

LATIN

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 14 | 15 - 31 | 32 - 45 | 46 - 56 | 57 - 68 | 69 - 79 | 80 - 100 |

Standard level

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 8 | 9 - 19 | 20 - 30 | 31 - 43 | 44 - 54 | 55 - 67 | 68 - 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

In the case of Research dossiers, the best pieces of work had precisely articulated and relatively narrow questions, which could be answered from Latin sources, and without too many imponderables being thrown up. It is worth noting, however, that some topics look from page 1 as if they won't lead to happy results. For example: "Death and dying in ancient Rome" is too broad and no precise question for research is being asked. Other examples, such as: "An exploration into how Homer and Virgil use similes to create threatening atmospheres within the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad*" is better idea, but again worryingly broad. Some texts could be discussed here, but the balance between the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* in a piece of work like this is likely to be tipped too far towards the *Iliad* for a Latin assignment. The use of evidence and sources also requires good attention to detail: in one assignment a Latin tombstone was illustrated, which is a good idea, but then neither provenance nor text and translation were given even though this was a Latin assignment, later in the same assignment a cinerary urn, was shown again a good idea, but insufficient research had been undertaken and it appeared to be Greek not Roman.

Choosing an ideal topic will not by itself, however, ensure 20 out of 20 and the student then has to go forth and actually do good work, Showing, as illustrated above, close attention to detail and ensuring they focus on Latin texts as the basis for the assignment.

The strengths and weaknesses of the work submitted

Internal assessments were completed to a very good standard in many centres. Research dossiers (Option A) tended to be the favoured option for most centres but it was pleasing also to see a number of centres undertaking prose and verse composition (Option B). In 2009, fewer schools attempted the oral presentation (Option C) – perhaps a surprising outcome; however, given the small candidature, fluctuations in the take up of the different IA Options offered may occur without much significance.

Research dossier

Research dossiers are well suited to bringing out the candidate's curiosity and organizational ability. The best dossiers are a pleasure to read and make excellent use of ancient evidence. However, there seemed to be the temptation in some cases to turn the dossier into little essays instead of responding directly to ancient sources collected, with a definite question in mind. Students should be warned against copying in pictures without commenting on them and their provenance. Many relevant pictures are easily available, although the beauty of medieval and modern paintings can be a snare - they are very far from being primary sources. Even more importantly, pictures almost never 'speak for themselves'. Someone who (for example) uses a carved tombstone showing a teacher sitting teaching two boys, holding a book roll, must *write down* what the image shows about what a Roman school was like.

Composition

Many compositions end up as worthwhile pieces of writing. The best compositions create a sense of occasion and convey a powerful sense of the original; even though they are challenging, demanding an accurate grasp of syntax on the part of the student.

Oral presentation

A danger in the case of the oral presentation is that of giving in the written commentary explanations which are not reflected in the performance. If candidates state that, for example, 'emphasis was placed on line x,' this emphasis should be audible on the tape; *wanting* to emphasize something isn't enough by itself. Some of the oral performances sounded as if they had not been rehearsed sufficiently.

Candidates should be reminded that internal assessment contributes 20% to the final assessment. This weighting should be reflected in the time that is spent preparing for the presentation; rehearsing extensively may be necessary for candidates to be at ease with the text read, and sound as if they are well familiar with it.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 5 | 6 - 11 | 12 - 17 | 18 - 22 | 23 - 28 | 29 - 33 | 34 - 40 |

General comments

There was a spread of performance in answers; but really poor work was relatively rare this session.

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

Question 1

This narrative passage is full of features of interest: image versus reality, paradox versus naive interpretation. It looked as if Philip had everything an elderly king could want, but really he didn't. It looked as if Perseus' friends were mad to be pleased about losing the mock battle, but in reality they were shrewd. It demands thoughtful and concentrated examination by the student to realise its potential.

