



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

www.XtremePapers.com

LATIN (PRINCIPAL)

9788/02

Paper 2 Prose Literature

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

The specimen paper is for general illustrative purposes. Please see the syllabus for the relevant year of the examination for details of the prescribed texts.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.



Section A (35 marks)**Principles of marking the translation**

- (a) full marks for each section should only be awarded if grammar and vocabulary are entirely correct. However, one minor error that does not substantially affect meaning, does not prevent the award of full marks
- (b) more specifically, examiners should check that verbs – tense, mood, voice and person (if appropriate); nouns and adjectives – case, number and gender are written or identified correctly
- (c) the number of marks awarded for each section reflects the length of the section and its (grammatical) difficulty
- (d) examiners should take a holistic approach. When work is entirely (see (a)) correct, full marks should be awarded. When work has some grammatical errors examiners should award the middle marks for that section; when work has considerable errors examiners should award the lower marks for that section.

Principles of marking the commentary questions

- (a) examiners should be guided both by the question-specific answers and by the extent to which candidates demonstrate understanding of the text and appreciation of the language used
- (b) while answers need not necessarily be structured as an argument, they will be more than a checklist of points
- (c) the question-specific notes describe the area covered by the question and define its key elements. There is no one required answer, and the notes are not exhaustive. However, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question
- (d) examiners, teachers and candidates should be aware that there is a variety of ways in which a commentary question can be answered. The exemplar answers provided in the indicative content are exemplary, and should not become a model for teachers and candidates
- (e) when answering the commentary question, candidates are rewarded for the following:
 - a sound and well-expressed understanding of the meaning or tone of the passage (depending on the question)
 - accurate observation and reference to the Latin either of meaning or of interesting use of language
 - sophisticated discussion of meaning or language (or both).

Indicative content

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 5.1–39.51 Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 5.6 Translation [10]

sed postquam res eorum civibus, moribus, agris aucta satis prospera satisque pollens videbatur, sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur, invidia ex opulentia orta est. [5]

igitur reges populique finitumi bello temptare, pauci ex amicis auxilio esse; nam ceteri metu perculsi a periculis aberant. [4]

at Romani domi militiaeque intenti festinare, parare, alius alium hortari, hostibus obviam ire, libertatem, patriam parentesque armis tegere. [5]

post, ubi pericula virtute propulerant, sociis atque amicis auxilia portabant magisque dandis quam accipiendis beneficiis amicitias parabant. imperium legitimum, nomen imperi regium habebant. [6]

Mark out of 20 and then divide by two.

EITHER

2 Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 5.15–16(a) Lines 1–10 (*iam primum . . . vecordia inerat*): how does Sallust succeed in giving the reader a vivid portrait of Catiline's character and motives? [12]

In these lines, Sallust portrays Catiline's madness and his corruption of the youth. Candidates should show how prone to exaggeration, and how lurid Sallust's portrayal of Catiline is. Candidates could suggest that it is more of a literary exercise than a true record of his character. Candidates could also show how Sallust's theme of moral corruption is always kept in mind.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- *multa nefanda stupra* (with entirely inappropriate women)
- falling for a woman who can only be praised for her beauty
- *scelestis nuptiis*
- themes adopted from tragedy when describing the madness of Catiline's character: e.g. pollution (*animus impurus*), mention of the gods (*dis hominibusque infestus*), madness caused by guilt (*conscientia mentem excitam vastabat*), horrific appearance (*color ei exsanguis, foedi oculi*)
- use of paradox: *neque quietibus sedari poterat*
- a typical example of Sallustian rhetoric, e.g. *igitur ... incessus*: verb omitted, asyndeton, tricolon, two examples of *chiasmus*
- use of alliteration: *voltuque vecordia*
- vivid, powerful language, e.g. *vastabat*
- written as though part of a speech.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

- (b) Lines 11–22 (*sed iuventutem . . . opportuna Catilinae*): how does Sallust portray Catiline's associates, and their relationship to their leader? [13]

