropriate and varied sources.

It is also recommended that the students are asked to show and analyse the evidence to support their arguments. What is not required is a simple rehearsal of narrative.

Further comments

All the above comments apply only to the Research Dossier option; no candidate attempted the composition option and only one candidate presented the oral option. The effect was generally acceptable but the accents did defeat the candidate in spite of the spirited defence mounted on behalf of the strategy followed.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 16	17 - 22	23 - 27	28 - 33	34 - 40

General comments

There was a spread of performance in answers to this paper.

Though there is no undertaking to limit set passages to straightforward narrative in future, it will be borne in mind that rhetorical features in the Manlius passage were a challenge even to the best candidates, and were a substantial obstacle to less accomplished students.

The Latin dictionary is not as easy to use as many candidates seemed to think. Far too many candidates, with very little knowledge of accidence, selected the wrong word; of those who selected the correct word very many immediately took the first meaning offered, however unsuitable. More lessons devoted entirely to developing dictionary skills would bring disproportionate benefits.

The supplementary questions were generally answered quite well.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

neque imperium consulare neque maiestatem patriam veritus presented opportunities to go wrong, especially to candidates who thought the one thing they knew for sure was that *patria*

= 'fatherland', and so gave 'you did not fear the majestic fatherland' or something similar. Taking *consulare* as an infinitive could enrich the mix, and lead to 'you were not afraid either to take account of power or the majestic fatherland'.

'contrary to our command, you fought outside the line against the enemy' was more or less reliably got by all except the weakest.

quantum in te fuit, 'as far as lay in you', most managed to get.

disciplinam militarem, qua stetit ad hanc diem Romana res, solvisti proved problematic, especially the phrase between commas. Getting *disciplinam militarem ... solvisti* as 'you overthrew military discipline' required concentration, though stronger candidates might find a good word, such as 'undermined' or 'subverted'. It's good to note that a number of candidates make an effort to go past literal or 'minimally' correct translating—though full marks are available for a correct and literal translation. Two difficulties militated against understanding of the phrase between commas: first, failure to make sense of *Romana res* as equivalent to *Romana res publica* ('Roman state'/'Roman republic'), and second, failure to recognise *qua* as ablative, 'by which'. Comparatively few were able to end up with 'by which the Roman state has stood [firm] to this day'. A typical partial attempt would be, 'You overthrew military discipline, which stood as a Roman thing until this day.'

Teachers might with profit tell their classes of the Romans' admiration for Fabius Maximus: *unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem. Res publica* may be simply *res*. It was a cardinal concept, in the republican days.

'You brought me to this necessity: ...': stilted as it sounds, this was usually well understood. The periodic structure of the following bit (to wit the necessity that *either* this *or* that should happen) lost some otherwise capable candidates.

Most figured out that *obliviscendum sit* was a gerundive of obligation, to do with someone having to forget something or someone. But the role of *mihi* was not always spotted, so that some got 'the state must forget me and my people', *vel sim*.

plectemur, 'let us be punished', was not well done. Those who figured out that it was the main verb often took it as a simple future ('we will be punished'): doing so was perhaps a venial sin. Here again the complex coding of the text ('let us be punished for our transgression, rather than that the state should make up for our sins at such a great cost to itself') was sufficient to cause weaker candidates to lose track of the train of thought.

salubre iuventuti too often came out as 'healthy youth'.

cum ingenita caritas liberum tum specimen istud virtutis proved difficult for nearly all students on account of *cum ... tum ...* ('not only ... but also ...'). Only a very few did not try to use some combination of 'when' and 'then', or even 'with' and 'then' ('With my inborn love of children ...', *vel sim*).

The paradox *specimen istud virtutis deceptum vana imagine decoris* was too much for most to handle. To some degree there was a dictionary trap here: a number took *decus* as 'beauty' rather than 'honourable conduct', so missing the point of 'an empty image of honourable conduct'.

me ... in te movet 'sways me in your favour' proved very difficult to spot.

sed cum ... abroganda was one of the easier parts of the passage.

Few students were familiar with *ne quidem* ('not even'), and the negative in *nec te quidem recusare censeam* put off even the few who might have navigated this passage safely. Only one or two of the whole cohort managed 'And I wouldn't think even you would refuse ...'. This was the most difficult sentence on the page.

si quid in te nostri sanguinis est: most got the idea that 'our blood' = 'my blood', but many ended up with 'if what is in you is my blood', which misses *si quid* = 'if any'.

