

LATIN

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 16	17 - 33	34 - 49	50 - 60	61 - 70	71 - 81	82 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 30	31 - 42	43 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 80	81 - 100

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Higher Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 22	23 - 26	27 - 30

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 30

General Comments

The vast majority of the candidates chose research dossiers; oral presentations and prose compositions were also represented, albeit in minority. The following commentaries are meant to suggest ways of improving the candidates' performance on this exercise.

Teacher's Role

There are two essential details to be adhered to by teachers, described in the section of IA of the guide:

1. The teacher must give consistent help at all stages, and especially with:
 - a. helping the student become familiar with the requirements of this exercise and the assessment criteria to be addressed;

b. the planning of the work.

2. The IA is an integral part of the classical languages course, contributing 20% to the final assessment. This should be reflected in the time that is allocated to teaching the knowledge, skills and understanding required to undertake the work, as well as the total time allocated to carrying out the work.

The hours allocated to internal assessment work should include:

- time for the teacher to explain to students the requirements of the internal assessment
- class time for students to work on the internal assessment component
- time for consultation between the teacher and each student
- time to review and monitor progress, and to check authenticity.

The students have the opportunity to examine in some depth an aspect of classical language, literature or civilization that is of particular interest to them, which should be reflected in their choice of subject, sources, and especially in their engagement with the topic and material selected. The topic therefore has to be clearly defined and the sources focused on describing it, whereas the commentary should aim to provide sufficient evidence of personal engagement of the student with the selection of sources.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Research dossier

Sometimes a dossier could refer rather vaguely to various aspects of life in ancient times, eg 'Music in Ancient Rome' or 'The Symposium Institution in Greece' without any narrowing down of any type. The use of a chronological frame, for instance, has the merit of simplifying the choice of sources. Also, not all sources have the same importance: secondary sources (critical literature) are modern products and as such are less susceptible of carrying the same value as direct sources. Among primary sources the extract from authors should be made taking into account the limitations introduced by the literary conventions of a *genre*: the satire uses sarcastic caricature, and love poems contain many *clichés*. The balance can be re-established by using non-literary sources.

Oral presentation

Reciting a passage in verse or prose can be a very successful exercise, if rehearsed in advance. The quantities, elisions and the appropriate emphasis of some of the words need to be acknowledged in the final version to be assessed.

Prose Composition

The choice of a passage should normally be made after checking the suitability of a modern author for being translated into Classical Latin; at times, the candidate can find help beyond Classical Latin: Medieval and Modern Latin forms and structures can be used, provided that

appropriate guidance is available to the candidate. That should include - but not be limited to – advice on how to use an English-Latin dictionary and to check the syntax used in the Latin translation. Also, if the translation is in verse, attention is to be given to quantities so that the lines scan properly. The commentary should bring forth these aspects, and show what is meant by an author's style (not just the use of the ablative absolute or the lack of the verb 'to be').

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The candidate should be encouraged to get information about the historical, literary, or political context of the topic chosen; which in turn should help a better definition of the topic itself and more accurate commentaries.

Translations of literary resources have to be provided, and clear photographs of non-literary ones as well; full references are a must and a really good presentation is a bonus.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 29	30 - 58	59 - 84	85 - 104	105 - 125	126 - 145	146 - 175

General comments

Question 1 was attempted by a very few candidates; while question 2 proved to be the most popular. The unseen translation from Cicero provided a greater challenge for candidates and few of them scored highly. Some candidates had clearly been well prepared for a task on Ovid and produced some excellent versions of the unseen translation, while many showed considerable gaps in their knowledge of grammar and syntax.

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

The candidates who attempted the passage from found it particularly difficult given the complex nature of Cicero's syntax.

For candidates who attempted question 2, the following points caused the most difficulty:

- L.316: *cum puerum vidit visumque optavit habere*; *visum* was not always recognised as the perfect participle, with some candidates translating it as a noun
- LI.317-8: *ante ... quam* (twice) was not always recognised as a tmesis of *antequam*

- c. L.323: *fortunata profecto*; *fortunata* was not always recognised as a perfect feminine participle, nor *profecto* as an adverb
- d. L.325 (twice): *longe* was not always recognised as a component of the expression *longe longeque beatior*
- e. Ll. 324 and 326: *ubera* and *taeda*; the choice between a literal translation and one more appropriate to the context

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers may wish to frequently practice sight-reading with thorough grammatical analysis of the text. It might be advisable for teachers to devote more time to the preparation on Cicero's work, using his speeches as a basis for the analysis of Latin syntax, but also setting the texts in their historical and political context, since it seems that the unfamiliar context of Cicero's time and surroundings is likely to be a further obstacle to a correct comprehension and translation. It might be wise for teachers to include more vocabulary common to Cicero and Ovid so as to build a stronger foundation for a particular author. Although the use of a dictionary appeared to be more sensible in this session compared to previous years, it is advisable to continue developing dictionary skills. Teachers may wish to let students to explore all different options offered for the translation of any word, and also experiment with the use of different dictionaries. The Internet offers a wide range of online dictionaries that can be easily and very profitably consulted and compared. Candidates should also be reminded to carefully read the Latin text and the translation of the introductory and closing sections, and to pay close attention to the help provided in the glossed word.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 23	24 - 27	28 - 30	31 - 34	35 - 44

General comments

This paper produced responses at an adequate level, within a suitable range of marks. It was evident that some candidates had been thoroughly prepared for this paper and scored highly as a result. All sections were attempted but Virgil, Catullus and Horace were the most popular, followed by Pliny, Livy and Juvenal.