The lines present a picture of (bad) young men easily led into corrupt and depraved behaviour by a master of depravity and corruption. But note that Catiline can also treat them badly, ruining reputations, forcing them to practise outrages so as not to be forced out of the habit. Veterans ruined by extravagant living, etc.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- use of alliteration: *multis modis mala*
- use of asyndeton: *fidem, fortunas, pericula*
- vivid, powerful language: *illexerat, attriverat, iugulare, torpescerent*
- use of historic infinitives: *commodare, habere, circumvenire, iugulare* (using infinitives after *imperabat* is an unusual construction)
- poetic language suggestive of a variety of meanings: *insontes sicuti sontes*
- pairs of words for emphasis: *famam atque pudorem* and *malus atque crudelis*
- written as though part of a speech: *ut supra diximus, post, scilicet*.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

OR

3 Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 5.34–35

- (a) Lines 1–6 (*at Catilina . . . scriptum est*): explain Catiline's situation at this point. How convincing is his explanation of his motive for leaving? [10]

Catiline, frustrated in his attempts to get rid of Cicero and obtain political power by constitutional means, has left Rome to join Gaius Manlius, who has been raising an army in Etruria. He has threatened to march on the city. He has left fellow conspirators in Rome with orders to continue acts of terrorism and attempts to assassinate Cicero. According to Sallust, this departure was prompted by a dramatic confrontation with Cicero in the Senate House, which ended with Catiline being hounded out by the Senate. He was also facing a number of prosecutions for violence.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

Catiline – unsurprisingly enough – tries to portray himself as a victim rather than a criminal. Note:

- *falsis criminibus circumventum*
- *non . . . tanti sceleris conscius*
- *sed uti . . . oreretur*.

In other words, Catiline portrays others as doing exactly what he has been doing: arguably, the idea that he might be leaving in order to preserve the peace of the Republic is laughable.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

(b) Lines 7–19 (*L. Catilina . . . haveto*): discuss the tone of the letter.

[15]

Candidates may make reference to the possibility that this is a transcript of a real letter written by Catiline, rather than a Sallustian invention. Whoever wrote it, candidates must discuss the tone, whether they call it persuasive and engaging or anything else.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- personal touches in the letter, e.g. *re cognita*: Catiline had genuine reason to be grateful to Catulus, leader of the optimates, who successfully defended him against charges of incest with a Vestal Virgin in 73 BC; and *nunc Orestillam commendo . . . per liberos tuos*: the request that Catulus protects Orestilla shows genuine concern
- the use of euphemism, e.g. *in novo consilio*: euphemism for his decision not to go into exile but to join Manlius and use force
- the portrayal of himself as the victim, rather than the aggressor, to evoke sympathy: *magnis in meis periculis, fructu laboris . . . privatus, vim mihi parari*
- colloquial expressions: *mediusfidius, honore honestatos, hoc nomine*
- a sense of urgency: *plura cum scribere vellem*
- sound effects: *contumeliisque concitatus, publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine*, (p-m-c, p-m-c), *homines honore honestatos*.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 31–804 Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 72 Translation [10]

M. vero Caelius cur in hoc iudicium vocatur? [2]

cui neque proprium quaestionis crimen obicitur nec vero aliquod eius modi, quod sit a lege seiunctum, cum vestra severitate coniunctum; [5]

cuius prima aetas dedita disciplinae fuit iisque artibus, quibus instituimur ad hunc usum forensem, ad capessendam rem publicam, ad honorem, gloriam, dignitatem; [6]

iis autem fuit amicitiiis maiorum natu, quorum imitari industriam continentiamque maxime vellet, iis aequalium studiis, ut eundem quem optimi ac nobilissimi petere cursum laudis videretur. [7]

Mark out of 20 and then divide by two.

EITHER

5 Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 45–47(a) Lines 1–10 (*feri enim . . . puerilis*): how does Cicero characterise orators in these lines? [12]

Generally speaking, orators are serious people who have to practise, work, and write a lot. They do not have the time for the sort of dissolute lifestyle that Caelius has been accused of.