A majority of students took *primo* as 'at first', and so got off on the wrong foot. As is so often the case, Livy's work provides an exercise in case usage: it was important to take *primo* with *agmini*: 'the front of the column'.

There is a second case usage issue in line 4: *omnium ... regum*. Having the genitive plurals separated by four words was a difficulty, which some students, though not a majority, were unable to handle. More than a few looked at *regum* and appeared to confuse it with *regnum*, and therefore wrote something like 'from the earliest origin of the kingdom of Macedonia'.

Lines 5 and the first half of 6 were well done: *deinde rex ipse cum liberis sequitur, proxima est regia cohors custodesque corporis, postremum agmen Macedonum cetera multitudo claudit*. A broad-minded attitude was taken to 'column of the Macedonians' versus 'remaining multitude of the Macedonians'.

A lot of help was given with *latera regis duo filii iuvenes cingebant*, and few students got it wrong.

Footnotes were also of help with the next line and a half: *Perseus iam tricesimum annum agens, Demetrius quinquennio minor, medio iuventae robore ille, hic flore*. It was pleasing to see that only a few wrote that Perseus was thirty: most managed to correctly translate as 'already in his thirtieth year' or 'aged twenty-nine'. Less encouraging was the candidates' handling of *ille* and *hic*—which, indeed, were more or less the only actual challenge to someone who had read and understood the footnotes. Although 'former' and 'latter' are not necessarily magic words, to gain the available marks, candidates were required to make clear which of Perseus and Demetrius was 'at the mid-point of his manly growth' and which was 'in the full flower of youth'.

si mens sana fuisset was well done by stronger candidates, though some who may have been thinking on the right lines ended up writing something which did not make the 'past unfulfilled' nature of the sentiment clear.

In lines 8-9 some candidates had difficulty with keeping the indirect statement going for a line and a half: 'The custom was ... *that* the army did (/would do) a military exercise, and *that* two battle-lines charged (/would charge) together for a simulation of a battle'. Candidates who had a general idea but were not among the best tended to simplify by using a finite verb at the back end of the sentence, thus writing something like 'When the purification ceremony was over, it was customary for the army to do a military exercise, and the lines, divided in two, charged together into an image of a battle'.

regii iuvenes duces ei ludicro certamini dati seemed to cause more trouble than it ought to.

ceterum = 'but': poorly known. This is (paradoxically) what might be called a 'dictionary trap', because a candidate in an exam where dictionaries are permitted *will not look it up because s/he thinks s/he knows it*, and it means 'the rest'.

tamquam de regno dimicaretur, ita concurrerunt, multaque vulnera rudibus facta was fairly well done., However, the next phrase left almost everyone bewildered: *nec praeter ferrum quicquam defuit ad iustam belli speciem*. Candidates also found '*quicquam*', 'and nothing,' challenging.

Most candidates were able to identify which side won the mock battle: *pars ea, quae sub Demetrio erat, longe superior fuit*. Most got the historic infinitive in the last line (though fewer knew what it was called, see 4 below).

Question 2: Most managed *ultima, proxima, postremum*, which were the superlatives which had made it into the markscheme.

Question 3: This proved to be challenging for many of the candidates.

Question 4: More got *laetari* than *concurrere*, but see above for the difficulty some students found in understanding *concurrere* as an infinitive: the theory that it was an ersatz 'finite' verb was at least consistent with translating it as '[and] they charged together'.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 6 | 7 - 13 | 14 - 17 | 18 - 21 | 22 - 25 | 26 - 29 | 30 - 40 |

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

Section A

1. Roman epic

(a)

- (i) Most managed this snippet of prepared translation, but more than one made some errors. It is very important for candidates to be aware that even though the text for translation is only two lines long, and is from a work they have studied in class, if they make any three mistakes they will score a zero, as one mark is deducted for each mistake.
- (ii) This is a question about presents and imperfects. A candidate will not score marks for merely identifying the tenses, but *misidentifying* them will make it impossible to earn any credit; and yet a number of candidates wrote about use of the future. Transition back to a past tense accounts for the second mark, but this is available only to those candidates who understood the basic idea.
- (iii) Without elision, these lines are about the easiest in Virgil to scan. Most, though not all candidates answered correctly. The only marked error seemed to be in scanning the first syllable of *miseros* long.
- (iv) Most candidates knew the story of the wooden horse, and Laocoon's part in it, sufficiently well to answer this question correctly.

