

May 2017 subject reports

Latin

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 17	18 - 35	36 - 48	49 - 59	60 - 68	69 - 78	79 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 29	30 - 43	44 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 79	80 - 100

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 24

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The range of work submitted this year was in line with work submitted in previous years. It is clear that the candidates enjoy the IA research dossier and seek a broad range of cultural, scientific, and literary topics. There continue to be problems with non-classical sources, and non-primary sources;

teachers must continue to give guidance on this issue. It is also the case that many research topics are very (rather too) broad in scope; the Guide (p. 34) gives clear guidance with examples that demonstrate how candidates might further focus the scope of a topic.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: A very large majority of candidates uses the correct number of sources at Higher Level. Where there are deficiencies (except for a very few candidates who submit work that is lacking), it is a result of misunderstanding about primary, classical, sources. The choice of sources does not always reflect coverage of the research area; in some cases, it seems as if candidates simply choose the first sources they find that add up to a sufficient number. This of course has a negative effect on Criterion C especially, since candidates must then work very hard to show how and why these particular sources logically and coherently address the research question. As always, sources must be evaluated with a view to how effectively they may be annotated and how well they fit into a logical argument about the research topic.

Criterion B: Candidates in general continue to struggle to resist simple description of their sources. While some description (especially of context) may be necessary in order to fully demonstrate understanding of the source, candidates must show some analysis of the source in evaluating its relatedness to the research question.

Criterion C: Candidates struggled especially hard with this criterion, as usual. It is quite difficult from an examiner's point of view to understand the process or events leading up to the finished product. In some cases, it seemed that candidates were struggling to discover the relationships between their chosen sources. In others, it seemed that candidates were annotating individual sources without attempting to understand their relationship with each other and with the research topic. There was little attempt to use logical connectors throughout the annotations that might facilitate the effective building of an argument, as well as highlight the progression of the argument across the annotations.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Encourage candidates to find five or six more sources than needed to meet the maximum number of sources allowed; this will enable them to evaluate and choose among their sources with a view to Criterion C. Annotations are strongest when they relate, not only to the research question, but also to each other. Some very strong dossiers present two or three sources, with a longer annotation that incorporates analysis of that group of sources. Teachers might consider how effectively they are incorporating within the 20 hours allotted for this component a) discussing with the candidate the choice of topic (especially in relation to its scope) candidate; b) advising candidates in regards to the research question (especially in relation to its suitability for logical argumentation and analysis); encouraging candidates to establish a clear research plan with timely goals. Please advise candidates that textual sources must be presented both in the original language and in translation whenever textual analysis is directly relevant to the argument, whereas they can be given in translation only when the reference is subsidiary and/or there is no textual analysis involved. If there is any doubt, provide the original language. While there is no explicit penalty for not providing the original and the translation, it is certainly the case that some candidates are presenting arguments or observations based on textual analysis unsupported by the original source; this can have a direct impact on Criteria B and C. Please keep in mind that an introduction and conclusion, even if very brief, are words well spent from the total allowed.

Further comments

The interrelation of the criteria cannot be over-emphasized. Teachers are strongly encouraged to continue to consult the subject guide, and to continue to carefully explain to candidates the purpose of the internal assessment task and its criteria.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 13	14 - 16	17 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 24

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The range of work submitted this year was in line with work submitted in previous years. It is clear that the candidates enjoy the IA research dossier and seek a broad range of cultural, scientific, and literary topics. There continue to be problems with non-classical sources, and non-primary sources; teachers must continue to give guidance on this issue. It is also the case that many research topics are very (or rather too) broad in scope; the Guide (p. 34) gives clear guidance with examples that demonstrate how candidates might further focus the scope of a topic.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: A very large majority of candidates uses the correct number of sources at Standard Level. Where there are deficiencies (except for a very few candidates who submit work that is lacking), it is a result of misunderstanding about primary, classical, sources. The choice of sources does not always reflect coverage of the research area; in some cases, it seems as if candidates simply choose the first sources they find that add up to a sufficient number. This of course has a negative effect on Criterion C especially, since candidates must then work very hard to show how and why these particular sources logically and coherently address the research question. As always, sources must be evaluated with a view to how effectively they may be annotated and how well they fit into a logical argument about the research topic.

Criterion B: Candidates in general continue to struggle to resist simple description of their sources. While some description (especially of context) may be necessary in order to fully demonstrate understanding of the source, candidates must show some analysis of the source in evaluating its relatedness to the research question.

