

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2015 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Question 3**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Development of Argument / Analysis</b>	<b>Use of Latin</b>	<b>Inferences &amp; Conclusions</b>	<b>Contextual Knowledge</b>
<b>5</b>  <b>Strong</b>	The student develops a strong analysis of how each speaker tries to persuade his men to take a certain course of action and consistently aligns it to Latin evidence. Occasional errors need not weaken the overall impression of the essay.	The student uses copious examples of accurate, specific, and relevant Latin, properly cited, drawn from throughout both passages.	The student consistently uses inferences and draws conclusions that accurately reflect the Latin and support the analysis.	The student is able to use specific contextual references consistently in order to support the analysis.
<b>4</b>  <b>Good</b>	The student develops a good analysis of how each speaker tries to persuade his men to take a certain course of action, providing main ideas and some supporting details. Although the analysis may not be nuanced, it is based on a sound understanding of the Latin.	The student uses examples of Latin that are generally accurate, specific, and relevant, properly cited; while they are not plentiful, they are drawn from throughout both passages.	The student uses some inferences and draws some conclusions that accurately reflect the Latin and support the analysis. The student may rely on what is stated, or may make inaccurate inferences.	The student is able to use some specific contextual references that support the analysis.
<b>3</b>  <b>Average</b>	The student develops an analysis of how each speaker tries to persuade his men to take a certain course of action that reflects some understanding of the passage; it may be strong for one passage but weak for the other. The analysis may not be well-developed, relying on main ideas but few supporting details, or it may rely on summary more than on analysis.	The student may have few accurate Latin citations; they may not be linked to the analysis, or fail to support it.	The student may display only limited understanding of implied information.	The student may sometimes misunderstand contextual references or fail to connect them effectively to the analysis.
<b>2</b>  <b>Weak</b>	The student recognizes passage(s), but presents only a weak analysis. It may be confusing and lack organization, or may rely on summary. It addresses only portions of the passages, or addresses one passage well, but the other not at all.	The student provides little Latin support, taken out of context or misunderstood; or may use no Latin.	The student may make incorrect assumptions or make inferences and conclusions based on the passages only rarely.	The student may show no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context; references to context, if any, are irrelevant.

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2015 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Question 3 (continued)**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Development of Argument / Analysis</b>	<b>Use of Latin</b>	<b>Inferences &amp; Conclusions</b>	<b>Contextual Knowledge</b>
<b>1</b>  <b>Poor</b>	The student understands the question but offers no meaningful analysis. Although the student may not recognize the passages, the response contains some correct, relevant information.	The student cites no Latin, or only individual Latin words, and exhibits either no understanding of the Latin in context, or a complete misunderstanding.	The student does not make inferences and conclusions based on the passages.	The student may show no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context and provide no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.
<b>0</b>  <b>Unacceptable</b>	The student offers a response that is totally irrelevant, totally incorrect, or restates the question.	The student demonstrates no understanding of Latin in context.	The student does not make inferences and conclusions based on the passages.	The student shows no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context and provides no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.
<b>—</b>  <b>Blank page</b>	Blank page	Blank page	Blank page	Blank page

Begin your answer to **Question 3** on this page.

In the passages presented, both Sabinus and Aeneas employ a variety of rhetorical tactics in order to persuade their men of a course of action, and in doing so reveal some insight to their characters.

Sabinus addresses his men in the midst of a life or death affair, as he and Cotta plead their respective opinions on leaving their winter camps at the advice of the Gauls. His tone reflects the tense nature of the situation, as Caesar notes that he "clamitabat," was shouting, as a means of persuading his men. The content of his speech also plays to the situation he and his men find themselves in, as he mentions the possibly impending dangers like the "maiores manus hostium", the greater band of enemies whose strength would only be bolstered by their joining with the Germans (adiunctis Germanis). Perhaps reminding them of their enemy's zeal in battle, Sabinus even calls to mind the "tot contumeliis", the great insults the Gauls had received "sub populi Romani imperium", under Roman rule.

In keeping with the generally ~~urgent and worried~~ tone of his remarks, Sabinus tells his men plainly that "superiore gloria rei militaris extincta", any glory war could bring was no longer a possibility for his men, in his eyes at least. He

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

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

emphasizes the fact that his speech reflects his own opinion in using phrases such as "suam sententiam", but this rhetorical trick may have helped to win over his men.