2. Tacitus' presentation of imperial policy

Not many answered on this topic. Most candidates who did were well prepared.

(a)

- (i) Most were able to answer Vatinius and Beneventum.
- (ii) In the case of an 'open' (not 'closed') question of this sort, credit is given for an intelligible and well-expressed argument. There is a sense that some teachers sometimes seem nervous (on their students' behalf) of questioning of this kind, but candidates who has some Latin and are able to problem solve can usually score well. The important thing in a question such as this is to give reasons: neither 'yes' nor 'no' by itself received any credit as an answer to the last element in the question.
- (iii) Most understood what made Torquatus dangerous.
- (iv) Answers to this prepared translation question were generally of a good standard.

(b)

Option (b) was chosen by fewer candidates than (a): so few, indeed, that any comment which might be made would be insufficiently supported by data.

3. Cicero's political speeches

(a)

- (i) Most could explain Clodia's connections.
- (ii) The selection for translation was on the whole well done, though imprecision did cost some candidates marks—as it will, in the case of prepared translation.
- (iii) Most correctly identified this question as being about the gold, and could describe the arrangement sufficiently well to score.
- (iv) *nobilis* vs. *nota* brings matters into the land of fine distinctions, and students who understood and explained the fine distinctions mostly did well. However, there were occasional instances of candidates not grasping and/or explaining what was at issue.

(b)

- (i) Most managed to get both marks, but some wrote several lines before they closed in on the point that 'our ancestors also allowed this'.
- (ii) *factitatum* vs. *factum* and similar questions are designed to test students' ability to understand fine distinctions in meaning (cf. a iv) above), something to which the work of Cicero is well suited, and to be able to show what these distinctions are. By doing this, students are practicing skills which support close reading as opposed to surface reading.
- (iii) Nearly all candidates managed to get the three places.
- (iv) Most were able to grasp the basic idea of this prepared translation piece. However, all except the best candidates lost marks through imprecision.

4. Love poetry

This and Epic were the sections which got the (relatively) highest numbers of answers.

(a)

- (i) Surprisingly, only a few could translate this well-known four-line epigram without making three mistakes and so losing all the available marks. Line 3 appeared to present the most difficulty for candidates.
- (ii) Most candidates could select apposite words and phrases and comment on them relevantly.
- (iii) The paradox is that Catullus is *more* burnt up with love, while Lesbia is *less* valuable/less important to him.
- (iv) Many candidates floundered with the phrase *amantem iniuria* when attempting the scansion. Most knew that an elegiac couplet ends with a pentameter, but a minority attempted to scan both lines as hexameters.

(b)

- (i) This couplet proved particularly difficult to translate, and few candidates gave answers without losing one or more marks.
- (ii) This question was well answered: discussing a published translation in the light of the Latin text seemed to be an exercise in which most candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding.
- (iii) Practically all candidates understood the areas of special concern which these two gods were believed to have.
- (iv) Most understood that the poet lacked suitable subject matter for light verse (line 19); but not all who understood that point could add that a boy or a long-haired girl could furnish or be that subject-matter. Earlier, most saw the point that the poet had made a good start to page 1 of his epic.

5. Roman satire

(a)

- (i) Most candidates who attempted this topic were able to answer adequately on Crispus.
- (ii) Although this scansion question is only of a usual degree of difficulty, only a few managed to score two out of two. Teachers might consider giving their students more practice in scanning, since there are a predictable number of marks available for it. Once a student has had some practice, it is a purely mechanical exercise.
- (iii) There was a range of possible answers, and most candidates who attempted this question managed to find three relevant words/phrases to quote, and add worthwhile explanations.
- (iv) This piece of prepared translation was in most cases well done.