Criterion C: Candidates struggled especially hard with this criterion, as usual. It is quite difficult from an examiner's point of view to understand the process or events leading up to the finished product. In some cases, it seemed that candidates were struggling to discover the relationships between their chosen sources. In others, it seemed that candidates were annotating individual sources

without attempting to understand their relationship with each other and with the research topic. There was little attempt to use logical connectors throughout the annotations that might facilitate the effective building of an argument, as well as highlight the progression of the argument across the annotations.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Encourage candidates to find two or three more sources than needed to meet the maximum number of sources allowed; this will enable them to evaluate and choose among their sources with a view to Criterion C. Annotations are strongest when they relate not only to the research question but also to each other. Some very strong dossiers present two or three sources with a longer annotation that incorporates analysis of that group of sources. Teachers might consider how effectively they are incorporating within the 15 hours allotted for this component a) discussing the choice of topic (especially in relation to its scope) with the candidate; b) advising candidates in regards to the research question (especially in relation to its suitability for logical argumentation and analysis); encouraging candidates to establish a clear research plan with timely goals. Please advise candidates that textual sources must be presented both in the original language and in translation whenever textual analysis is directly relevant to the argument, whereas they can be given in translation only when the reference is subsidiary and/or there is no textual analysis involved. If there is any doubt, provide the original language. While there is no explicit penalty for not providing the original and the translation, it is certainly the case that some candidates are presenting arguments or observations based on textual analysis unsupported by the original source; this can have a direct impact on Criteria B and C. Please keep in mind that an introduction and conclusion, even if very brief, are words well spent from the total allowed.

Further comments

Detailed comments from teachers are very useful in moderating work. The interrelation of the criteria cannot be over-emphasized. Teachers are strongly encouraged to continue to consult the subject guide, and to continue to carefully explain to candidates the purpose of the internal assessment and its criteria.

Higher level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 40	41 - 81	82 - 91	92 - 109	110 - 126	127 - 144	145 - 180

General comments

Most candidates chose to translate the Ovid passage. Generally, however, those who chose to translate the Cicero passage produced a more accurate translation.

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

Producing an accurate translation of a complicated passage containing multiple clauses and participial phrases.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates were able to identify the correct meaning of most words and successfully recognised a range of grammatical forms and constructions.

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

Cicero Passage:

Sense Unit:

1-2. Confusion over the tenses of the verbs

5. Deponent infinitive *sequi* not recognised

7. The use and function of the Ablative (*vituperatione*) not recognized

9. Confusion of the indirect statement (*eam fuisse*)

12. Mistranslation of the gerundive *punienda* (gerundives are widely mistranslated every year when encountered)

15. *liceat* not recognised as subjunctive

16. Ablative *salva re publica* not recognised as absolute

21. The use and function of the Ablatives *humanitate*, *miser cordia* not recognized

26. Confusion over agreement of *sepulta*

27. Confusion over agreement of *miseros* and *insepultos*

30. *bacchantis* was widely misunderstood

Ovid Passage:

Sense Unit:

2. *medios* ... *Argos* usually correctly rendered, but *in* often mistranslated as “in” (not “into/onto”)
4. *mirata* often not recognised as a deponent participle and incorrectly linked to *die*
- 5-7. String of indirect statements dependent upon *sensit* often not recognised; *remitti* frequently not recognised as passive infinitive; *non* frequently linked incorrectly to *sensit* (instead of *to esse*)
- 8-9. Common confusion over subjects of verbs (whether Jove or Juno)
9. Indirect question often misunderstood
- 16-18. Common confusion over subjects of verbs (whether Jove or Juno)
18. *mutaverat* often not rendered as pluperfect
- 22 *litotes* not recognised (*nec non*) and sentence incorrectly rendered as negative
23. Often mistranslated, especially the genitive *veri*
24. The three indirect questions linked to *sit* were frequently overlooked, although most candidates recognised at least one
25. Only a few candidates correctly translated the indirect statement after *mentitur* and the ablative (*terra*) linked to *genitam*
26. Passive *inquiri* regularly rendered as active, although the purpose clause was correctly rendered by most
27. *hanc* frequently linked incorrectly to *munus*; few candidates correctly rendered the apposition
29. *crudele* generally not recognised as an impersonal complement followed by infinitive (*addicere*)
30. Connection of *nec dare* to *suspectum est* frequently missed

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Grammatical points and language features common to either Ovid or Cicero:

Use of ablative case without prepositions
Subjunctive in principal clause (recognition and use)
Recognising the delayed verb

Link of nouns and adjectives to nouns in the ablative or genitive cases

Specific technical terms e.g. *patres conscripti*, *contio*

Uses of the gerundive (attraction/obligation/purpose)

Standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 19	20 - 38	39 - 46	47 - 56	57 - 67	68 - 77	78 - 90

General comments

Paper one continues to present (understandable) challenges for candidates at SL. The general distribution between Cicero and Ovid appeared to be roughly the same as in years past. Candidates and teachers are becoming more accustomed to the new assessment scheme, and there are many improvements among the general candidature in terms of sensible translations (even when incorrect). This is a trend that heartens the examiners.

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

Candidates continue to struggle with subordinate clauses of all kinds and with participial phrases. Forms of *eō*, *īre* (including compounds) and other "irregulars" vex candidates at this level. It appears that dictionary skills are somewhat better, but candidates still often seem to choose the first meaning available without evaluating the whole sense structure (e.g. sentence, phrase).

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Candidates appeared well-prepared in basic morphology and in phrase level structures, such as prepositional phrases. In general, candidates appear well-prepared to follow a narrative thread, even with some gaps.