It could be argued that in these lines, Cicero demonstrates how much effort has to be put into persuasive and effective rhetoric: he could not have been drunk when he wrote this.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- the asyndeton of *libidini . . . cupiditate* and *nimia copia*
- orators need to be both physically (*agendo*) and mentally (*cogitando*) fit
- eloquence leads to *tantis praemiis*
- the repetition and asyndeton of *tanta* (five times in various forms)
- the rhetorical question of ‘when there are so many rewards, etc., why so few?’
- more asyndeton in the last few lines, with the list of all the nice things that have to be rejected or abandoned.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

(b) Lines 11–19 (*an hic . . . luce laetetur*): how does Cicero make these lines persuasive? [13]

Having established what sort of life an orator must lead, Cicero goes on to try to show that Caelius was a very successful orator as a very young man. The argument is that, therefore, he cannot be the sort of person depicted by the prosecution.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- the conditional sentence and rhetorical question in lines 11–12
- *adulescens* in line 11
- further conditionals in line 12
- more asyndeton in lines 13–15, all part of a rhetorical question
- lines 15–19: Cicero gives an alternative explanation that, implicitly, assassinates the character of Clodia by describing the sorts of places she likes to frequent
- Clodia is explicitly characterised by *non . . . flagitiorum integumenta, sed in turpissimis rebus*, etc.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

OR

6 Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 59–60

(a) Lines 1–11 (*vidi enim . . . doleret*): discuss the tone of these lines. [15]

Cicero is trying to impress the jurors/readers with the nobility of the death of Metellus. He is also trying to bask in the reflected glory of that nobility by stressing his personal involvement and his presence at the death-scene, etc. He seems to be aiming for grandeur, sadness and nobility.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- *vidi . . . vidi* in line 1; *dolorem . . . acerbissimum* in line 1
- line 2: *gremioque patriae*
- line 2: *natum . . . imperio*
- lines 3–5: Metellus' public activities in the senate and law courts are stressed; note the many superlatives
- line 5 onwards: a certain pathos here as well: *moriens, oppressa mens, extremum sensum, flentem, morientibus, impenderet procella mihi* (with *quanta tempestas*)
- striking the wall, calling on Catulus and Cicero and Republic (*crebro . . . saepe . . . saepissime*).

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

- (b) Lines 12–18 (*quem quidem . . . impedit*): discuss the rhetorical techniques used in these lines. [10]

The lines are dramatic, disgusted, extreme.

Candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- *repentini sceleris*
- *furenti fratri . . . furere*
- the threat to kill Clodius with his own hands in line 15
- the sequence of rhetorical questions
- the disgust of *ista mulier . . . audebit*
- the pleading of *nonne*
- *non . . . non*
- colourful vocabulary: *funestam . . . luctuosam perhorrescet, debilitavit*
- the superlatives in line 17.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

Section B (25 marks)

All questions in this section are marked according to the mark scheme below. Candidates will not tend to show **all** the qualities or weaknesses described by any one level. Examiners will attempt to weigh up all these at every borderline to see whether the work can be considered for the higher level.

To achieve at the highest level candidates need to demonstrate excellent control of their material, an ability to select and analyse, in addition to thorough and empathetic understanding of the texts studied. Credit is given for reference to the wider social and political context, and for engagement with secondary literature, where appropriate. Candidates are likewise credited for effective use of technical language and for a well-expressed and well-structured response.

Examiners should take a positive and flexible approach and reward evidence of knowledge, especially any signs of understanding and careful organisation.

Marks are awarded in the following ratio:

AO1: 10 marks

AO3: 15 marks

Level	AO1 descriptor	Marks	AO3 descriptor	Marks
5	Thorough historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Specific detail as well as wide-ranging knowledge of the text.	9–10	Close analysis of the text. Authoritative selection of appropriate material. Engagement with secondary literature, where appropriate. Confident use of technical terms. Well-structured, well-developed and coherent response.	13–15
4	Sound historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Specific detail or wide-ranging knowledge of the text.	7–8	Clear ability to analyse the text. Relevant selection of material. Familiarity with secondary literature, where appropriate. Some use of technical terms. Clear and logically structured response.	10–12
3	Some historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Fair knowledge of the text, though superficial and/or lacking in general context.	5–6	Some analysis of the text. Material selected but not always to best effect. Some reference to secondary literature included, where appropriate. Occasional correct use of technical terms. Uneven structure and development of the response.	7–9
2	Limited historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Partial knowledge of the text/wider context.	3–4	Weak analysis of the text. Material unfocused. Attempt at correct use of technical terms but some confusion. No progression of argument.	4–6
1	Very limited evidence of knowledge of the text/wider context.	1–2	Very limited attempt at analysis of the text. Basic material. Limited evidence of technical terms. Little attempt at structuring the response.	1–3
0	No rewardable content.	0	No rewardable content.	0

