

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **9788 LATIN**

**9788/02**

Paper 2 (Prose Literature), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

Cicero *Pro Milone* 24–56, 72–78, 83–90

## 1 Cicero *Pro Milone* 33

(i) Translate lines 1–4 (*an vero...inustus*).

[5]

<i>an vero...versamini</i>	4
<i>vestrae...versantur</i>	4
<i>quas ille...inustus</i>	4
<i>-si leges...rei publicae-</i>	3
	<b>15 ÷ 3 = 5</b>

(ii) *exhibe...posses* (lines 4–8): examine the tone and effects of the language addressed to Sextus Clodius in these lines.

Expect candidates to show how Cicero uses language to mock Sextus Clodius, Clodius' right-hand man who led the riot which resulted in the burning down of the senate-house on the night after Clodius' death.

e.g. Cicero's use of mock-epic features:

- the direct appeal to Sextus Clodius, *vestrarum* (poetic plural), poetic use of *aiunt*, reference to the Palladium (statue of Athena saved from Troy by Aeneas), epic language (e.g. *ex mediis armis*)
- *librarium*: (= bookcase) suggestive of the vast programme of laws Clodius intended to introduce during his tribunate, compared sarcastically to the Trojan Palladium which in contrast afforded protection to the city
- *te...eripuisse...turba nocturna*: language suggests that Sextus was little more than a violent looter
- *praeclarum videlicet*: ironic
- *tuo arbitrio tribunatum*: mocking alliteration.

(iii) *et aspexit...non debeo* (lines 8–15): how does the language used here make these lines vivid and dramatic? [10]

Candidates might mention the following:

- *et aspexit me*...Cicero pretends that Sextus is glaring at him menacingly
- *lumen curiae*: a clever double-entendre, either sarcastically describing Sextus as 'shining light of the senate-house' (which he wasn't) or a reference to the fact that it was he who set it on fire
- *tu me...tu inimicissimum*: juxtapositions to emphasise the paradox
- *multo crudelius...humanitas meae*: Sextus treated his friend Clodius much more cruelly than Cicero, his bitterest enemy, ever would have done
- *Clodi cruentum cadaver*: harsh alliteration suggests Sextus' inhumane behaviour
- *tu* anaphora
- *imaginibus, exequiis, pompa, laudatione*: long list in asyndeton suggestive of Sextus' sacrilegious behaviour depriving Clodius of all the normal funeral rites
- *infelicissimis lignis semustilatum nocturnis canibus dilaniandum*: a graphic picture of Clodius' half-burnt body lying on accursed senate-house benches to be torn apart by carrion dogs. Cicero is both taunting Sextus for his inhumane treatment of Clodius' body but at the same time no doubt enjoying it.
- *in meo inimico crudelitatem...tuam*: delay of *tuam* emphatic
- *laudare non possum, irasci certe non debeo*: a neat conclusion to the digression

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

## 2 Cicero *Pro Milone* 72–3

(i) Translate lines 1–4 (*occidi...gloria*). [5]

<i>occidi...familiaris</i>	4
<i>quia...appetendi</i>	4
<i>non Ti. Gracchum...abrogavit</i>	3
<i>quorum...gloria</i>	4
	<b>15 ÷ 3 = 5</b>

(ii) Explain the events to which the following refer: (a) *nefandum adulterium* (b) *nefarium stuprum* (c) *civem...exterminavit* [5]

- (a) Clodius' suspected adultery with Caesar's wife Pompeia at the festival of the Bona Dea. (62 BC)
- (b) Clodius accused of committing incest with his youngest sister by her husband Lucius Lucullus. (66 BC)
- (c) Cicero exiled during Clodius' tribunate for executing citizens without trial (58 BC), though he was considered to have saved the state.  
1 mark for each event, 1 mark for each explanation up to max. 2

(iii) *eum qui...petebat* (lines 11–18): with what techniques does Cicero highlight Clodius' criminality in these lines? [10]