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

Cicero: Candidates valiantly kept their focus through most of the reading, which is often a challenge with the Cicero text, although the first few sense units in particular were well done. Of wide-spread difficulty were: the relative clause, gerundive+esse, the ablative absolutes, the meaning of *deesse* toward the end of the passage. Candidates varied in their capacity to deal with *ne ... videamini* and with *quae cum ita sint, patres conscripti*. The former should, as a rule, be taught with other very common idioms in Ciceronian oratory - literal attempts capture little for Criterion A even if they manage to achieve on Criterion B.

Ovid: Candidates managed to establish and keep track of the narrative. In general, candidates do well with dictionary skills (see above), but there were a couple of mistaken *lemmata* (e.g. *numen*, *-inis* or *nemo*, *-inis* for *nemus*, *-oris*; *solus*, *-a*, *-um* for *sol*, *solis*) that introduced some confusions. Of

almost universal difficulty was *tuoque beatum nescioquem factura toro*, but achievement was quite high on either or both criteria for other phrases that might have been expected to pose issues (e.g. *a patrio... redeuntem flumine; medio sol est altissimus orbe*). As always, compounds of *eō, īre* confounded some candidates.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers are encouraged to continue to work with candidates on identifying potential sense units in their preparation for Paper 1. While these might not match in every case the markscheme, the likelihood is that major sense markers (subordinating conjunctions, strong punctuation such as periods or colons, verbs in final position, etc.) will be sense unit beginning or end points. Candidates who choose Ovid are encouraged to scan/read lines carefully, as several common problems are quickly resolved through quantities. As ever, encourage even more careful use of dictionaries. Please be sure that candidates are able to devote as much of the 135 hours as is practicable to unseen translation skills in preparation for Paper 1 (35% of language focused teaching would align with the assessment outline). In some cases, it might be structurally useful within the two-year diploma course to front translation of unseens in order to build some facility, followed prescribed reading study, followed by an intensive review of unseen skills before the examination period in year two. Attempting the 135 hours within one school year (entirely discouraged) seems a difficult proposition, and would very likely lead teachers to reduce effort spent on Paper 1.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 8	9 - 16	17 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 38	39 - 52

General comments

The paper was considered by most teachers who returned the teachers' comments feedback form to be of a similar standard to last year's and suitable in terms of accessibility and bias.

The impression received by the examiners was that, overwhelmingly, the time allocated was sufficient to complete the paper.

As mentioned from time to time in the coordinator's notes sent to schools, teachers are invited to send feedback on the examination by means of the teachers' comments form. When expressed courteously, this feedback forms part of a constructive dialogue that assists the examiners in their task and informs the writing of future papers.

Performance in this session covered practically the full range of attainment. Pleasingly, there are signs that schools are reading the subject report more closely and that this is resulting in a better examination experience for candidates.

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

Section A

Geographical and background context (questions 1c, 2b, 3d, 4a, 4b, 7d, 8a, 8b). From this, one can see that option C was affected less hard in this respect.

Section B

Questions 12, 13 and 14 (see comments below). Question 15 was attempted by too few candidates to enable sensible comment.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Option A seemed to be the most successful. Translation questions gained more marks than under the previous markscheme. In section B, question 11 was the most successfully attempted.

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

Section A

It is pleasing to report that performance in scansion questions has improved markedly over the last few years. Writing out the lines and marking elisions seems to have helped to focus candidates' minds. Indicating the quantity on an elided syllable was not penalised but this is a true error and should be avoided.

The justification for geography questions given in last year's report retains its validity. Preparation for these questions is not meant to be burdensome, but contextual knowledge of the text is a necessary element of its understanding and as such is included in the subject's second assessment objective. The candidate's response must allow the reader to find the location on a map and it is satisfying that this year's answers were more precise.

The same justification can be applied to 'explain the reference in context' questions and the same level of precision is to be expected of candidates here as in geography questions. The questions are set on texts that should have been prepared in detail and appreciation of the work must be considered to be imperfect if such references, e.g. the *quercia corona* in 4b, are not understood.

Performance in translation questions has also improved and the guidance included in last year's report still obtains. Most responses this year were in the 1-2 bracket, 3 marks still being quite rare. There were fewer blank responses than in the past. Since these questions assess understanding of the text at its most basic level, they play a significant part in the examination; the skills required for these questions are also applicable to most others, since those also rely to a great extent on

showing the examiner that the Latin has been understood. A certain amount of flexibility is allowed in the translation to allow for the native idioms of the target language, but the full meaning of the Latin must be conveyed, and any omission will almost certainly lose the third mark.

There is greater appreciation of the need to support points with Latin when required to do so, though technique is still often imperfect. Schools may find the recommendation made below to be helpful.

The markscheme for six-mark questions (mostly, though not invariably, stylistic in character) has been clarified, particularly in respect of the manner in which the two marks for clarity and coherence are allocated. It is hoped that teachers will find the new wording helpful when preparing candidates. In essence, four style points should be made and explained in order to obtain the full six marks. Those candidates who had prepared the text well and followed an effective technique tended to gain high marks.

Option A was by far the most popular, generally in combination with one of options C or D. Most candidates offering option B were particularly well prepared.