Indicative content

EITHER

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 5.1–39.5

EITHER

- 7 Discuss Sallust's narrative technique in this passage. How typical is it of the rest of the *Bellum Catilinae*? [Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 21–23] [25]**

For AO1, candidates could make some or all of the following points:

- the interest in the dramatic
- the use of reported speech
- the innuendo (*fuere . . . qui dicerent*)
- the colourful vocabulary (*incredabat, cupiditatis, ignominiae, sceleris, degustavissent*, etc.)
- the extraordinary story of Catilinarian transgression
- Catiline as plotter extraordinaire
- examples of other bad people (Curius, in this case).

For AO3, candidates could discuss the interest in drama. Drama runs through the text, as does the larger-than-life figure of Catiline (appropriate examples should be given of similar pen-portraits). However, there is no shading here: Catiline simply seems to be bad, and his (few) positive or at least remarkable and not entirely negative qualities are excluded from this account (appropriate examples should be given). The use of rumour and innuendo is also common, as is the dominance of words from a moral vocabulary.

OR

- 8 'Sallust is primarily a moralist, not an historian.' Discuss this view of the *Bellum Catilinae*. [25]**

For AO1, candidates should show knowledge of the structure and content of the *Bellum Catilinae*, specifically the sections which are overtly moralising, e.g. chapters 1–4 and 6–13. Candidates should also show awareness of a number of instances where Sallust's account lacks chronology, omits important facts or makes errors, accidental or deliberate.

For AO3, candidates should discuss the role of an historian and analyse Sallust's own view of history. Candidates should appreciate that the Romans' view of history at the time was different from our own and Sallust was one of the first true Roman historians along with Caesar. Sallust follows the Greek historian Thucydides as far as his interest in rhetoric (and speeches) is concerned but he is not as scientific as Thucydides. Candidates could argue that Sallust's introductions and digressions are over-long, over-generalised and exaggerated for a work of this scale. Candidates could mention the digression on Sempronia (chapter 25) as a good example of Sallust's interest in moral corruption.

Regarding historical research, Sallust seems to have relied heavily upon his own knowledge and hearsay (he was 23 at the time of the conspiracy). He is not clear on chronology, e.g. pre-dating the meeting in Laeca's house, dates are vague and there are large omissions, e.g. we pass straight from the elections of 64 BC to those of 63 BC. His aim is more to show how atrocious the crime of Catiline was, suggesting that he is biased against Catiline; but, interestingly, he is only lukewarm in his praise of Cicero and praises Cato as highly as Caesar, whom he supported politically. It is difficult to argue that the *Bellum Catilinae* is primarily a political pamphlet, though it may in part have been written to clear Caesar's name, since his involvement in the conspiracy had been implicated.

Provided that candidates show awareness of Sallust's defects and his pre-occupation with social discontent, various conclusions are acceptable. Candidates must discuss Sallust as a historian and a moralist to achieve levels 4 or 5.

OR

9 Why do you think Sallust chose to write a work on the conspiracy of Catiline? [25]

For AO1, candidates should show knowledge of the overall structure of the *Bellum Catilinae* and be able to recall Sallust's stated reasons for writing about it: the unprecedented nature of the crime and danger to the state. Candidates should be able to show how the conspiracy fits into the history of the late Republic. Candidates could also show knowledge of Sallust's own life and career, which were contemporary to events described.

For AO3, various approaches are possible but the best answers will perhaps not focus on any one answer and will discuss a number of reasons for Sallust's chosen subject, including his own stated reasons (e.g. chapters 1–4 and 36–39). Candidates could discuss Sallust's interest in social history and aim to show the conspiracy and Catiline himself as products of the moral decline in the late Republic; or candidates could approach the question from a more literary point of view, arguing that Sallust was less interested in telling the truth and more interested in displaying his artistic and rhetorical skills as a writer, e.g. character sketches, speeches, letters, description of human emotions, description of battles. On the other hand, candidates could argue that the *Bellum Catilinae* is primarily a political pamphlet, though this is more difficult to defend.