Expect candidates to discuss a selection of the following:

- *hyperbole*: *qui regna dedit, ademit, orbem terrarum... partitus est*
- *eum* anaphora
- use of superlative: *plurimis caedibus*
- his lack of respect for an outstanding citizen, Pompey: *singulari virtutue et gloria civem domum vi...compulit*
- string of negatives: *nihil...nefas nec...nec, nulla...nullum...nulli*
- lack of respect for the gods: *aedem Nympharum incendit* for a political motive
- lack of respect for the law emphasised by tricolon: *nulla lex, nullum...ius, nulli...termini*
- use of force emphasised by list in asyndeton: *castris, exercitu, signis inferendis* (2,4,6 syllables)

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

Tacitus *Annals* XV, 38–743 Tacitus *Annals* XV 54–55

- (i) *nam cum...praevenisset* (lines 1–6): assess Tacitus' attitude to Milichus in these lines. [6]

Tacitus emphasises three motives which lead Milichus to betray the conspiracy: power, fear and greed. His servile background was a major factor and he did not act without thinking (*reputavit*) and not before persistent nagging from his wife.

*servilis animus*: contempt for his status

*praemia perfidiae*: effective juxtaposition

*immensa pecunia*: emphasises the huge temptation presented to Milichus the potential amount of money is 'unmeasurable'

*pecunia et potentia*: more *p* alliteration

*obversabantur*: vivid verb suggesting the motives were visibly moving about right in front of his eyes

*cessit*: promoted for emphasis

*fas et salus patroni et acceptae libertatis memoria*: tricolon crescendo listing the factors which 'withdrew', starting with emphatic monosyllabic *fas*

*muliebri ac deterius*: critical of Milichus taking a woman's advice

*ultra...intentabat*: imperfect tense suggests he acted after persistent nagging from his wife

*multos...unum*: contrast emphasises the rewards on offer

*nihil profuturum...at*: strong contrast

- (ii) *igitur... signatas* (lines 6–13): show how Tacitus presents this episode vividly and dramatically. [9]

Tacitus aims at rapid narrative to emphasise the speed with which the conspiracy was detected. A series of short phrases mirrors the swift action.

*Milichus...pergit*: brief matter of fact statement using historic present

*cum foribus arceretur*: momentary delay

*magna et atrocia*: concise

*dictitans deductusque*: frequentative verb and alliteration of *d* and *t* suggests persistence

*ab ianitoribus...ad..Epaphroditum, ad Neronem*: within a short time Milichus is in the presence of Nero himself

*urgens...gravis*: promoted adjectives underline the urgency

*et cetera*: emphatic summing up

*audierat coniectaverat*: asyndeton emphasises Milichus' breathless report

*docet*: blunt climax to sentence

*telum*: first word for emphasis

*is*: defendant not even named

*ferrum*: the defence (by Scaevinus) starts with the weapon

*olim...subreptum*: tricolon, climaxing with *subreptum* (used only here by Tacitus)

- (iii) Translate lines 13–16 (*pecunias...probatam*). [5]

*pecunias...datas* 3

*sed...largius* 2

*quia...diffideret* 5

*enimvero...probatam* 5

$$15 \div 3 = 5$$

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

- 4 (i) What particular reasons has Tacitus already given for Nero's personal animosity towards the consul Vestinus? [4]

Nero hated him due to their close companionship which had led to Vestinus being outspoken about the emperor and making him the butt of jokes. In addition Vestinus had married Statilia Messalina, one of Nero's mistresses.