As usual, option F attracted the smallest number of candidates. These tended to fall into two camps: those who performed very strongly and those who performed weakly in the paper as a whole, often leaving several questions (in both options) unanswered. Since two of the authors prescribed for this option require philosophical as well as literary treatment, teachers in schools without a tradition of philosophical analysis should consider either supplementary preparation or the choice of another option.

1a. *te matre* is a concessive ablative and not accusative and vocative respectively. The phrase was often misinterpreted.

1b. Mostly well answered unless the elision in line 320 was missed.

1c. A large number of candidates missed the reference entirely, while others took *Thymbraeus* to be the name of the place and not an epithet, as stated in the question.

1d. While some answers gave very pleasing analysis of the themes, little more than identification of relevant Latin and matching translation or paraphrase was required for the marks, though bare quotation and translation would rarely find favour. However, mismatches or imperfect evidence of understanding of the Latin quoted (e.g. “He has lost his bees — *apibus morboque fameque*”) was penalised. Likewise, while translation of the obvious was generally sufficient (“through disease and famine — *morboque fameque*”), metaphorical language needs more explanation (“Aristaeus has lost his bees — *amissis apibus*” does not link the Latin to the theme of death but “His bees have died — *amissis apibus*” does, since the image of *amissis* is explained and its understanding would be presumed by a reasonable examiner). Some candidates interpreted this as a style question. This was not a problem unless insufficient content was quoted and explained: “The list of imperatives, *erue, fer, interfice, ure, molire* — ‘uproot’, ‘bring’, ‘kill’, ‘burn’, ‘wield’” would not deserve a mark because there is nothing destructive about the imperative mood *per se*.

2a. Mostly well answered by candidates who had grasped the storyline of the poem.

2b. The crucial fact about *montis* is that the river emerges rather than flows over it. Many candidates missed this point.

2c. For recommendations on style questions see below. Answers had to address the question of 'indignation'. Thus, accusatory questions were accepted but rhetorical questions were not: Venus most definitely wanted answers (and got them in Jupiter's subsequent speech).

3a. A range of approaches was accepted but an overarching analysis supported by two precise quotations (with evidence of understanding) were required.

3b. Mostly well answered, quite a few candidates obtaining full marks.

3c. Declaring one's legal status to be that of a prostitute is not the same as practising prostitution.

3d. Several candidates considered *sortitio* to be a lottery in general and had not understood the term in its political sense and so lost the first mark. Others thought that the quaestor had won his wife in such a lottery and so lost the second.

4a. More than mere translation (e.g. "the Saliar song", "the Augustal priests") was required. See the fairly broad markscheme.

4b. Understanding of the nature and significance of the *quercea corona* was often limited.

4c. For recommendations on six-mark questions see below. This question could be approached stylistically or in terms of argument but consideration of 'ambivalence' was necessary and marks for coherence and clarity were often lost by those who omitted to link their points to the question. Ambivalence could be addressed either by quoting examples that were in themselves ambivalent or by contrasting two examples of exuberant honouring with two of restraint or abeyance.

5a. This was not intended to be a style question, though those candidates who took this approach were not penalised if there was sufficient content to back up their points. Rather, the question was intended to assess knowledge of conventions of the elegiac genre. Identification of a typical convention with supporting Latin (and evidence of understanding) was sufficient to get the mark, e.g. "Separation drives the poet to fantasise about his death: *cum tenuem fuero mutatus in umbram* ('when I have been changed into a thin shade')". There was a preponderance of answers taken from the second half of the extract, the generic nature of *ille* and *ille* in lines 1-4 often not being grasped.

5b. Generally not well answered, particularly the section *nec mihi... meae*.

5c. Generally reasonably well scanned.

5d. Although technical terms are not required, candidates had to identify a specific device of sound or form. Answers based on content were acceptable if they reflected some image but points based on content alone did not deserve credit. Answers that alleged a figure but showed no sign that the Latin had been understood received no credit. See the recommendations below on the importance of showing evidence of understanding.

6a. Surprisingly few candidates gave sufficiently precise contrasting answers, despite the fairly generous markscheme. Vagueness was candidates' principal foe here. A considerable number of candidates thought it was usual for Roman love poets to commit suicide.

6b. Generally well scanned, particularly the pentameter.

6c. For advice on six-mark questions see below. This need not have been interpreted as a style question, though most candidates opted to do so and this approach was perfectly legitimate.

7a. This was not a style question but was intended to assess candidates' knowledge of poetical conventions. It required identification of a conventional feature (e.g. dishevelled clothing) and an example in Latin (with evidence of understanding) of that feature (e.g.: *non contecta amictu* – 'not covered by her mantle'). Note that the command term in the question is 'describe' rather than 'illustrate' (5a) or 'outline' (1d). Nevertheless, since a considerable number of candidates adopted a stylistic approach, style was not penalised if accompanied by sufficient content to address the question.

7b. The spondaic fifth foot in the second line (less uncommon in Catullus and Lucretius than in later poets) embarrassed a fair, though not excessive, number of candidates.

