

MARKSCHEME

November 2003

LATIN

Standard Level

Paper 2

SECTION A

[45 marks]

1.(a)

- (i) Sinon [1 mark] having been captured by the Trojans [1 mark] has just artfully broken off a long speech in such a way as to gain the Trojans' confidence [1 mark]. Candidates will offer a variety of accounts; award [1 mark] for Sinon's name and up to two others for more details.
- (ii) Mark only for length of syllables. [1 mark] per line if all correct, no mark otherwise. In this case, the last syllable of both lines must be marked long, since they are.
- (iii) She is Iphigeneia (accept Iphianassa) [1 mark]. She was sacrificed by her father [1 mark] to provide winds to enable the Greek fleet to sail from Greece to Troy [1 mark]. The story provides plausible support for what Calchas is saying [1 mark]. Candidates will approach this variously; ask yourself whether they have made four valid points for full marks.
- (iv) A word at the beginning of a line immediately followed by sentence end ("enjambement") gains great emphasis [1 mark], a striking effect here as the climax of Ulixes' supposed manipulation of Calchas [1 mark]. Judge other approaches on their merits.
- (v) [4 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [3 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [2 marks] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); [1 mark] for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

1.(b)

- (i) *Panthus* is repeated very sonorously [1 mark] and given his patronymic [1 mark] and his status (*Phoebique sacerdos*) [1 mark]. The effect is to suggest that this is a very important development [1 mark].
- (ii) *uenit, fuimus, fuit, transtuli* are all perfects [1 mark]; then we encounter presents: *dominatur, fundit, miscet* [1 mark]. The effect is to contrast Panthus' judgment that the Trojans end has come with his account of what is going on [1 mark]. Other suggestions on their merits.
- (iii) The horse is high and in the middle of the city [1 mark]; together these facts sum up the disaster suffered by the Trojans [1 mark]. Other suggestions on their merits.
- (iv) [4 marks] for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); [3 marks] for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; [2 marks] for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); [1 mark] for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (v) Mark only for length of syllables. [1 mark] per line if all correct, no mark otherwise. In this case, the last syllable of both lines must be marked long, since they are.

2.(a)

- (i) The fire of Rome **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) Tacitus' appears to be reacting favourably towards the project **[1 mark]**. Any two of the following (or of equally valid points) should be awarded the other **[2 marks]**: "absence of gems and gold", "that such things are *luxu uulgata*", "*arua, solitudinum, siluae, aperta spatia* are all words with favourable connotations".
- (iii) Any **two** of: *audacia* **[1 mark]** suggests "rashness" **[1 mark]**; *quae natura denegauisset* **[1 mark]** suggests "arrogance" **[1 mark]**; *uiribus principis inludere* **[1 mark]** suggests "extravagance" **[1 mark]**; *nec satis causae* **[1 mark]** suggests "frivolity" **[1 mark]**; *incredibilium cupitor* **[1 mark]** suggests "stupidity" **[1 mark]**; *inritae spei* **[1 mark]** suggests "pointlessness" **[1 mark]**. Judge other suggestions on their merits.
- (iv) Tacitus does not like Nero **[1 mark]**. A good account of the evidence for that proposition should be awarded the other **[2 marks]**. A weak but truthful account should attract one of those marks. A truly poor account, neither. A candidate who argues that Tacitus liked Nero should be able to salvage something based on the quality of the argument presented.
- (v) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

2.(b)

- (i) The Pisonian conspiracy **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) According to Tacitus, he called for the poison because bleeding himself was working too slowly **[1 mark]**. The real reason was that he wished to imitate Socrates **[1 mark]** who had died from ingesting hemlock **[1 mark]**.
- (iii) Tacitus is suggesting that some of the conspirators wished to kill Piso after he had killed Nero **[1 mark]** with the intention of replacing him with Seneca as the leader of the conspiracy and the obvious successor to Nero **[1 mark]**. The words quoted deprive Seneca of the excuse that he did not know of their plans **[1 mark]**.
- (iv) This could be answered in very many ways. Award **[1 mark]** for a clear and plausible general conclusion and up to a further three by awarding **[1 mark]** each for any valid supporting points. Ignore true but irrelevant points, deduct **[1 mark]** each for false points.
- (v) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