- (ii) *igitur...consularibus* (lines 1–12): how do these lines cast Nero as the villain and Vestinus as the innocent victim? [11]

*non crimine, non accusatore existente*: repeated *non* emphasises illegality of Nero's actions  
*speciem...induere*: metaphor emphasising Nero's customary deceit; but in this case Nero cannot even 'assume the role' of a judge since there is no case to answer  
*ad vim dominationis*: Nero behaving like a master to his slave  
*immittit*: historic present  
*praevenire...occupare...opprimere*: vocabulary suggest a military threat from Vestinus, promoted verbs  
*velut arcem*: suggests both exaggeration and contempt  
*quia...Tacitus* explains the actual circumstances – a house which happens to look over the forum (*imminentes* promoted to suggest a threat), with a household of young slaves  
*cuncta...convivium celebrabat*: the scene is set, emphasising that Vestinus had carried out his consular duties and was now innocently enjoying dinner  
*nihil metuens an dissimulando metu*: typical Tacitean variatio; the innocent Vestinus is bravely concealing his fear  
*dixere*: syncopated form  
*clauditur cubiculo...swift* actions showing that Vestinus is ready and prepared to accept his fate  
*nulla edita voce, qua semet miseraretur*: Vestinus' lack of self-pity and noble death evokes sympathy from the reader  
*et imaginatus et inridens*: Nero's sadism towards Vestinus' fellow-diners is emphasised by the position of the participles and the alliteration, as he enjoys the *pavorem* of the guests expecting to die along with Vestinus

- (iii) Translate lines 13–17 (*is profluente...vox fuit*). [5]

<i>is...manusque</i>	3
<i>et paulatim...intellegit</i>	4
<i>recordatus...tradiderat</i>	5
<i>versus...fuit</i>	3
	15÷3 = 5

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

**5 ‘Cicero’s arguments in defence of Milo are flimsy and flawed but a rhetorical triumph’. Discuss.**

For AO1 candidates should show knowledge of the main arguments used by Cicero to defend Milo, i.e. that the meeting with Clodius on the Appian Way was planned by Clodius, that Clodius was killed in self-defence, that Clodius had the political motive to murder Milo whereas Milo had no hatred for Clodius, that Milo had had previous better opportunities to kill Clodius which he had not taken, that the location of the fight was suitable to Clodius, that Clodius’s entourage was ready for battle whereas Milo’s wasn’t, that Clodius’ killing, assuming it occurred, was ‘justifiable’ and a benefit to the state. Expect candidates to discuss a selection of passages where Cicero displays his rhetorical powers.

For AO3 expect candidates to show some understanding of the conventions of rhetoric in the law courts as well as the weaknesses in Cicero’s arguments; how they are based on the false premise that one of the two protagonists planned an attack when it appears to have been accidental; how Cicero falsifies the dates and timings to suggest that Clodius planned the ambush; how he ignores the fact that Clodius was wounded, taken to an inn and only later murdered on Milo’s orders etc. Credit reference to the independent account by Asconius which reveals what really happened and shows how inaccurate Cicero’s ‘narratio’ is. Expect candidates to discuss a selection of passages where Cicero displays his rhetorical powers, usually a sign that his case is weak, e.g. the contrast between Clodius’s and Milo’s departure from Rome and their entourage [omitting the fact, as recorded in Asconius, that Milo actually had a large bodyguard of gladiators with him far outnumbering Clodius’ small retinue], depicting Clodius as a rabble-rousing ‘insidiator’ and Milo as an unsuspecting family man (chap. 27–8); his ‘cui bono’ arguments that Milo’s death would have been an advantage to Clodius, whereas Clodius’s death was, in fact, a disadvantage to Milo (chaps. 32–35); his imaginary ‘painting’ of the incident (chap. 54–5), with visual amusing contrasts; imaginary speech by Milo boastfully lying that he did kill Clodius for the benefit of the state, including a long list of Clodius’ crimes (chap. 72f); his preposterous but entertaining claims that Clodius’ death was due to divine vengeance for his desecration of the Bona Dea festival (chap. 85–6); his desperate attempts in the peroratio (chap. 92 f.) to win sympathy for his client whose defiant demeanour in court would have been a sign of guilt. Only credit discussion of Cicero’s rhetorical techniques if they are relevant to the argument.