7c. Candidates performed less well here than in questions 1a and 3b. Omission of the second *tum* was not penalised.

7d. Some candidates, who had prepared well, obtained both marks without difficulty, but a surprising number simply omitted this question altogether.

8a. This question attracted a range of answers of differing quality.

8b. Although questions of this nature have been a staple of the examination for many years, there was much confusion about Melanthius, though some candidates gave clear and detailed answers.

8c. For recommendations on six-mark questions see below. On the whole this question was well answered though some candidates seemed to think that Penelope had sent Telemachus away to seek Ulysses and understood *sine viribus uxor* as 'a wife without a man'.

9a. Some evidence that the Latin quoted had been understood was needed for the mark. Technical terms were not required but candidates had to identify a specific device of sound or form or imagery and answers based on content alone were not credited.

9b. Generally well scanned by those who did not miss the elisions.

9c. This question was often left blank but some translations were both exact and idiomatic.

9d. Among those who answered this question some thought that *virginis* referred to Iphianassa/Iphigenia rather than to Diana/Trivia.

10a. Not generally well answered, mostly as a result of not comprehending the Latin.

10b. The question was marked leniently but, as in the past, interpretation of philosophical texts did not come easily to most candidates.

10c. For recommendations on six-mark questions see below. Few candidates approached this question adequately.

Section B

In this, the second year of this section, the full range of marks was awarded across the cohort, some essays struggling to refer to any reading at all while others were delightful discursive explorations that revealed wide reading and careful thought on the part of their authors. Occasionally, a candidate chose to write the essay on an option not attempted in section A: this is permitted by the rubric and due credit was given but is generally an unwise tactic. Recommendations on writing and assessing these essays is given below.

11. This was generally the best addressed prompt and attracted a wide range of approaches. There was no predetermined answer and the term mortality was susceptible of being understood in different ways.

12. Candidates understood 'man' in different ways, most of which were acceptable, though some candidates' coherence suffered when changing their understanding half-way through. This option was less well addressed in section B than in section A.

13. Some essays displayed a misunderstanding of *eros*, equating it with love in its broadest sense. Few arguments based on Catullus 101 prospered. Likewise, there is a distinction to be drawn between 'only death can bring an end to *eros*' and 'even death cannot bring an end to *eros*'. The two essays would be very different and the candidate cannot change the prompt without impairing the mark for focus.

14. It is against the wording of the prompt that the essay's focus is judged. Many candidates failed to distinguish between Roman and other women (e.g. Penelope) and between mythical, literary and historical women (e.g. Daphne). Some non-Roman women, such as Cleopatra, could be drawn on by linking them to Roman society, but attempting to demonstrate that Cynthia's seductiveness was an exercise of direct power in the Roman public sphere is a brave effort indeed. A wide range of examples is pleasing in principle, but those essays that listed all the women in the prescribed texts irrespectively of their relevance and asserted their exercise of direct power were not generally successful. Some candidates attempted to rewrite last year's essay. This was not penalised explicitly, but such an approach generally had a negative effect on focus. On the other hand, assessments of Clodia's influence over aspiring politicians and the public recognition of Cloelia as an example of civic virtue were more fortunate.

15. Very few candidates attempted this option. Of these, some essays barely scored any marks at all, but one or two candidates wrote discursive essays in the best Anglophone tradition. As with the other options, interpreting the prompt legitimately is crucial to success. The examiner allowed a very wide range of interpretations but an essay on whether it is possible to control one's fate departs excessively from the prompt's wording.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Section A

Understanding of the content of the Latin text should not be dismissed as irrelevant. This is evidently the case in the translation questions, to which are assigned nearly 9% of the total marks for the paper. However, the same obtains in those questions that ask for some kind of outline, description or analysis of the text supported by quotation of the Latin, and also in the style questions. In these cases quotation of the Latin words themselves is almost universally essential for gaining the marks, and the use of ellipsis is highly risky, since failure to quote the words on which an argument is based will fail to satisfy the requirements of the rubric. Broad-brush references to line numbers are equally

perilous unless there is a perfect match between the lines in question and the point being made. Even then, if the rubric says 'quote', the candidate should quote. Likewise, the examiner must be confident that the candidate has understood the Latin. Direct translation of all the Latin quoted is not positively required, and alternative methods of conveying understanding are admissible, but evidence of understanding must be present. It is pleasing to see increasing year-on-year progress in an area included in past subject reports but further improvement would serve candidates well.