3.(a)

- (i) The polyptoton (term not necessary for the mark), the juxtaposition of two cases of one word **[1 mark]**, puts great emphasis on the two words **[1 mark]**. Here, it is important for Cicero's argument that there were very many villains from all over the World who had joined and that they were matched by many more respectable people **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iii) The argument is that if so wise a man as Cicero could have been deceived it is little wonder that Caelius was **[1 mark]**. He stressed himself 1. by placing *me* first word 2. by adding *ipsum*, 3. by repeating *me*, 4. by the emphasizing *inquam*. Award **[1 mark]** for the general answer and up to three more for the language points.
- (iv) The Catilinarian conspiracy **[1 mark]** and Cicero's triumph over it **[1 mark]**.
- (v) Caelius' association with Catiline was potentially embarrassing **[1 mark]**. This passage forcefully sums up all the reasons why the jury should, nevertheless, disregard it **[1 mark]**.

3.(b)

- (i) An adverb last word in a sentence must be emphatic **[1 mark]**; it is obviously a matter of concern for a defence if the jury seem to be paying close attention to what the prosecution is saying **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) If Herennius was normally a relaxed character **[1 mark]** his severe manner now would obviously be especially effective **[1 mark]**.
- (iii) Cicero's argument is that the jury can hardly be blamed for paying such close attention to Herennius **[1 mark]** since Cicero himself was overcome by his severity **[1 mark]**. The words to emphasize are *attente* and *egomet* **[1 mark]**. Other approaches may be possible and should be judged for their internal consistency; **[2 marks]** for an analysis, **[1 mark]** for two words.
- (iv) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (v) Award **[1 mark]** for a good choice of example, **[1 mark]** for an effective analysis of what the rhetoric is aiming to achieve, and **[2 marks]** for an account of how it does it. If you think that, in an individual case, a more just award would involve changing this allotment (e.g. awarding **[2 marks]** for giving an analysis of what the rhetoric is aiming to achieve, and only one mark for an account of how it does it) you should not hesitate to do so.

4.(a)

- (i) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (ii) *quondam* “once” is slightly pathetic since it was once true but is not any more **[1 mark]**; *uere* is more argumentative “it really was the case despite what it looks like now” **[1 mark]**. Judge other suggestions on their merits.
- (iii) *obdura* (line 12), the imperative, sums up the consequences of what he has just realized he must do **[1 mark]**; *obdurat* (line 13), the indicative, is an immediate assertion that he is doing what, in the previous line, he had told himself to do **[1 mark]**. The delayed *obdura* (line 19), back to the imperative, may be a reminder of how difficult it will be to persevere in the attitude he has prescribed for himself, or perhaps it is no more than a further demonstration of his determination **[1 mark]**. Judge other suggestions on their merits.
- (iv) The striking point of style is the staccato effect of seven brief questions with no connectives **[1 mark]**. The effect is to suggest anger or some other strong emotion **[1 mark]**. Judge other suggestions on their merits.
- (v) Judge all suggestions on their merits. **[1 mark]** for candidates who can make an intelligent suggestion with little or no supporting arguments. **[2 marks]** for candidates whose analysis is very dubious. **[3 marks]** for candidates who use the Latin to draw plausible conclusions. **[4 marks]** for candidates who use the Latin extensively and in depth to draw interesting conclusions. Interpret this instruction flexibly.

4.(b)

- (i) *bella Numantiae*: a reference **either** to wars fought by Romans against Numantia in the 2nd century BC culminating in its destruction in 133 BC **or** to wars fought there by Augustus; *saeuos Lapithas*: a wild people who invited the Centaurs to a wedding which ended in a savage brawl; *Hylaeum*: a Centaur; *Telluris iuuenes* the Giants, who wanted to attack the gods in Olympus. **[1 mark]** each up to two.
- (ii) The first *me* is emphatically placed by being both the first word of its sentence and the first word of its stanza **[1 mark]**; this importance is reinforced by the close proximity of the repeating *me* **[1 mark]**. The effect is to make clear that Horace is passing from what Maecenas might like (but will not get) to what Horace will do **[1 mark]**. Judge other approaches on their merits.
- (iii) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.