Nearly all, even weaker candidates, managed to end triumphantly with, 'Go, lictor, tie him to a stake!'

Question 2: it is not accepted that an ability to comment on the emotional weight conveyed by *imperium* and the other words listed requires 'knowledge of Roman society and history beyond the syllabus'. Learning Latin ought to involve learning about qualities and ideas which were important to the Romans. *fides* (not mentioned on this occasion) would be a particularly clear example; and *res publica* is not far behind in importance to the Romans' way of thinking.

An apology is extended for the misprint in question 3.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Students who knew *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and the *triste lupus stabulis* incident in that book might have been at lesser risk of getting *triste exemplum iuventuti ... erimus* wrong.

Somewhere in several years of Latin studies, I'd also hope a student would have a chance to reflect on the differing connotations of words for 'power', e.g. *potestas*, *potentia*, *dominatus*, *imperium*. In the case of question 2, most students managed a comment which was sufficient.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 18	19 - 22	23 - 26	27 - 30	31 - 40

General comments

Section A

It was observed overall that the standard of prepared translation was not as good as might have been expected. Students have studied the set works in class and received the benefit of expert support from teachers: it should be expected that prepared translation would usually be a matter of cashing in marks which cannot be lost except by culpable negligence. And yet some students, a minority, seemed virtually to be tackling the translations as if they

were unseen; larger numbers had done memory work imperfectly and ended with one or two marks out of three.

Section B

Where a critic is quoted in a question, there is little or no expectation that candidates will have read the work quoted, though occasionally a quotation may come from an edition used in schools. Possible difficulties relating to 'subtle prose' and international candidates are noted, but it might be said in defence of the questions that the aim is to open out a field of thought. So in 10

'The language of the satires is the language of a poor and disappointed man' (J.D. Duff). Is this a perceptive comment?

... the intention is to make it possible for a candidate to gain credit for saying almost anything which relates to 'Was Juvenal a poor man?' or 'Was Juvenal bitter?'. 'Language' is a key term, and ought to give the candidate a cue to quote, perhaps preferably in Latin, from Juvenal in the essay.

Concerns raised about 'discuss' and 'comment' are noted and will be considered further. A literary education cannot be evaluated on the basis of wholly convergent questioning, so that while the possible helpfulness of reminding candidates to refer to texts in their answers is acknowledged, there will be continuing efforts to resist any move to a situation in which questions call for cut-and-dried responses; nor will it be sufficient any time soon to write an essay which consists wholly or mainly of plot summary. The quotation from Brooks Otis was used in the hope of provoking students to consider what might be special about an *Augustan* hero (Is such a person, for instance, axiomatically the same as a *Roman* hero?), and steering them away from an essay plan which runs:

- *pietas*
- *furor*
- character of Aeneas
- conclusion: 'Aeneas was an Augustan hero'

... for which only partial credit is available.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Virgil

A

The contextual questions were well done on the whole. The question (iii) calling for identification and comment on the effect of two verbs elicited sensible, but not often sophisticated, answers: the marks were given easily. Most candidates managed to show some comprehension and response, as also in (i), but differentiation between stronger and weaker candidates was achieved mainly on questions (ii) and (iv), translation and scansion.

B

This was handled less confidently than A, and those who chose just one Virgil question usually preferred A. Perhaps the reason was that A comes from earlier in the work. (i) was usually answered correctly; (ii) tripped some candidates up: note that scansion is marked for quantities only, but there is one mark per line (the examiners are not allowed to use halves) and a single mistake in quantities will lose the mark for the line. (iii) Was marked liberally, since the answers involve a matter of judgement and opinion, and any sensible comment ('such and such a thing sounds menacing', *vel sim.*) received credit.

Tacitus

Very few candidates attempted this set book.

Cicero**A**

This question was well answered. Surprisingly few used the words *optimates (boni)* or *populares* in (iv), but full marks were available for saying that Catiline and Cicero were personal enemies, and/or that they were on opposite sides in politics. (i) and (iii) were both answered particularly well by most candidates.

B

This question, too, was well answered: many of the best students in the examination had been prepared to answer on the Cicero set book.

Love poetry**A**

(i) Was usually well done, though occasionally a candidate failed to get *plorares* 'you would be sorry for'. Nearly all understood (ii) that the speaker is imagined as being outside the lady's door, in the rain, hoping to be let in (to enjoy the pleasures of love).