When tackling style questions, it is worth remembering that a literary text is made up of its content and the manner in which that content is expressed, but in such a way that appreciation of the latter is dependent on comprehension of the former. In other words, 'style is the handmaiden of content'. The author's intention is to draw the listener's attention to what he is saying, and he does this by manipulating the language phonetically, morphologically, syntactically or through some kind of imagery. These stylistic effects, however, do not exist in a vacuum, and, to an extent, are merely additions to the content. It follows that candidates' style points should be bolted onto content points. "The anaphora of *non...non* ('not...not') is worth 0 marks because not enough content has been adduced to make sense of the stylistic point. "The parallel construction of *non in verbis sed in rebus* ('not in words but in deeds') deserves credit because (a) meaningful Latin has been quoted, (b) there is evidence of its understanding, and (c) a remarkable stylistic feature that draws our attention to the content has been identified. A further comment, like "focuses attention on the second element, thereby stressing the influence of philosophy on conduct", would count as development, since it has explained the effect of the identified remarkable feature and links the point as a whole to the question. This is not just a matter of cynically jumping through hoops to satisfy a pernickety examiner: this is a distillation of the principles on which all literary criticism is founded. The revised wording of the markscheme, it is hoped, will enable schools to see more clearly how these questions are marked. Performance varied greatly from candidate to candidate, but there were occasions when one felt that a closer attention to technique might have resulted in many more marks. This is applicable both to the 6-mark questions and to the shorter style questions, such as 5d and 9a.

Section B

The following general points are offered as suggestions but it should be remembered that the essay invites (and rewards) original thought and treatment, and should not be reduced to a mechanical exercise.

The advice in last year's report still stands. The marks for Criterion A (range of evidence) depend in great part on how specific the references to reading are. In the case of the prescribed texts, which should have been studied closely, such references should be very precise indeed. Quotation and line numbers are most definitely not required, but reference should be made to specific points by such means as clear examples, paraphrases or detailed reports (e.g. 'Jupiter's allusion to the closing of the doors of the temple of Janus during his prophecy in the prescribed section of *Aeneid* I'). References to supplementary reading do not need to be quite so exact. A reference to the killing of Turnus at the end of *Aeneid* XII would be sufficiently specific: as a rule of thumb, the reference should indicate the author, title or some other detail that would permit the examiner to look up the reference with comparative ease. Other classical works, modern secondary literature and epigraphy all count as additional reading. In the case of Classical authors, reference should be made to the incident under discussion, e.g. 'Hector's parting from Andromache in the *Iliad* illustrates the tension between family affection and public duty', rather than 'Homer illustrates the tension between family affection and public duty', which is not really worth any credit at all.

Criterion B (understanding of the option in its context and quality of the argument) offers a real chance for the best candidates to shine. The best essays are carefully planned, thereby ending up by default in the top assessment level for focus and coherence. A brief introductory paragraph or sentence can set up a yardstick against which both candidate and examiner can measure the essay's argument. The best essays place the examples in their context, and include evidence that the candidate is aware of such things as conventions of the genre, the historical background to the work or the author, the limitations or advantages of the sources, the relative value of the examples discussed... but good essays are frequently not limited rigidly to these. The essay should address the prompt as set, avoid contradiction in its argument and develop the argument reasonably. The strongest arguments are often deductive and use the chosen examples to support a clear thesis; mere assertions with no logical link to the examples score poorly under development.

Finally, a plea from the examiners touching the quality of written communication. Latin is part of the world's cultural inheritance and is intricately bound up not only with literary pursuits but also with the survival of literacy in Europe after the end of the Western Empire. We should do our best to deserve this inheritance. Candidates' spelling was adequate in almost all cases. However, the paragraph seems to be an endangered species and its conservation is greatly to be desired. Similarly, handwriting remains for the moment an essential tool of communication between the candidate and the examiner. Examiners make great efforts to interpret the written characters and they understand that examinations are written at speed and under stress. Nevertheless, there was a significant minority of candidates whose handwriting was such that their schools should have availed themselves of the alternative provisions offered by the IB.

Standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 14	15 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 45

General comments

Analysis of the data provided by teachers in the teachers' comments forms, it is clear that most teachers felt that the paper was appropriately challenging for candidates, and that it was similar in difficulty to papers of previous years.

As in the previous year, and consistent with HL, Option A, Vergil seems to be the most popular choice, matched with either Option C, Love Poetry or Option D, Women. Option B, History was less common, but the candidates that chose this option tended to perform well. Very few candidates chose Option F, Good Living.

It is important to note that there was a wide range of scores and that all grade mark boundaries were covered.

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

Previous Standard Level (SL) reports and the Higher Level (HL) report above have addressed the use of background information in the form of peoples, places, and objects mentioned in the extracts. These guidelines are again, still valid. While the inclusion of geographical, historical and biographical information has caused consternation among candidates and teachers, it is clear that the understanding of these elements is essential for the overall context of passage or extract. Because the concepts are sure to continue on future tests, a valuable option for teachers and candidates would be to at least highlight any people, places, or cultural concepts that the candidates encounter in the prescribed extracts. Perhaps it would be useful to keep a running list of elements or an open set of online flashcards, such as Quizlet on each of these encounters.

While candidates have shown strength in identifying relevant passages/extracts of Latin, it is necessary to add some words of caution in the way that candidates present this information. Many of the highest performing candidates produced answers very close to the guidelines for examiners found in the markscheme. These candidates were able to answer with individual points and match these points with individual direct quotations. Some candidates answered with several points and then provided long quotes from the Latin, hoping to hit all of the points. Unfortunately, using this approach makes it mostly unclear as to whether the candidates understood the Latin points individually. As mentioned above for HL, all candidates should be cautioned against the use of elisions or line numbers, as it must be absolutely clear to the examiners that the candidate has indicated the appropriate information.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

In general, it is refreshing to see that candidates are continuing to improve in their understanding of the concepts in the Latin extracts. It is apparent that candidates are able to identify extracts in the larger context of the prescribed readings, and have a general picture of what events precede and follow the extracts. When asked to provide direct quotes, or even describe the information without quotes, most candidates were satisfactory with their responses. There were some struggles with rendering the evidence into satisfactory English, even with the ability to paraphrase, and problems with connecting the quotes to their answers, but candidates are on the right track.

