
AP Latin

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Free Response Question 3

- ☒ **Scoring Guideline**
- ☒ **Student Samples**
- ☒ **Scoring Commentary**

AP[®] LATIN

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3

	Development of Argument/Analysis	Use of Latin	Inferences and Conclusions	Contextual Knowledge
5 Strong	The student develops a <u>strong</u> essay about how the Romans and Trojans attempt to overcome difficulties of coming safely to shore and <u>consistently aligns it to Latin evidence</u> . Occasional errors need not weaken the overall impression of the essay.	The student provides <u>copious examples of accurate</u> , specific, and relevant <u>Latin</u> , properly cited and drawn <u>from throughout both passages</u> .	The student <u>consistently makes inferences and draws conclusions</u> that accurately reflect the Latin and support the analysis.	The student <u>uses specific contextual references</u> consistently in order to support the analysis.
4 Good	The student develops a <u>good</u> essay about how the Romans and Trojans attempt to overcome difficulties of coming safely to shore, <u>providing main ideas and some supporting details</u> . Although the <u>analysis may not be nuanced</u> , it is based on a sound understanding of the Latin.	The student <u>provides examples of Latin that are generally accurate</u> , specific, relevant, and properly cited; <u>while not plentiful, they are drawn from throughout both passages</u> .	The student makes some inferences and draws some conclusions that accurately reflect the Latin and support the analysis. The student <u>may rely only on what is stated or may make inaccurate inferences</u> .	The student <u>uses some specific contextual references</u> that support the analysis.
3 Average	The student develops an <u>adequate</u> essay about how the Romans and Trojans attempt to overcome difficulties of coming safely to shore. The essay may <u>reflect some understanding of the passages</u> , or the essay <u>may be strong for one passage but weak for the other</u> . Analysis <u>(1)</u> may not be well developed, <u>(2)</u> may rely on main ideas but few supporting details, or <u>(3)</u> may be more summary than analysis.	The student <u>may provide few accurate Latin citations</u> ; they may not be linked to the analysis or may fail to support it.	The student <u>may display only limited understanding</u> of implied information.	The student <u>may sometimes misunderstand contextual references</u> or fail to connect them effectively to the analysis.

AP[®] LATIN

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 (continued)

	Development of Argument	Use of Latin	Inferences and Conclusions	Contextual Knowledge
2 Weak	The student <u>recognizes the passage(s), but presents only a weak essay</u> . It may be confusing and lack organization, or may rely on summary. It addresses (1) only portions of each passage or (2) addresses one passage well but the other not at all.	The student <u>provides little Latin support</u> , which is taken out of context or misunderstood, or the student <u>may use no Latin</u> .	The student <u>may make incorrect assumptions</u> or only rarely draw inferences and conclusions based on the passages.	The student <u>may show no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context</u> ; references to context, if any, are irrelevant.
1 Poor	The student <u>understands the question but offers no meaningful analysis</u> . Although the student may not recognize the passages, the response <u>contains some correct, relevant information</u> .	The student <u>cites no Latin or only individual Latin words</u> and exhibits either no understanding of the Latin in context or a complete misunderstanding.	The student <u>does not draw inferences</u> and conclusions based on the passages.	The student <u>shows no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context</u> and provides no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.
0 Unacceptable	The student offers a <u>response that is totally irrelevant, totally incorrect, or restates the question</u> .	The student <u>demonstrates no understanding of Latin in context</u> .	The student <u>does not draw inferences</u> and conclusions based on the passages.	The student <u>shows no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context</u> and provides no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3 A
1 of 5

Everything about Illioneus' speech is meant to calm and reassure Dido. Vergil describes him as speaking with a "calm heart" (*placido... pectore*), as getting too excited might worry Dido. He acknowledges that Jupiter gave her the right to found her city (Lines 2-3), which an invader wouldn't do, as that would mean that the invader would be conquering a city that the gods ordained a specific person to rule. He humbles himself and the other Trojans, calling them wretched (*miseri*), and begs (*oramus*) her to ~~not attack~~ spare his dutiful people (*parce pio generi*). An invader trying to intimidate

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3A
2 of 5

someone would beg them to spare his or her wretched people. He specifically states that the Trojans aren't here to steal Libya's household gods or ~~or~~ ung plunder ~~plunder~~ by the sword (Lines 7-8), if it wasn't already clear. He also states that ~~the~~ the conquered Trojans could not expect to conquer such a city (Line 9). All of this speech is to reassure Dido that the Trojans aren't a threat.