- (iv) Achaemenes was the traditional founder of the Persian kings [*1 mark*]; he was very rich [*1 mark*] and is used to suggest the enormous wealth that Maecenas would forego if he could have Licymnia [*1 mark*].
- (v) The poem is in two parts, what Maecenas would not want him to write about and what Horace would like to write about [*1 mark*]; the first manages both to refuse to write about great military achievements including Augustus' and, even so, to flatter Maecenas and Augustus [*1 mark*]; the second part enables Horace to write lightheartedly about Maecenas' affairs or (if you believe David West) his wife [*1 mark*].

5.(a)

- (i) This is part of a list of people summoned to Domitian's council **[1 mark]** to decide what to do with a giant turbot **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) "If under that disaster and plague" *uel sim* **[1 mark]**. They refer to Domitian **[1 mark]**.
- (iii) Mark only for length of syllables. **[1 mark]** per line if all correct, no mark otherwise. In this case, the last syllable of line 92 may be marked long or short but the last syllable of line 93 must be marked long, since it is.
- (iv) Acilius' son was undeservedly **[1 mark]** put to death by Domitian **[1 mark]**. This Brutus pretended to be mad **[1 mark]** in order to avoid the wrath of his uncle, Tarquinius **[1 mark]**. Both stories reveal the dangers of Domitian's court, Acilius' son obviously and Brutus because it is specifically stated that his trick would no longer work **[1 mark]**.
- (v) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
The first part indicates that for a long time now longevity and political success united in one person has been regarded as miraculous **[1 mark]**. The second line means that, consequentially, Juvenal would rather be a nobody **[1 mark]**.

5.(b)

- (i) Sarmentus and Gabba were court jesters **[1 mark]** in the time of Augustus (the Caesar here) **[1 mark]**. Augustus was regarded as cruel to such people but even they would not have tolerated Domitian's conduct **[1 mark]**.
- (ii) That it would be better to beg openly in public **[1 mark]** than to attend a patron's dinner party **[1 mark]**.
- (iii) **[4 marks]** for a correct translation (or one with a minor error); **[3 marks]** for a translation with one major error or with two minor errors; **[2 marks]** for a translation with two major errors or with three minor errors (or one of a similar quality); **[1 mark]** for a translation with three major errors (or one of a similar quality). Otherwise, award no mark.
- (iv) Mark only for length of syllables. **[1 mark]** per line if all correct, no mark otherwise. In this case, the last syllable of both lines must be marked either short, as it is, or long (*brevis in longo*).
- (v) Any four of 1. "he has to break off his sleep in the morning", 2. "he has to go about with flying shoe ties", 3. "he has to worry that others will get to the *salutatio* before him", 4. "he has to be about just before dawn as the stars are fading (*sideribus dubiis*)", 5. "or at midnight (editors are not unanimous on *aut illo tempore...serraca Bootae*)". Other suggestions on their merits.

SECTION B

[15 marks]

Questions 6 – 10.

Essays are notoriously hard to mark; Here follows an attempt to characterize what might be expected for a given mark.

The essays are worth only fifteen marks each; you should not expect anything very long.

- 13 – 15** This suggests an essay which shows a detailed knowledge of the text coupled with a persuasive answer to the question posed.
- 10 – 12** This suggests an essay which shows either a detailed knowledge of the text coupled with a weaker or less well focussed answer to the question posed **OR** one which shows a reasonable knowledge of the text coupled with a persuasive answer to the question posed.
- 7 – 9** This suggests an essay which is competent and worthy but which shows little or no knowledge or understanding beyond the obvious. Occasionally, such a mark will indicate an essay in which gross error is combined with excellent knowledge or judgment.
- 4 – 6** This suggests an essay which combines pedestrian knowledge and judgment combined with some error.
- 0 – 3** This suggests the essay of a candidate who has read little or nothing of the syllabus.
-