Candidates may justifiably conclude that Cicero knew he was fighting a losing battle (especially since he was aware of Pompey’s support for condemnation) and that the best he could do was to portray Clodius as a villain and Milo as a hero and win the jury over to his side with entertaining arguments, however preposterous they might be.

**6 What picture of the violence of first-century Roman politics does the *Pro Milone* present?**

For AO1 candidates should show knowledge of the circumstances of the trial, the violent clash between Milo and Clodius on the Appian Way leading to Clodius’ killing and the violent aftermath when Clodius’ body is cremated in the Senate House which was then damaged by fire; how further rioting, including an attack upon the house of Lepidus, prompted the appointment of Pompey as sole consul with the authority to restore order. Credit knowledge that the surviving speech is a later revision, not the original one delivered by Cicero intimidated as he was by the hostility of his opponents and the military guard surrounding the court.

For AO3 much of the discussion will no doubt focus upon Cicero’s presentation of Clodius himself as a man fostering violence in many forms; in the proemium, Cicero relates examples of the murder of Papirius and attempted murder of Pompey himself carried out by Clodius (chap.18). In the narratio Cicero claims that Clodius’ ambitions to be praetor were specifically so that he could spend a whole year subverting the republic and when he failed to be elected he resorted to violence, organising gangs of slaves to kill Milo. Candidates may argue that Cicero’s account is

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9788	02

exaggerated and completely false in places. The story of the death of Clodius is certainly very inaccurate (if Asconius, the commentator's, account is anything to go by) seeing as the meeting seems to have been accidental not a planned ambush. Cicero's digression to attack Sextus Clodius, Clodius' gang-leader, who led the gang which cremated Clodius' body and set fire to the senate-house is used to highlight Clodius' danger to the state even after his death; the burning of the senate-house is later used by Cicero to symbolise the weakening of the senate as a body (chap 90). Cicero portrays Clodius as the 'heir' of Catiline, driving Cicero himself into exile in 58 BC, murdering senators and intimidating elections, e.g. chap 87. Cicero highlights how politicians were using the tribunate to break the power of the senate, even attack ex-consuls such as himself (chap. 89). In contrast, Cicero portrays Milo as a 'liberator' in imaginary speeches (e.g. chap 93–4). Notwithstanding Cicero's strong republican sentiments and personal enmity towards Clodius, candidates will no doubt conclude that the picture of late 50's Rome is a lurid and violent one in which no politician was safe from prosecution, exile or even assassination.

**7 To what extent does Tacitus live up to his claim to write 'without anger and bias' in the extracts you have read?**

For AO1 candidates should select the main episodes in Books XIV and XV where Tacitus' personal emotions are evident, e.g. the murder of Agrippina, exile and death of Octavia, the fire of Rome, the persecution of the Christians, Nero's love of the arts, the detection and suppression of Piso's conspiracy.

For AO3 candidates will no doubt take the opportunity to discuss Tacitus' infamous 'indignatio' and may explain how Tacitus' view of Nero's reign may have been jaundiced by his own later experiences in the reign of Domitian. The quote itself 'sine ira et studio', comes in the early stages of Annals I before his narrative of Tiberius's reign. Many will argue that Tacitus does not live up to this claim; his bias against the emperors and jaundiced view of human nature generally result in him emphasising the negatives about people. Very few escape criticism. He often includes damning rumours (which he himself claims not to believe); their very inclusion, however, leads the reader to give them some credence e.g. the rumour that Nero sang on a private stage as Rome burned (XV.39); he will often insinuate a dishonourable motive for a particular action e.g. that those hurling firebrands to stoke the fire were 'acting under orders' (XV.38); it is even suggested that Nero is to blame for causing storm damage to a fleet when he orders it to return by a certain date (XV.46); Natalis' accusation of Seneca we are told is to ingratiate himself with Nero (XV.56).