In addition, as scansion has been an ongoing focus point for teachers and candidates, it does appear that candidates are improving, especially in terms of their work with dactylic hexameter. In terms of the pentameter lines of elegiac couplets, some candidates welcomed the predictability of the second half of the line, while others still tried to force it into a hexameter line. There is still a disparity between candidates who clearly understand scansion, and easily score points, and those that do not, and fail to earn the points, but the number of candidates in the first group are increasing. In fact, some candidates performed very poorly on large parts of the examination, but were able to gain some points almost entirely in scansion. Teachers have clearly been communicating that these are points that are relatively easily earned (or conversely, easily lost) and candidates have risen to the challenge.

The marking of translation passages changed with the new course, and there has been an increase in candidate performance in that area as well. It is still true that very few candidates scored perfect 3's as candidates still seem prone to omit words from their translation, but most candidates scored

at least 1 or 2 points on translation. Even among candidates who clearly struggled with the task, some were able to scrounge together enough of the meaning to gain a point, as long as they attempted the task.

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

1.a Most candidates were able to answer that Lulus would rule for 30 years. Candidates were also mainly able to identify that Lulus would fortify Alba Longa. Unfortunately, a number of candidates had difficulty with the genitive *Lavini*, identifying it as *Lavinia* instead of *Lavinium*. Some also failed to identify the preposition *ab*, stating that Lulus transferred the kingdom to the seat of Lavinium.

1.b Candidates that properly identified the conjunction until properly identified that the event ending Lulus's house was the birth of Romulus and Remus.

1.c. In general, candidates had difficulty with questions requiring geographic location. These questions are important, as indicated in the assessment objective 2, which requires candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the texts '*within their historical, political, cultural and geographical contexts*'.

1.d Overall, candidates were able to piece together the tricolon of *excipiet, condet, and dicet*. Some had difficulty with the genitives and datives of "*lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine*"

1.e Candidates were mostly successful with this question. Some difficulties came from mistranslation of various passages and the use of predictions that did not apply to Romulus's descendants.

2.a This extract was generally well-received by candidates. Polypoton, repetition, enjambment, tricolon crescens, and onomatopoeia were all common identifications.

2b. In general, candidates had difficulty with this scansion. Of the candidates who properly identified that the consonant combination –tr- does not force a long syllable, very few were able to identify the hiatus in a-e-nis.

2c. While candidates struggled somewhat with the first line "*sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;*" most candidates did well with the remainder of the passage.

2d. Similar to 1.e.

2e. Candidates were able to identify many of the details in the Latin, but some were not able to render the extract well enough in English to gain all the points. In terms of contrast, candidates were generally successful in identifying the differences between the rise/ peace of Carthage and the fall/ conflict of Troy.

3a. See 1c.

3b. Candidates were successful with this question for the most part, unless they mistranslated *nescia* as unable.

3c. Most candidates were successful with this question, unless they were unable to render the English well enough.

3d. Almost all candidates were able to answer this question, mostly relying on the superlatives *celerrimum fidissimumque* instead of any background information outside of the question.

3e. There were a variety of errors, but candidates were mainly successful with the passage.

4a. There were a variety of errors, but candidates were mainly successful with the passage.

4b. Candidates had difficulty with this question, but were mostly able to identify Tiberius's wish for moderation to be observed.

4c. Candidates were generally successful with this question and able to identify the tricolon *crescens* of "*cladis...interitum...amissas*."

4d. With several viable options, candidates were able to answer this question well for the most part.

4e. Candidates were generally able to come up with one or two different elements about *Ludi* (usually the facts that it involved theater and was dedicated to *Magna Mater*.)

5a. Candidates were able to identify the actions that the poet suggests in Latin, although some struggled with rendering the actions into English. Almost all candidates were able to identify that the poet would hunt (*venabor*) and or capture wild beasts (*captare feras*)

5b. Of all the scansion questions, candidates were the most successful with these lines. With a pleasant repetition of dactyl spondee and no elisions, the first line was scanned correctly by almost everyone that attempted it. The second line was less well-received, with some candidates confused by the length of vowels in the first half and others attempting to make the pentameter into a hexameter.

5c. See 1c.

5d. Given that there were numerous possible answers for this question, most candidates answered it very well.

5e. Similar to other translation questions, very few candidates were able to gain full points, but most were able to score some points on this question. Candidates had difficulty with several points, including the future tense of *poterunt*; the translation of *solae* as lonely, as opposed to sun; various elements of the description of the river in line 30; some confusion about line 31.