Using a flurry of conditional clauses, he introduces the main point he wishes his men to take to heart, that "unam esse in celeritate positam salutem", their one safety was their swiftness in leaving the camp.

Aeneas, on the other hand, addresses his men not before a tragedy, but after seemingly every possible misfortune has already fallen upon him and his men. Exhorting his men to keep faith and stay the course, his uplifting tone contrasts with that of Sabinus. Addressing them as "socii", allies in the vocative case, Aeneas concedes to his men that "ignari sumus ante malorum" they were not ignorant of misfortunes beforehand, a statement he quickly soothes by ensuring his men that "dabit deus finem", God will end them eventually. Repeating this pattern, he reminds his comrades of the horrors such as the "rabiem Scyllaeam", the rabid Scylla, or the "Cyclopia Saxa", the Cyclops rocks, only to encourage his men by telling them to "revocate animas" call back their spirits. In fact, he takes the sorrows they have suffered and flips them to a positive outlook, telling them that "Forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit", they may find it pleasing to remember these

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.



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

Things Someday.

Doing just what any leader must in the face of tragedy and misfortune, Aeneas affirms his men that they "tendimus in latium", hold course to Italy. He tops off his entire exhortation with an invocation of Troy and ~~new~~ promise of rest, reminding his men that they await "quiescentes", quiet seats, and that it is "Fus regna resurgere Troiae", right for Troy to re-emerge. His invocation of "Jove" and "Fata", God and the Fates, he in with ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> own journey and certainly convince his men to "durate", hold fast in their ~~journeys~~ wanderings.

Both men employ similar tactics, as each acknowledges the dangers at hand and uses that acknowledgement to his advantage in convincing his men. Interestingly, however, they use that tactic inversely. Whereas Sabinus takes the worst possible scenario and convinces his men how they could end up there, Aeneas takes the worst possible scenario and presents his men with the consolation that it could not get much worse. Ironically, their fortunes also flip somewhat, as while Sabinus and his men do not succumb to the "Fames timenda est" starvation that must be feared, they are slaughtered as a result of his speech. Aeneas, on the other hand, comes to find that the gods indeed bring an end to his misfortune. These differing results show that, although one may be

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

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

3A  
404

effective in persuading others to do something, that course of  
~~action being persuaded~~ action being persuaded  
may not be sound.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Begin your answer to Question 3 on this page.

In the given passages, Caesar and Vergil depict two leaders and their approaches in dire situations. Caesar reveals Sabinus in the skirmish with the Eburones and his handling of Ambiorix. Vergil shows Aeneas giving a speech to his men, trying to raise their spirits after the destruction of their ships by Aeolus and Juno. In both of these passages, the men undertake specific persuasive methods in trying to convince their men to follow their advice.

Sabinus applies historical context and rhetorical questions in order to persuade his men to agree with him, and not Cottus, in wanting to leave the camp because of Ambiorix's notice. Caesar sets the scene by discussing how Sabinus uses "*contra ea... clamitabat*" shouting against him (Cottus), and how he disagreed with Cottus's view that the men should not depart (1). When Sabinus addresses his men, he discusses how "*magno esse Germanis dolori Ariovisti mortem*", the death of Ariovistus was a great pain to the Germans (3). Caesar discusses this event in book 1, and Sabinus remarks on how it was a great victory for them (3). He talks about this historical event to try and affirm Ambiorix's claim that the Germans are forcing the Eburones to fight the Romans. Sabinus continues, after stating that

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.



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

have been received under the command of the Roman people, and he rhetorically questions "sine ceteri" without certainty if "mudi consilium" this uses Ambrosius's only plan (6-7). Finally, he ends by simplifying Ambrosius's motives, saying that the Etruscans would lose all chance of danger by aiding the Romans, because they "in celestite position scilicet" would be put into safety (9). Scimus then rhetorically questions his men with "Si praesens periculum non..." if there is no danger, what is there to fear?