(b)

- (i) Nothing unusual to report about these lines for scansion.
- (ii) Most could answer this question correctly.
- (iii) Most knew that this cobbler was Vatinius, and that Nero had advanced him.
- (iv) This is a genuinely challenging piece for translation, and few managed a score of three out of three.

Section B

Question 6 was a relatively straightforward question, and the key to a good mark was being able to recall relevant material from all of Books 1, 2, 4 and 6. Books 2 and 4 are no doubt at the heart of a persuasive answer.

Question 7 was attempted by very few candidates.

Question 8 was capably done, though it did not provoke the kind of moral outrage that might have been expected against Cicero as the kind of ‘shyster’ who could talk a jury into believing black was white: this is probably all to the good, in that a number of mature analyses were on show.

Question 9 on the other hand, was rarely well done: those who attempted the question tended not to focus well on *language*, or draw the comparisons/contrasts between ‘spontaneous, conversational Latin’ and, for example, the words and tone of Virgil (or any Latin text the candidate has read which is not ‘spontaneous’ or ‘conversational’), which would have been the foundation of a good answer.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 4 | 5 - 9 | 10 - 14 | 15 - 19 | 20 - 23 | 24 - 28 | 29 - 40 |

General comments

High marks were rare for this paper: for instance, some students who scored highly for set texts scored considerably lower for the unseen translation. This particular selection, however, is not of unusual difficulty. As so often, case usage was the key to a number of doors which candidates had difficulty unlocking.

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

Candidates who had read and noted the translation of the lead-in passage (this was nearly all) knew that the poet was addressing his poetic lines. In line 5 a solution can be found provided that *vos*, *faciles* and *ministros* are all taken as being accusative and understood as the object of the sentence. Similarly to the comment made in regard to HL Paper 1 and the case of *regii iuvenes duces ei ludicro certamini dati* where it was important to get ‘given as generals’, here, ‘I had you as easygoing servants ...’ was the vital insight: it was necessary for candidates to find a way to understand a pileup of words in the same case.

In line 7 *idem* (masculine nominative singular) caused great difficulty. The great temptation was to commence with ‘The same sacred rites I sing ...’ – and no marker could then avoid treating *idem* as wrongly related.

Undoubtedly, *ecquis* is a word which Latin students do not see every day. It is advisable in such instances for candidates to look up the word in the dictionary rather than merely assume that they know it. Many believed it to be the same as *quis*? Therefore *ecquis crederet*, ‘Is there anyone who

would believe ...?'/ 'Would anyone believe ...?' was missed by some candidates who ought to have got it.

Line 11, about [not] throwing javelins, gave rise to a dictionary problem. Candidates who did not know *pila* were faced in the dictionary with (to simplify a little) these options:

- *pīla*, ae, f, 'mortar'
- *pīlum*, i, n, 'pestle' or 'javelin'
- *pīlus*, i, m, 'hair'

... and far from all identified *pila* as accusative plural of *pilum*. Mortars (sometimes, and more logically, pestles) were being incorporated into the translation by many candidates.

In line 12, getting *bellatoris* as an adjective proved difficult, and required candidates to identify it as agreeing with *equi*, in order to arrive at a translation nearing the correct meaning. A warrior's back is [not] pressed – but how does the horse fit in?

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Mark range: | 0 - 3 | 4 - 7 | 8 - 11 | 12 - 16 | 17 - 21 | 22 - 26 | 27 - 40 |

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

Section A

1. Roman epic

(a)

- (i) Relatively few managed three out of three for this. *dives opum* 'rich in wealth' was a stumbling-block to some, because a mark was lost for translating simply as 'rich'. *statio male fida carinis* provoked all kinds of tangles.
- (ii) This scansion question was fairly well answered. As in recent years, although it was not especially easy, most did well. The few who tripped up mostly did so over *acie* (short, short, long).
- (iii) Most scored full marks, though a few did not.
- (iv) Most were able to identify the three items called for.