6a. Candidates had a variety of correct answers for this question. The juxtaposition or antithesis of "*odi et amo*" was by far the most popular answer. Several candidates suggested that "*qui potis est?*" and "*quo signo*" were rhetorical questions, but because Catullus does directly answer each of these questions, it does not fit the definition.

6b. Similar to other translation questions, very few candidates were able to gain full points, but most were able to score some points on this question. Candidates had difficulty with several points, including the translation of *villior* as *morevile*; struggles with "*qui potis est?*" and "*inquis*"; mistaking *cogit* as *cogitat*.

6c. This question posed problems for most candidates. While the question asks for candidates to characterize the love that Catullus had in the poems, few were able to do so. Most candidates simply wrote examples of the love as opposed to describing the characteristics of the love.

6d. The scansion of these lines was well-received by the candidates. Some struggled with the length of the syllables in "*amo quar-id*" and others tried to make the vowels in *feri* a diphthong. Similar to the lines in Propertius, some candidates tried to make the pentameter line a hexameter line.

6e. Candidates had difficulty with this question as well. Many failed to really discuss the theme of love and hate, but merely identified elements of love and hate in each poem. Several candidates failed to grasp the idea that Catullus both loves and hates the same individual, and suggested that Catullus loves the girl (often Lesbia) but that she hates him, or that Catullus loves the girl and hates himself, or that he loves the girl and hates the concept of love.

7a. Candidates were for the most part successful with this question. There were a number of acceptable answers and candidates had their choice of possible options.

7b. Similar to other questions, candidates had no difficulty finding examples of Porsenna's actions towards Cloelia in Latin, but did struggle with rendering the examples into English. In addition, candidates had difficulty with identifying specific passages, relying on long quotes without clear indication of where their ideas were coming from.

7c. For some candidates, this passage came as quite easy, and the identification of the hostages chosen and the reasons was well done. Other candidates were able to identify specific elements, but were not able to render it correctly enough in English.

7d. Similar to other translation questions; Candidates had difficulty with various parts, although nothing in particular caused problems across the board.

7e: This question was well answered by many candidates, but several candidates were unable to identify either that the equestrian award was only given to men, or that it was given for military service.

8a. Similar to geographic references, candidates had difficulty identifying background information. Very few candidates were able to identify "*senem durum*" as Appius Claudius Caecus, instead suggesting that *senem durum* was Clodia's father, brother, or Cicero himself.

8b. When discussing the qualities of the male relative of Clodia, many candidates were able to identify various correct answers. Some, however, relied on the description of the man as a child, which are really not qualities of the man.

8c. Similar to other questions, candidates were able to identify the examples in Latin fairly easily, but were not able to render the answers in English well enough.

8d. This translation posed similar problems to candidates. Candidates had difficulty with the apposition of *paratos* and the gerund of purpose with *causa*, as well as some other issues.

8e. Most candidates easily identified *condiciones* as conditions, which makes sense as it's a fairly close cognate. Some, however, interpreted the word "conditions" as medical conditions, as

opposed to legal or contractual conditions. Some candidates were not able to interpret Cicero's use of the word as lovers or affairs.

9a. Scansion on this passage did not cause many problems.

9b. Candidates translated the first two lines fairly well, but had difficulty on the third line.

9c. There were many possible options, and candidates tended to do quite well with the figures of speech on this extract.

9d. Candidates answered this question fairly well and only a handful of candidates took *templa* literally.

9e. Candidates were able to answer this question fairly well with little difficulty.

10a. Candidates had a bit of difficulty with this question. Candidates were able to identify scenes of nature, but not specifically the scenes showing the revolving cycle of nature. Candidates also had difficulty with the images of the destiny of man. Very few were able to adequately contrast the two concepts.

10b. Candidates did alright on this passage, but had difficulty with many of the individual words.

10c. Candidates had no problem identifying nymphs and their role in mythology. Very few, however, were able to identify *Gratia* as a Grace, or that the twin sisters were other Graces, or the role of the Graces in mythology.

10d. There were many options, and candidates tended to do well on this question. Several candidates, however, did try and describe the 2nd lines of Horace's 1st Archilochean as being enjambment when no enjambment occurred.

10e. As with other questions about historical background information, candidates were mostly unable to define Tullus and Ancus as anything other than old or legendary characters. Candidates were able to identify that the kings were used to show the inevitability of death for humans, but were unable to recall specific details about the kings.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There are many recommendations in the preceding part of the report, but the two most important elements are as follows:

Geography, history, and culture: Candidates continue to have difficulty with background information throughout the paper. These questions, however, will continue to appear on this examination paper in the foreseeable future. While it may seem nitpicky, fully understanding the greater contexts of our authors' works can only help candidates understand the works themselves and the authors' choices more fully.

Quotations and Discussion: Previous subject reports have mentioned the necessity for candidates to accurately represent the Latin in English when answering questions. In addition, it would be beneficial for candidates to focus on the quotation of Latin. Individual points should be quoted individually, and candidates should not rely on extensive quotes of Latin attempting to support

multiple points. In addition, ellipses and line reference should not be used unless they clearly and absolutely support the points that the candidates are making.