

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

Latin

COMMENTARY

Many scripts were of high quality, produced by well-prepared, scholarly candidates. Several candidates wrote accurate and fluent translations, a significant achievement under the pressure of an examination and particularly so for the prose passage, where the candidate has no forewarning of style or content. Most candidates seemed to tackle the verse passage with the confidence obtained from being familiar with some aspects of Virgil's hexameter.

Scholarship questions are written to offer capable candidates at the conclusion of their secondary school education the challenge of writing responses which draw on all the knowledge, understanding and skills which they have gained in their study of Latin to date. This year's questions requiring the use of analytical skills in order to demonstrate critical appreciation of language, style and context proved particularly searching, but some candidates gained full marks for writing perceptive responses supported by evidence from the text.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- paid very close attention to detail when translating Latin into English e.g. in Question 1 they were able to tell that *ipsas* referred to the darkness and that dust was falling back *in ipsos* onto the very people who had stirred it up. They recognised genders in *huius*, *quaedam*, *ad tristia* and *ad subita*. In Question 3 they were able to express the meaning of *dimitte fugam* clearly in English idiom
- demonstrated depth of perception in literary comment e.g. in Question 2 they were able to appreciate that Seneca, in writing about emotion, was observing what it is to be human, rather than himself demonstrating emotion. In Question 4 they detected the rhythm of horses' hooves in line 11 of the verse and they observed that the horrific slaying of the enemy warrior was made the more horrific because Virgil used a simile from the natural world to describe a killing, leaving the reading audience to imagine for themselves the gory details of the killing of the man.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- paid close attention to detail when translating Latin into English e.g. in Question 1 they were able to construe *de illo in quem* correctly, to recognise that *cum* in line 3 is best translated as 'since' and that *adducet* is in the future tense, while *haberet* and *auferret* are subjunctives. In Question 3 they were able to apply their knowledge of grammar and prosody to match words correctly so that for example they were able to tell that in line 6 of the verse, *accensa* describes *illa* rather than *dolore*
- demonstrated some perception in literary comment e.g. in Question 2 they were able to appreciate that Seneca's journey had been a struggle as well as why that was so. In Question 4 they detected that the warrior's assumption that Camilla would be unable to defeat him assisted her to take him by surprise.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- had difficulty in recognising some vocabulary and/or word forms and structures, preventing their obtaining full understanding of the Latin passages, thereby making specifically accurate literary comment difficult for themselves
- did not fully grasp what was required by the literary questions i.e. explanation or comment or analysis in detail with reference to specific words/groups of words in the texts of Questions 1 and 3
- were unable to address all the literary questions, in particular Question 4 (a) (i), requiring explanation of how language had been used effectively.