

Scholarship

2012 Assessment Report

Latin

COMMENTARY

The cohort on the whole was not as strong as in previous years, although the top two candidates performed just as well as in the past.

The translation questions provided a full range of responses. The literary analysis questions were sometimes not read carefully enough for what was required to be understood. In Question 4 (a), a number of candidates did not write out the line and then scan it before talking about it in their answers. It was therefore difficult to know whether these candidates were taking a 'punt', or had actually done the scansion on their question paper. It seems that candidates need to be told specifically to scan the line(s) in their answer booklet when a question is about scansion.

It was evident that the word glossary was not used as carefully as possible by some candidates. It is particularly important for candidates to make careful use of the given glossary assistance.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- had a very strong command of the vocabulary and were able to apply that knowledge to the passages for translation – for example in passage 1, they knew the meaning of *tamquam*
- showed an understanding of nuance by choosing the most appropriate word from a range of glossed meanings to fit the way in which they framed their translation
- communicated their literary responses in a sophisticated, but clear and unequivocal way; their answers were well-recognised and made constant reference to the Latin text in order to support their answers
- demonstrated a deep understanding of the grammar of the language which enabled them to translate the passages effectively and consistently, for example in passage 1 translating *eandem...adeptam* as a clause rather than a participle
- had a particularly good understanding of Virgilian style which they were able to demonstrate through accurate and sensitive translation as well as perceptive and original commentary.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- grasped much of the vocabulary but made occasional errors, such as mistaking *morbi* in passage 2 for *mors*, *mortis*; and in passage 1, not recognizing *soletis*
- made good sense of the passages but sometimes left out minor details such as adverbs or made small errors with singular and plural, such as *omnia bona* in passage 1, which was often read as singular
- showed understanding of the passages by providing clear answers to the analysis questions and by providing some evidence from the Latin passages to support their answers but not always consistently
- answered all parts of the analytical questions and made it clear by their written skills how they were doing so.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- did not read the questions carefully and provided comprehensive answers on questions they were expecting. For example in Question 4 (b) a large number of candidates thought that this question was seeking a response on literary techniques; it was not
- left gaps in their translation and lost the flow of the passage, meaning that it was difficult for them to provide coherent commentary in the analysis questions
- showed major gaps both in vocabulary knowledge and in both accident and syntax which meant that their translations often did not make sense, for example in passage 1: linking *opis* and *ipsis*; mistaking *coegit* for *coepit*, *ducem* for part of the verb 'to lead' and *sumus* for *summus*
- commented on the scansion of a line of poetry without providing evidence in the form of a scanned line in their answer
- did not attempt all questions.