It is acknowledged that (iii) is an awkward question. Most candidates knew that Penelope was a self-controlled lady who successfully resisted suitors' advances, and scored something for knowing this; fewer knew that Etruscan fathers were proverbially over-indulgent, and therefore presumably unlikely to bring up their daughters to imitate Penelope's moral qualities.

(iv) Could be asked without the quotation from Gordon Williams (e.g. 'Comment on the role of irony and humour in this poem'). The purpose of quoting the critic is to give the student something to think about and point him/her in a relevant direction. The aim is to avoid the dangers of, as it were, 'starting from cold'.

B

Well answered on the whole. Most students got a fully correct answer to (i). (ii) and (iii) fitted the patterns already referred to in connection with prepared translation and scansion.

The idea that (iv) is 'ambiguous and confusing' is accepted in part. The aim was to avoid prissiness while calling for discussion of the interface between fear of daughters having sex before marriage and delight at daughters entering on the happiness and support which marriage can bring. In defence of the question it can be said, first, that the intention was to be open-ended (with the result that certain convergent wordings would not be suitable); and second, that marks were available for arguing in either direction, e.g:

'These lines, supposedly celebrating a marriage, are really all about anxiety: the poet raises the spectre of no one wanting a girl who has lost her virginity (*nulli ... pueri, nullae optavere puellae*). The great thing about a wedding day, then, is that it is the day when parents can stop worrying about that.'

or

'The theme of these lines is the way marriage makes a girl's life productive, and the way she and her husband can support each other like a vine and an elm tree. 'An equal marriage undertaken at the right time' (line 57) sums up the thought of these two stanzas, and is more important than the fears evident in the 'what if' parts of them.

Both these (synthetic) answers would get 3 marks.

Juvenal

A

(i) Well answered; (iii) surprisingly intelligently dealt with. Asking candidates to reflect on an emendation was challenging, and many rose to the occasion well. The misprint ('amending' for 'emending') is regretted, but does not seem to have misled candidates.

B

(i) well done on the whole, but the question provoked too much narrative recapitulation from some candidates.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 18	19 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 40

General comments

With occasional honourable exceptions, this paper was poorly done.

It is not accepted that the usage of 'chicks' as meaning 'women' would be likely to be unfamiliar to English learners at the level appropriate to this exam. See below from the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*:

“**chick** (WOMAN) Show phonetics
noun [C] SLANG

a young woman. This word is considered offensive by many women.”

In view of this entry, however, concerns raised since the exam about offensiveness are acknowledged as justified and an apology is offered.

There is some substance to the idea that the translated sections were not helpful, especially in stylistic terms. Careful thought went into deciding what translation to use and several possibilities were considered. The eventual decision went in favour of something which errs on the literal side: it would perhaps have been better to use a more poetic version.

Dictionary skills were mentioned in last year’s report, and merit further discussion on this occasion. An important dictionary skill is the skill of *not* always choosing the first meaning given, and if necessary searching through an entry until a meaning is found which makes sense. In the case of *consultus*, note that ‘learned barristers’ is in the heading. In view of the international dimension, ‘attorneys’ might have been a better choice.

Another dictionary skill is the skill of not trying to use a dictionary instead of Latin grammar. In the last couplet it says *hic invenies quod ames, quod ludere possis* and a good number of students began by looking up *ames* in a dictionary. They found *ames*, a forked pole [for supporting bird nets]. Thinking, then, that the one thing they knew for sure about the clause was that *ames* means ‘a forked pole’, they cast aside some half-remembered Latin grammar and rearranged to rest to get in the forked pole, e.g: ‘Because here you find a forked pole, because you can play’.

