

# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2006**

**LATIN**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 2**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IBCA.*

## SECTION A

[30 marks]

## 1. (a):

- (i) The wooden horse [1 mark]. The pretence was that the horse had been left behind by the Greeks [1 mark] while they went home to seek expiation for their sin [1 mark].
- (ii) That the horse had been made so large because the Greeks wanted it to be kept outside so that it would not help them [1 mark]. He wanted them to believe that it would be in their interests to admit the horse [1 mark].
- (iii) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) There is much that could be said. Award [1 mark] for one good point and a second mark for a second. *E.g.*: the switch to the editorial (rather rare), the poignancy of the proper names, the link between the treachery of Sinon and its consequences. Other ideas on their merits.

## 1. (b):

- (i) Both have been hidden, both appear suddenly in the night, both are *nitidus*, both are young: [1 mark] for up to any **two** of these. Other suggestions on their merits.
- (ii) Automedon [1 mark]. Pyrrhus was Achilles' son [1 mark] and Automedon had been charioteer and *armiger* of Achilles, therefore close to him [1 mark].
- (iii) Mark only for length of syllables. [1 mark] for each all-correct line; no mark otherwise.
- (iv) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

**2. (a):**

- (i) Prosecutions for *[1 mark]* extortion as provincial governors *[1 mark]*.
- (ii) By suggesting that he *[1 mark]* and not the Senate *[1 mark]* should decide that proconsuls should receive the thanks of the province *[1 mark]*.
- (iii) By leading a conspiracy *[1 mark]* against Nero *[1 mark]* .
- (iv) *[3 marks]* for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); *[2 marks]* for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; *[1 mark]* for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

**2. (b)**

- (i) They were receiving thanks *[1 mark]* for helping to uncover the Pisonian conspiracy *[1 mark]*.
- (ii) Sol or Sun *[1 mark]* for revealing the secrets of the conspiracy *[1 mark]* .
- (iii) *[3 marks]* for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); *[2 marks]* for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; *[1 mark]* for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) That Tacitus consulted the official records *[1 mark]* of the Senate *[1 mark]*; (this is the real point). To confirm what he knew from elsewhere *[1 mark]*. The mark should not be withheld if the second point is made only implicitly.

**3. (a):**

- (i) That his fellow townsmen do not approve of him [1 mark]. His response is that he had been voted honours in his absence [1 mark] higher than those awarded to any other citizen when he was present [1 mark].
- (ii) That he had been awarded in his absence honours for which he had not asked [1 mark] although many who had asked had been refused [1 mark].
- (iii) Emphasising his point by *praesenti...absenti* [1 mark] and *non petenti...petentibus* [1 mark]. Other suggestions on their merits.
- (iv) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

**3. (b):**

- (i) Philosophical arguments about appropriate conduct [1 mark], now a mass of inconsistencies and/or out of date restrictions [1 mark].
- (ii) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iii) [1 mark] each for up to **three** of carelessness of his own *pudicitia*, or that of another, squandering his patrimony, usury, attacking another's home and reputation, shaming the chaste, tainting the virtuous, spoiling the reputation of the good, frightening anyone with violence, joining a conspiracies, criminal conduct. Candidates may use either Latin or English or both.
- (iv) Much could be said. Award [1 mark] for any reasonable point and a second for either a particularly good account of the one point **or** another good point.

**4. (a):**

- (i) At first, the reader is led to believe that this is a solemn poem about virtue [1 mark]. The use of the first person, the singing about Lalage, the wolf and *inermem* all suggest a very different poem [1 mark].
- (ii) Daunia was a wild area of Southern Italy [1 mark]. Iuba was an African king [1 mark]. Both enhance the terror of the situation [1 mark].
- (iii) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) In stanza five, Horace imagines himself in cold barren lands [1 mark], in stanza six in intolerably hot lands [1 mark].

**4. (b):**

- (i) [1 mark] each for up to **three** examples.
- (ii) [3 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [2 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [1 mark] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iii) Mark only for length of syllables. [1 mark] for each all-correct line; no mark otherwise.
- (iv) There is a good supply; [1 mark] each for up to **two**.

**5 (a):**

- (i) The emperor's council has been summoned [*1 mark*] to decide what to do with an enormous fish [*1 mark*].
- (ii) To call the city prefect, a man of high rank, a *vilicus* [*1 mark*] is to suggest that he is a slave [*1 mark*].
- (iii) [*3 marks*] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [*2 marks*] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [*1 mark*] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) Mark only for length of syllables. [*1 mark*] for each all-correct line; no mark otherwise. For the third mark mention the spondaic fifth foot in line 87.

**5. (b):**

- (i) Atticus is rich [*1 mark*], Rutilus is poor [*1 mark*]. Juvenal thinks that Atticus can get away with extravagance, but Rutilus cannot [*1 mark*].
- (ii) A Roman taking up being a gladiator [*1 mark*], because he has spent all his money [*1 mark*].
- (iii) [*3 marks*] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [*2 marks*] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [*1 mark*] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) Mark only for length of syllables. [*1 mark*] for each correct line; no mark otherwise.

**SECTION B**

***[10 marks]***

**A** Knowledge and Understanding

Achievement  
Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1** The candidate has demonstrated limited knowledge and understanding of the prescribed topic. The essay shows little evidence of wider reading and little familiarity with the texts studied.
- 2** The candidate has demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of the prescribed topic. The essay shows some evidence of wider reading as well as some familiarity with the texts studied. Where appropriate, the candidate has shown only a little awareness of authors' techniques and styles, and/or has made few connections with other, non-literary, features of Roman civilization.
- 3** The candidate has demonstrated satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the prescribed topic. The essay draws on a satisfactory range of literary knowledge as well as familiarity with the texts studied. Where appropriate, the candidate has shown some awareness of authors' techniques and styles, and/or has made connections with other, non-literary, features of Roman civilization. Where appropriate, the candidate has shown some understanding of the topic from ancient and modern perspectives.
- 4** The candidate has demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the prescribed topic. The essay draws on a wide range of literary knowledge as well as considerable familiarity with the detail of the texts studied. Where appropriate, the candidate has commented on authors' techniques and styles, and/or has made relevant connections with other, non-literary, features of Roman civilization. Where appropriate, the candidate has shown a degree of understanding of the topic from ancient and modern perspectives.
- 5** The candidate has demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of the prescribed topic. The essay draws on a very wide range of literary knowledge as well as great familiarity with the detail of the texts studied. Where appropriate, the candidate has made perceptive comments on authors' techniques and styles, and/or has made relevant connections with other, non-literary, features of Roman civilization. Where appropriate, the candidate has shown a high degree of understanding of the topic from ancient and modern perspectives.

**B** Quality of Argument

Achievement  
Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1** The essay is poorly structured, with arguments either incoherent or unsupported by examples or quotations. The overall impression is very weak.
- 2** The essay has some organization but arguments are supported by few examples or quotations. The overall impression is weak.
- 3** The essay is adequately structured, with an argument satisfactorily supported by examples and quotations. The overall impression is sound.
- 4** The essay is well structured, with a clear line of argument well supported by appropriate examples and quotations. The overall impression is solid and carefully argued.
- 5** The essay is very well structured, with a clear, strong line of argument supported by highly appropriate examples and quotations. The overall impression is powerful, precise and persuasive.
-