On the other hand, the standard bearer, after Caesar's efforts to make the landing safer for his men, makes a speech and performs an action meant to force the soldiers to attack. Despite ~~the~~ Caesar's movement of his ~~own~~

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3A
3 of 5

larger warships to the open flank of the Britains,
ordering men there to shoot weapons and projectiles
at the Britons, and the slight fearful retreat
of the Britains (Lines 1-6), his men still are
hesitant to leave the ship, "on account of the
depth of the sea" (propter altitudinem maris). ^(nostris militibus cunctantibus)

Caesar has done all he can, and the depth of the
sea isn't changing. The standard bearer's speech,
which gets them advancing, begins with him ordering
the soldiers to "jump down" (desilite). The fact that
this command is in the imperative gives it some
extra force. Then, he states that the soldiers must

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3A
4 of 5

want the enemy to get the standard, as if they don't

jump down, that's what will happen (*nisi vultis aquilam hostibus prodere*). This is quite the accusation, as a standard of a legion was worshipped by the soldiers and was thought to have protective powers. Losing a standard to the enemy was a deep disgrace and would have brought shame to the legion and, more specifically, the men who lost the legion in the first place, which none of them would want. ~~The standard bearer was~~ ~~the standard bearer~~. He then jumps off the ship with the eagle (Line 10). Now that the eagle ~~is~~ (i.e. standard) is actively going towards the enemy, the soldiers must choose to either stay and lose the eagle, or depart and protect it. Thus, the standard bearer's words and action ~~prompt~~ are designed to prompt action from the soldiers.

To conclude, a speech assists each group in going to shore; Ilioneus reassures Dido that the Trojans aren't a threat, and the standard bearer encourages the Romans to attack. The reason these two approaches differ so much is due to the different position each group has in the power dynamic. Ilioneus and the Trojans are weak;

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3A
5 of 5

Didor could easily dispatch them. Thus, they must try to appease her. The Romans and the standard bearer, however, are trying to gain power over the Britons, who ~~not~~ ~~negatively~~ ~~negatively~~ ignore diplomatic advances from the Romans, making diplomacy not an option without a show of force first. Thus, each speech is effective in the relevant situation, but wouldn't work in the other situation.

-19- ~~test page~~ GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Begin your answer to Question 3 on this page.

3B
1 of 3

In both The Aeneid and Caesar's Bellum Gallicum, the protagonist's army faced difficulties when attempting to come to the shore of an unknown place. Aeneas and his crew were separated before landing because of the storm ~~caused~~ sent by Juno and her ~~own~~ disregard of Neptune and Jupiter's power. When they arrived in Carthage, they request safety for their ships and themselves from Queen Dido. In contrast, Caesar and his army was viciously bombarded with attacks from the native army of the land they were ~~approaching~~ approaching.

Caesar was faced with aggression; his army and ships were poorly equipped to handle the shallow water. "Barbaris inuasionem et motus ad usum expeditionem" (Caesar 12). The enemy was familiar with the land and practiced ~~the~~ combat and ~~learned~~ strategies on the shore, but Caesar's men were not used to the shallow water. Their ~~boats could not~~ ~~on~~ ship was open for the enemy to attack. "ad latus apertum hostium constitit" (Caesar 4). The enemy was attacking ~~the~~ and it seemed like Caesar's army had no hope to succeed in invading the land, but the aquilifer encouraged the men to go and fight with his rousing speech ~~encouraging them~~ and

3B
2043

2 of 3

undite the
most ene

~~Ullrich~~ Galtner

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

3B
3 of 3

Caesar's passage jumped into the sea of ~~lethargy~~ adversaries, while Ilieneus approached the queen of the foreign land with respect, addressing her properly, "O regina" (Virgil 2), and ~~and~~ ~~expressing~~ expressing reverence for her and the city by ~~invoking~~ invoking Jupiter's title, insinuating her great power, "nonam cū condere Iuppiter urbem iustitiam dedit" (Virgil 2) and indirectly diminishing his power to be more ~~contrary~~ respectful to Dido, as if he was a child begging for something to a superior.

3C₁

Begin your answer to Question 3 on this page.

The Romans ~~and Trojans~~ attempted a lot to overcome these difficulties. They worked hard ~~and~~ had to go through a lot of obstacles to make it to shore. In line 1 they had to face against barbarians "prae barbarias". It was a difficult tough fight but they were able to defeat the barbarians.

The queen was raging in line 2 and in line 3 the Romans ~~Trojans~~ were deciding how they were going to defeat the enemy ("ad latus apertum hostium constitui").

In line 7 they had come up with a plan in where the 10th legion was carrying a eagle, "qui decimae legionis aquilam ferebat". This eagle was to distract the enemy from attacking the Romans and Trojans. The eagle was used as sort of a sacrifice. When they had heard the great voice of the enemy they began to carry the eagle from the ship and to the enemy as explained in lines 9-10 ("Hoc cum voce magna dixisset, se ex navi proiecit atque in hostes aquilam ferre coepit").

