

Scholarship

2013 Assessment Report

Latin

COMMENTARY

The overall quality of the candidates' responses was impressive. It is possible that the new examination format, including a vocabulary booklet, contributed to all candidates being able to complete both translations. All questions produced a range of marks from 8-1. For Questions 1, 3 and 4, the median mark was 5 and for Question 2, the median was 4. This may reflect the fact that candidates were less familiar with the type of Latin requiring analysis in Question 2 than they were with that in Virgil's verse (specified in the standard) requiring analysis in Question 4.

In the translation questions, more candidates achieved an 8 for the prose than for the verse, although similar numbers for both gained either 8 or 7. It is possible that candidates, being less familiar with the writing of Tacitus, took more care with it to look for the finer points and/or made minor errors in the Virgil out of increased familiarity with his style and consequently took less care for detail. Repeated errors of translation were not penalized more than once.

Candidates had been well prepared for the analysis questions, particularly in scansion, which assisted their good understanding of the verse. Most candidates demonstrated the ability to go beyond recognition of an aspect of style by providing some explanation of its effect. Those who were able to apply this ability consistently were able to demonstrate sustained higher thinking.

Candidates need to remember to cross out clearly any rough working and/or any first response later replaced by what they think is an improvement, and not to address the marker directly with explanations or comments. They should also refrain from writing alternative translations. Parentheses such as these tend to interrupt the fluency the standard requires and by offering alternative answers candidates in effect are expecting markers to choose the better translation.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- applied highly developed knowledge, skills and understanding of Latin syntax in a sustained manner to produce convincing communication through an accurate, idiomatic and fluent translation into English e.g. by effectively conveying the meaning of such clauses as *num . . . occumbere . . . num . . . potuere capi* and *dubitem . . . implorare* in Question 3
- demonstrated a strong command of vocabulary (enabling careful use to be made of the provided glossary) as well as thorough understanding of Latin accidence e.g. by recognising the number and case of nouns such as *res* and *adulteria* in Question 1 and *regum* in Question 3, as well as the subject and tense of verbs such as *dabitur* in Question 3
- demonstrated analysis and critical thinking at a high level in Questions 2 and 4, showing perception and insight and independent reflection, with responses always including detailed reference to sections or words from the Latin text (and for verse, to correctly scanned lines) appropriate to support explanation of identified stylistic and poetic features.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- applied highly developed knowledge, skills and understanding of Latin to produce an accurate and mostly idiomatic and fluent translation, but not, for example, consistently supplying a part of the auxiliary verb 'to be', where it had been omitted in the Latin passage in Question 1 but was needed for fluency in English
- translated Latin words accurately but occasionally not in the correct order, e.g. *infecti caedibus scopuli* in Question 1 and *regnis . . . Latinis* in Question 3
- demonstrated analysis and critical thinking at a high level and communicated this thinking convincingly, e.g. by being able to comment appropriately on the effect of a particular use of scansion or reference or stylistic device, though not to the depth or breadth of explanation achieved by those candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- did not always make correct use of the information given in the vocabulary booklet when translating Latin into English e.g. in Question 3 by treating *capti* as if it were *capiti*, or confusing *viros* with *vires* and *gener* with *gens*
- did not correctly recognise and handle some word forms and instances of grammatical structure, e.g. in Question 3 by treating *caput* as nominative and not linking *haec* with *dicta*
- wrote some analysis in their responses to Questions 2 and 4 but did not manage to recognise sufficient subtleties of language in Questions 1 and/or 3 in order to analyse the Latin passages convincingly.