Though candidates are likely to focus upon Tacitus characterisation of Nero as a monster, higher level essays should have a wider scope, e.g. Tacitus' contempt for women generally, most obviously in his treatment of Agrippina: her lust for power, incest, gullibility etc.; Paulina's cowardice.

Candidates should be credited for showing how Tacitus' language and style suits his tone, e.g. his use of *variatio* to give two possible explanations can point to which he attaches the most importance; his *brevitas* which often suggests words unspoken; use of unusual or archaic vocabulary.

It is also possible, however, to argue that Tacitus shows a lack of bias by including conflicting accounts; he does not directly point the reader to which account is correct, it's just that the more lurid one tends to stick in the memory. It is also clear that Tacitus does use a variety of sources and does not deliberately distort the facts. It is the often dishonourable or dissimulating motives which Tacitus ascribes to people's actions which characterises his work though it can be argued that this is not due to 'ira' or 'studium' but is merely Tacitus' view of the world, affected by the times he himself lived in. There is also no doubt that many of the events recorded during Nero's reign were horrific and abhorrent and so will attract justified 'anger', e.g. the murder of a mother, wife, former adviser, extravagant building plans following the burning of Rome, Nero's persecution of the Christians and indiscriminate killing of both the innocent and guilty in the aftermath of the Piso conspiracy.



<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9788</b>	<b>02</b>

Whether or not Tacitus shows ‘bias’ towards, e.g. Nero is difficult to gauge. It may be that Nero fully merits the treatment he gets. Candidates may also argue that Tacitus does not actually depict Nero as a ‘monster’ but in fact an emperor who is very insecure and in many ways just not suited to the job: he’d rather be performing on the stage!

Various conclusions are valid and should be credited provided the evidence has been supplied.

**8 How effectively does Tacitus portray the horrors of Nero’s reign? [20]**

For AO1 candidates should show knowledge of horrific events in Books 14 and 15, notably in Book 14 the plot to murder his mother Agrippina, the death of Burrus and the death of his wife Octavia; and in Book 15 the effects of the fire of Rome, the persecution of the Christians, the torture and suicide of the freedman Epicharis, the conspiracy of Piso and the consequent deaths of Piso, Seneca and others.

For AO3, candidates might discuss their reactions to the horrific descriptions of, e.g. Acerronia, Agrippina’s companion, bludgeoned to death by conspirators with ship’s equipment, the long drawn out death of Octavia, victims overtaken by the fire, the inhumane treatment of the Christians. Expect candidates to focus upon the botched assassination attempt upon Agrippina, her final brave words ‘strike me in the womb’ and the lack of respect afforded her by her own son Nero after her death; candidates may conclude that the death of Agrippina along with many others in Books 14 and 15 are designed to show Nero as an inhumane monster, e.g. Nero mocking of Sulla’s decapitated ‘prematurely grey’ head. Most of the deaths are ascribed either directly or indirectly to the emperor. Likewise, the death of Seneca is arguably the most memorable death in Book 15, long drawn out as it is including the philosopher’s emotional speech to his wife and three different methods employed to finish him off.

Candidates may argue that the horror is increased by Tacitus’ inclusion of a short epitaph or moral directing the reader’s sympathies, e.g. praise of Burrus’ integrity after his death.

Deaths are often ‘cinematic’, with the victim’s last words, thoughts or actions recorded, e.g. Lucan composing poetry as he died. Executions are mixed with suicides and often the reader is left in suspense until the last moment wondering which will occur. For variation, some deaths are almost instantaneous, others are slow and painful.

Expect many to focus upon Nero’s character but the essay should not be a mere character assassination.

Credit should be given to references to Tacitus’ language and style which make the set piece descriptions more effective.

Candidates may conclude that Tacitus’ ‘cinematic’ approach affords the reader a graphic, often gruesome picture of events.