Aeneas, however, employs some other methods in his speech, using commands and historical events to convince his men that they will survive and persevere. He addresses them — "O socii —", oh allies, stating that God "debet... his quoque rebus" will give an end to these things (the bad events that have occurred, ship wreck etc.) (1-2). He then lists the things they have overcome, including the events with the Cyclopes in Sicily (3-4). He commands them: "revocche animas maeshum..." revive your spirits and send out fear (5-6). He says that they "terribus in latum" will stretch towards Latium, and that they will revive Troy there (9). He ends on a command; telling them to "Prote", he shows (10).

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.



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

Aeneas and Subinus both employ different methods of persuasive rhetorical devices, and they are both successful because of them. Both use historical events, and they give facts to their argument. Subinus uses rhetorical questions, getting the soldiers to think in his favor, and ultimately allows him to overcome Gha. Aeneas uses commands, which raise the spirits of his men, and they stone Gha with a more positive outlook. All of this rhetoric is what makes them successful.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Begin your answer to **Question 3** on this page.

— Both Quintus Titinius Sabinus and Aeneas were forced to address their men in times of difficulty. While the two leaders are both insightful and address their men, first telling them to remember past accomplishments, they possess different qualities and styles of leadership that show when addressing their men.

— Aeneas and Sabinus both invoked their previous victories and accomplishments while speaking to their respective groups. Sabinus describes the pain they inflicted by the death of Aniovisus, and other large victories they had. In lines 3-4, "Magno esse Germanis dolore Aniovisi mortem et superiores nostras victorias..."

Aeneas takes a more specific approach when describing their past accomplishments. For example, he explains how they've survived Scylla and the Cyclops and the storm that Juno let down on them, in lines 3-5, "Vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque Sonantes aestu scyphos, vos et cyclopa saxa experti..." Aeneas is more insightful and descriptive while Sabinus is a strong, but less personable leader. We later see in *Bellum Gallicum* that Sabinus is not much of a leader as his army is defeated.

— Aeneas also encourages his men to keep

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

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

on going and to not give up. He tells them to remember the harsh times + fear they underwent, ~~Chloe~~ ~~and the old~~ (line 6 "forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit"), knowing that ~~acknowledgement~~ his acknowledgement for their hard work + survival would keep them from giving up on their journey. Aeneas is far more encouraging and insightful than Sabinus. Aeneas is close with his men and is a personable leader. We are able to see the relationship he has w/ his men later on in The Aeneid when they land in Carthage and he falls in love w/ ~~Dido~~ Dido. We can see their concern for his stoppage of journey. Sabinus on ~~the~~ the other hand lacks in the department of ~~personability~~ <sup>theoretical</sup> personability. He asks his men many <sup>theoretical</sup> questions that keep them from giving up.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2015 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 3**

**Overview**

The question assessed students' ability to comprehend, analyze, and contextualize two thematically related passages, one from Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* and one from Vergil's *Aeneid*.

**Sample: 3A**

**Score: 5**

- The student develops a strong argument with a cogent analysis of how each speaker tries to persuade his men.
- Sabinus, employing a "tone" that "reflects the tense nature of the situation," emphasizes "impending dangers" and "in a flurry of conditional clauses" advises his men that "their one safety was their swiftness in leaving the camp."
- Aeneas, adopting an "uplifting tone" and "exhorting his men to keep faith and stay the course," gives "the sorrows they have suffered . . . a positive outlook," and assures his comrades that "God will end them eventually."
- Latin is drawn from throughout both passages and is accurately translated. Although the Vergil passage is addressed more fully, the Caesar passage has enough Latin to warrant a 5.
- The student provides relevant context for both passages: Cotta's previous speech in Caesar and the final outcome of Aeneas' journey in Vergil.

**Sample: 3B**

**Score: 4**

- Student supports a credible thesis with specific Latin drawn from each major section of both passages, but not throughout.
- Some citations are not correctly contextualized (e.g., *in celeritate positam salutem*).
- The argument is not balanced enough or analytical enough for a 5.
- The student provides some relevant context: the skirmish with Eburones and handling of Ambiorix in *Bellum Gallicum* and Aeolus and Juno in the *Aeneid*.

**Sample: 3C**

**Score: 3**

- Average discussion of how speakers address their men, with some comparative analysis, e.g., Sabinus and Aeneas "possess different qualities and style of leadership" but "both invoked their previous victories."
- There is very little Latin, but it is correctly cited.
- Analysis relies on main ideas, and is not well-developed, but provides some effective supporting details.