Various approaches and conclusions are possible. However, candidates must make sufficient direct reference to the text and should not over-generalise in their answers.

OR

Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 31–80

EITHER

10 How consistent is the portrait of Clodia in this passage with Cicero's portrayal of her elsewhere in *Pro Caelio*? [Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 34] [25]

For AO1, candidates could make the following points:

- Cicero has invented a speech by a famous ancestor of Clodia's (for contrast)
- Clodia is depicted as predatory in lines 1–2
- Clodia seems to be unaware of the superb achievements of her ancestors, and the responsibilities entailed by those achievements and that rank
- Clodia is not seen to have treated her husband Metellus well
- Clodia is characterised by *temeritas* and *libido*; this is in contrast to *familiam clarissimam*
- the implied contrast between Clodia not being impressed by her male ancestors, but that her female ancestors are pious, inspired, brave, etc.
- *tu amorum turpissimorum cotidie foedera ferires*
- *inceste*.

For AO3, candidates should discuss the characterisation of Clodia. They should also note that elsewhere in the speech, Clodia is generally more directly characterised (i.e. the contrast is less important). Some of the traits are similar – bad friends, disgusting sexual behaviour, dishonesty, etc. Candidates should be able to write about all these, and anything else relevant, with appropriate examples.

OR

11 What do you think are the main qualities of Cicero as a defence lawyer which emerge from *Pro Caelio*? [25]

For AO1, candidates should show some knowledge of what was expected of a defence lawyer in Roman times. They should show knowledge of the main arguments, techniques and tactics used by Cicero in the speech.

For AO3, candidates could discuss Cicero's skills as an orator. Expect candidates to discuss the ways in which Cicero uses humour, e.g. mockery of the prosecution case and the inexperience of Atratinus; the vivid picture of Clodia as a whore, conjuring up one of her ancestor's ghosts to castigate her; using quotes from comedy in playing the part of the stern old man giving advice to an extravagant youth; his pretence that his picture of a lustful woman preying on young men is not Clodia but some imaginary person; etc. Candidates could also discuss the ways in which Cicero deflects criticism from his client onto Clodia, using attack as the best way of defence. Cicero mixes the serious with the humorous, e.g. moral and philosophical sections. Cicero's own personality also comes through and one feels that he is intimately bound up with the case, i.e. the speech is not a tedious, objective presentation of the case but vivid and dramatic. Candidates could also discuss Cicero's use of narrative, e.g. his witty reworking of the charges against his client; and his ability to stir the emotions of the jury, e.g. his emotional description of the death of Metellus or his final appeal for sympathy towards Caelius's father.

Candidates should discuss a variety of points and successfully show why this speech is regarded as one of Cicero's most brilliant.

OR

12 'In *Pro Caelio*, Cicero is more interested in entertaining the jury than in addressing the charges against his client.' To what extent do you think this is true? [25]

For AO1, candidates need to show knowledge of the structure and content of the whole speech, pointing out the sections which deal with the actual charges of theft (sections 51 onwards) and attempted poisoning as well as the entertaining attacks upon Clodia (sections 31–6) and more general defence of Caelius' youthful extravagance.

For AO3, candidates need to show some balance in their argument, showing how Cicero spends much of the earlier part of the speech defending Caelius for past misdemeanours, e.g. as a supporter of Catiline, and only addresses the charges against his client after half the speech is over, pouring scorn on the prosecution's story about how he supposedly tried to poison Clodia. Candidates should show how even here he digresses, e.g. to mourn the death of Metellus, Clodia's ex-husband, to further blacken her character. However, the majority of the essay should deal with the different ways in which Cicero entertains the jury, since *Pro Caelio* is recognised as being one of his most humorous: mocking the prosecution; the vivid picture of Clodia as a whore; conjuring up one of her ancestor's ghosts to castigate her; using quotes from comedy in playing the part of the stern old man giving advice to an extravagant youth; his pretence that his picture of a lustful woman preying on young men is not Clodia but some imaginary person; etc. Give credit for specific examples of humour such as sarcasm, word play and exaggeration, but mere lists of examples should not receive as much credit as a well-argued essay. Higher-level essays should be balanced in their argument, showing ways in which Cicero aims to entertain the jury but also analysing how he addresses the actual charges. Candidates should generally conclude that Cicero does both.