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

Most candidates completed all the questions required.

Questions in which candidates had to discuss style attracted both very good and weak responses. Candidates who produced good answers identified stylistic and literary features and illustrated their points with focused and well-incorporated quotations from the texts. Many candidates were able to comment on a particular passage but failed in sustaining their arguments with phrases and words from the Latin text. The context questions were generally well answered.

The translation questions attracted both excellent and weak responses. Some candidates produced fully accurate translations of the passages. The scansion questions provided some very good examples of understanding.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates need to be thoroughly familiar with the content and translation of prescribed texts. Candidates should also be reminded of the importance of knowing prepared translations at a correct standard. Teachers may wish to continue close reading of set Latin texts drawing attention to literal translation, stylistic and literary analysis.

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 22	23 - 44	45 - 59	60 - 69	70 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 105

General comments

Question 2 proved to be the most popular, while Question 1 was attempted by significantly fewer candidates. The unseen translation on a work of Cicero proved more difficult for candidates who chose that option than for candidates who had been prepared for the unseen translation from Ovid. Some candidates had clearly been well prepared for an task on Ovid and scored highly as a result.

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

Many candidates showed an orderly approach to translation. Annotations on the scripts suggested that candidates had spent time in listing noun cases and verb tenses before starting the actual translation. There was also evidence that some candidates had tried hard to apply their knowledge of grammar, usually to a quite a high degree of success. Some of the better candidates demonstrated a good understanding of both grammar and style, and

their translations reflected their awareness of subtleties of meaning. Some errors that could have been avoided were made by candidates who failed to consider case endings and verb tenses. Some candidates were weak on syntax and had difficulty, at times, identifying the correct form of the word.

Few accurate translations of Question 1 were produced. The following points caused most difficulty:

- a. LI.2-3: recognition of cases proved difficult for weak candidates.
- b. LI.5-7: the section *ut quaeque nobiscum maxime societate amicitia sponsione pactione foedere est coniuncta, ita mihi maxime communione beneficiorum praemiorum civitatis contineri videtur* proved difficult for some candidates
- c. Passim: the translation of *civitates/-ibus* etc. –state or citizenship
- d. LI.5-6: the translation of *societate, amicitia, sponsione, factione, foedere* in the series of ablatives –the first two as “in (‘alliance and friendship’ or similar)”, whereas the last three, as “by (‘agreement, pact, treaty’ or similar)”
- e. The choice of translation of words with similar meaning meant the finer points of Cicero’s rhetoric were often lost

There were several very good and many reasonable attempts to answer question 2. The following points caused more difficulty:

- a. L.440: *dum*; correct meaning for this passage ‘until’ was not always recognised
- b. L.441, *hic* here used as an adverb was not always recognised
- c. L.448, *mactata Polyxena* as the subject and *manes* as the object of *placet* were not always recognised

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers may wish to frequently practice sight-reading, combining this with a close analysis of what has been misunderstood and why. Teachers may also wish to spend more time ensuring that basic grammar and syntax and, in the case of poetry, scansion are better understood. It might be wise for teachers to include more vocabulary common to Cicero and Ovid so as to build a stronger foundation for a particular author. For Cicero, considerable experience of reading Cicero’s periodic sentences and analysing the architecture of grammar and structure would be beneficial. Although the use of a dictionary appeared to be more sensible in this session than in previous ones, it is advisable to devote more lessons to developing skills in the use of a dictionary. Too often, candidates went for the first option of translation offered, regardless of the context or sense; the use of a dictionary should be taught and practised so that candidates do not settle for the first word listed, so they proceed to take notes of grammatical information such as principal parts of verbs, noun declensions,

etc. Many candidates would benefit from being more aware of words that can easily be confused. Candidates should also be reminded to carefully read the Latin text and the translation of the introductory and closing sections, and to pay close attention to the help provided in the glossed word.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 35	36 - 45

General comments

This paper attracted a wide range of responses from excellent to weak ones. It was observed that many candidates had been clearly well prepared for this paper and coped well with its demands. All sections were attempted but Virgil, Catullus and Horace were the most popular, followed by Pliny, Livy and Juvenal.

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

Most candidates completed all the questions required.

Most candidates displayed understanding or awareness of the genre under study. Many candidates were able to identify literary and stylistic features and to assign extracts to context and to comment adequately on specific words and phrases. The context questions were generally well answered.

The translation questions attracted both excellent and very weak responses. Seen translation was clearly difficult for a number of candidates. The reason appeared to be a lack of familiarity with the prescribed texts. This was general through all sections. The scansion questions provided some very good examples of understanding, but conversely other answers lacked basic knowledge.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers might consider giving their students more practice in scanning since there are relatively easy marks to be obtained if candidates know the basic rules of scansion. Candidates need to be thoroughly familiar with the content and translation of prescribed texts. Since candidates have the opportunity to study the set texts in detail and over a period of time, it is important for them to remember prepared translation with precision. Teachers may

wish to continue close reading of set Latin texts drawing attention to literal translation, stylistic and literary analysis.