B) Great Iliares uses another attempt to overcome the barbarians by talking and persuading them to stop what they were doing ("O regina, novam cui condere Iuppiter urbem iulitiaeque dedit gentes frenare superbas")

3C2

Continue your answer to Question 3 on this page if necessary.

He continues to explain himself and goes on and on. Illioneus is trying to talk reasonably with the barbarians in order to avoid the battle and overcome this threatened difficulty. Illioneus to overcome this difficulty of threats, he starts to ask them serious questions. Lines 9-10 he asked why do the barbarians send the death of the father (paraphrasing). The Trojan Illeareus tries to get the barbarians deeply thinking of why their trying to mess with the Trojans.

The Romans use physical actions by using the eagle to get past the barbarians and the Trojans, specifically Illeareus uses kind of a psychological trick to get past the barbarians. ~~The Romans fought a more~~ The Romans sought a more aggressive approach while the Trojans used a more laid back approach in order to get past and make it to shore.

AP[®] LATIN

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 3

Overview

Responses were expected to demonstrate clear and coherent arguments about Latin texts and Roman culture, overall comprehension of Latin readings outlined in the course syllabus, and analysis of the effects of language usage and stylistic features in Latin texts.

Sample: 3A

Score: 4

The student introduces citations from the Vergil selection after a brief statement of Ilioneus's purposes: "Everything about Ilioneus' speech is meant to calm and reassure Dido." The reliance upon single words and phrases ("*placido pectore*" / "*miseri*" / "*oramus*") in lines 4–6 moves the discussion forward but does not allow for a full, nuanced analysis. Additionally, Ilioneus's shift in tone during the remainder of the speech is not addressed. This lack of elaboration limits the essay's effect.

The treatment of the Caesar passage is also somewhat uneven. The student comments only briefly on Caesar's efforts to reverse the difficult position of the army. Instead, the student focuses on the Roman standard bearer's exhortation of his fellow soldiers, ordering them to "jump down (*desilite*)" and warning them that the enemy will "get the standard ... if they don't (*nisi vultis aquilam hostibus prodere*)." Here the student makes a number of valid inferences, e.g., that the soldiers are shamed by the possible loss of the standard and are thereby persuaded to act to safeguard it.

The essay displays a confident use of generally accurate and relevant paraphrased Latin examples: "He then jumps off the ship with the eagle (Line 10)" and summarizes the thought with "Thus, the standard bearers' words and action are designed to prompt action from the soldiers."

Sample: 3B

Score: 2

The essay reflects a recognition of the general contexts of both passages, although it contains some misunderstood Latin citations and a limited understanding of implied information. The introduction merely restates the question: "In both the *Aeneid* and Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*, the protagonist's army faced difficulties when attempting to come to the shore of an unknown place." The student recognizes the general situation described in the first passage but makes errors in understanding the Latin text, claiming that Caesar's men "were poorly equipped to handle the shallow water" and "were not used to the shallow water" when in fact the Latin indicates that the problem they encountered was deep water.

The treatment of the second passage offers only limited use of citations and analysis: "Ilioneus begs the queen, Dido to allow them to stay safely in Carthage. He describes '*ventis maria omnia vecti*' (Virgil 4) that the Trojans were thrown across all of the sea by the wind, and begs, '*oramus*' (Virgil 5), to accept their proposal for safety in Carthage."

In a final paragraph the student compares the Romans and the Trojans, observing that Caesar's men were more aggressive, whereas Aeneas's men were logical, respectful, and less rash.

Because it addresses only portions of each passage and does so with a limited understanding of the Latin, the essay does not rise above a score of 2.

AP[®] LATIN
2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 3 (continued)

Sample: 3C

Score: 1

The response demonstrates little understanding of the passages or their contexts. The response accurately states that in passage A the Romans “had to face against barbarians” and that someone “was carrying a eagle ... ‘*aquilam ferebat*,’” but the remainder of the commentary demonstrates a deep misunderstanding of Caesar’s text: “This eagle was to distract the enemy from attacking the Romans and Trojans. The eagle was used as sort of a sacrifice.”

In the treatment of passage B, Ilioneus is vaguely said to be “persuading them to stop what they were doing,” but the Latin cited as support (*O Regina, novam cui ... superbas*) reveals that this observation is based on a general recall of the passage and not on an understanding of the Latin text. The response attempts to deal with the questions in lines 11–12 (*Quod genus ... patria?*) but misreads *morem permittit patria* as “send the death of the father.”

Though the student seems to recognize the passages and provides at least some correct, relevant information, the essay demonstrates frequent misunderstanding of the Latin and offers no meaningful analysis; it therefore merits no more than a score of 1.