On reflection, a comment received about the passage chosen being alien to the style of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Amores* is dissented from. Its special feature, if it has one, lies in the degree to which it is about everyday life in Rome (the temple of Venus being next to the court, etcetera), but on balance it is a passage of no special difficulty. Every couplet is end-stopped.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Legal vocabulary did prove to be a challenge for some, but simpler matters were more than equally problematic. Relative plus subjunctive, especially in the last couplet, was something to which many candidates were not equal, showing no conception of *quod* as a word which might not mean ‘because’. *fertiora* few got as ‘more fertile’: this seems to suggest that they looked up *fertil-* in the dictionary, got ‘fertile’ (OK so far) but then failed to think about comparative adjectives.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

See above on dictionary skills.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 18	19 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 40

General comments

Section A

Similar observations to those made above about the Higher Level set texts exam apply to Standard level in the cases of prepared translation and scansion. Briefly:

- Students ought to remember prepared translation in detail and with precision, and will lose marks when they do not. As a general principle, in unseen translation, a candidate will score something for anything s/he gets right (unless completely trivial); but in prepared translation, a candidate will lose something for anything s/he gets wrong (and can score zero despite having got a partially correct answer). The justification for this is that students have had the opportunity to study the set texts in detail and over a period of time.
- One mark per line is available for scansion, which is marked on quantities only. If one quantity is wrong in a line, the mark is not scored.

Teachers of standard level students have selected for the most part the Virgil and Love Poetry set texts. No doubt these choices put some of the very best things in Latin literature before students, but teachers might bear in mind that popular set texts are not necessarily also easy. While not hinting that others are easier, the present writer commends to teachers the thought that further reflection on choice of set texts may be called for from time to time, and that other authors may prove to be equally rewarding.

Section B

6 proved to be a poorly judged question, provoking answers which were usually only plot summary (for which only partial credit was available).

9 was answered better, provoking students to define what Horace's 'limited but central field' might be, and usually eliciting answers which were well related to particular texts.

In the case of 10, the few who attempted it usually played safe by focusing on some examples of pictures of external life: the implicit invitation to illustrate what might be wrong with Juvenal's depiction of character (or to contradict and say how great his character-drawing is) was declined.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Knowing prepared translations to the necessary standard.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Virgil

A

There was an element of inadvertence in setting a passage which overlapped with a 2006 selection, and an apology is offered. This having been said, candidates must expect to be tested on any part of the set work, and ought not to treat recently examined passages as being off limits.

(iii), calling for comment on the tenses of verbs, was very poorly answered. It is not probable that this style of grammatical question will appear again any time soon.

B

(ii) proved to be a useful question, eliciting the right name from most (though not all), but also exposing misconceptions on some candidates' part about what is happening in lines 383-5.

Tacitus

The Tacitus set book proved not to be at all popular with students and their teachers.

Cicero

Comparatively few attempted the Cicero questions, though those who did proved to be among the better candidates.

A

This question was well answered, except that the translation tripped some students up.

B

This question was chosen by fewer candidates, and perhaps (ii) and (iii) are demanding questions. The very small number who attempted the question, managed it well.

Love Poetry

A

Barely a candidate knew the story of how Bellerophon succeeded in riding Pegasus. The mark scheme suggested that an answer as brief as 'divine help' should get one mark out of two, but even that was beyond candidates' reach.

If quotations from critics were being eliminated (there is no undertaking at present to eliminate them), (iv) might have read 'What words and phrases in the fourth stanza reveal the speaker's inner anxieties?' The answers hoped for would have been:

- *non ... posthac alia calebo femina*: you are the last woman I'm ever going to fall in love with
- *minuentur atrae ... curae*: my (/our [?]) dark worries will be reduced

These are essentially also the answers which were wanted this time. But few candidates appeared to read the poem as revealing the speaker as anything but a confident cheerful seducer with some persuasive ideas.

B

Fewer candidates than expected said that *foedus amicitiae* ('treaty of friendship') sounded formal and diplomatic, or that *foedus* strikes an unusual note when applied to lovers.

Many, however, noted under (iv) that something is perhaps not right when the speaker prays to the great gods to make the lady whom he is addressing capable of telling the truth and speaking sincerely. The verdict on question (iv) was split more or less evenly, which is perhaps evidence that many candidates (say, half) retain the optimism of youth. Others read the whole thing as cynical: a view for which a case can be made, though it was perhaps disappointing that no one introduced the idea of what might be called 'hoping against hope'—writing without cynical intent, but with almost full awareness that optimism is unjustified.

Juvenal**A**

Few attempted this question.

B

This one was the choice of those who had prepared the Juvenal set text. (ii) attempts to get candidates to identify and comment on ideas: outcomes varied. A fair number managed to comment on kingship as an idea which struck a hollow note for Romans, though fewer than hoped drew attention to the contrasting idea of 'a free man'. The idea of nakedness (*quis enim tam nudus, ut illum bis ferat?*) mostly went unremarked. (iv) was done adequately for the most part.