(b)

- (i) This was relatively well done; but some candidates experienced difficulties with *audentem extrema*.
- (ii) In this brief passage there are third-, second- and first-person verbs, and this is perhaps why it proved to be a challenging extract.
- (iii) This was reasonably well addressed, although more wolves came into the answers than were needed.
- (iv) This proved to be a good question for distinguishing between those with a sketchy knowledge of the set book (who knew that Aeneas told the story), and those with practically none (who might give answers like 'Sinon' or 'Hector').

2. Tacitus' presentation of imperial policy

(a)

- (i) Most candidates could answer this correctly.
- (ii) This was a relatively difficult selection, and some candidates were not well enough prepared to gain marks.
- (iii) Most could handle this question.
- (iv) This presented more of a challenge than the purely factual questions, and candidates in general were not strong on the force conveyed by particular words, or their connotations beyond the surface meaning. But literature teaching should be concerned with such matters of close reading: what difference does it make that Tacitus used the word *violentia*, not (e.g.) *vis* for example?

(b)

It is not possible to comment on this option as too few attempted it.

3. Cicero's political speeches

(a)

- (i) Many could remember the *Iudi Megalenses*, but few got the date.
- (ii) This translation question was well done.
- (iii) This question was well answered.
- (iv) Most could get Bestia and Clodia.

(b)

(i) Well answered.

(ii) Very well answered: a surprising number knew the exact cash sum which Caelius was paying in rent.

(iii) It was surprising to note that few knew about Ennius, let alone what his play was.

(iv) The translation was well done.

4. Love poetry

(a)

(i) *multi Lydia nominis* caused difficulties. 'Lydia of many names', and such.

(ii) All candidates who mentioned singing received their mark, as well as dancing and playing the lyre. .

(iii) Only about half of candidates saw how to use the comparative *clarior* in answering 'how beautiful?'

(iv) This open-ended question was on the whole poorly answered: it appeared that credible characters Vs shallow stereotypes was a question which candidates had not considered much.

(b)

(i) This was generally answered correctly even so, there were some who could not get *mule* = 'mule' which highlights the importance of close attention to detail even if a question appears to be easy.

(ii) The scansion question was well done.

(iii) Some approached this evaluative question with confidence, but more did not. In questions such as this, candidates are required to give an opinion and back it up with argument.

(iv) Despite this being a piece of prepared translation, a good many candidates seemed to be unfamiliar with how to tackle the wishes (e.g. *dispeream, nisi ...*).

5. Roman satire

(a)

(i) Almost candidates could get 'fishmonger' and 'Domitian'.

(ii) This piece for translation was well done.

(iii) A decision was taken at the Grade Award meeting that this question would not be taken into account for the setting of the grade boundaries for paper 2 due to its difficulty.

(iv) This scansion question was done fairly well.

(b)

(i) It is not possible to comment on this question as too few attempted it.

SECTION B

Question 6 answers tended perhaps to focus too much on the gods, and say too little about whether characters showed as little independence as chess pieces. This question would perhaps have been better approached by writing a couple of paragraphs about the gods and what they do in *Aeneid 2*, and a couple of paragraphs about the characters.

Question 7 was barely attempted.

Question 8 gave rise to some good answers from candidates who had evidently given thought to the issue.

Question 9 was less well done - possibly the comment above (Question 4 a, iv) about candidates not having much idea about credible characters vs. shallow stereotypes comes in here and writ large: candidates in most cases did not seem to have given thought to the human being behind the voices in Horace's poems.

Question 10 was answered by only a few candidates. Candidates appeared to struggle with distinguishing between great poetry and good poetry.