

Cambridge International Examinations

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

LATIN 9788/01

Paper 1 Verse Literature May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME Maximum Mark: 90

Published

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

 ${\tt \it ll}$ IGCSE is a registered trademark.

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



Section A

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).

Question	Answer	Marks
1	Virgil, Aeneid 10.426–38 Translation	15
	at non caede viri tanta perterrita Lausus, pars ingens belli, sinit agmina: primus Abantem oppositum interimit, pugnae nodumque moramque. 7 marks	
	sternitur Arcadiae proles, sternuntur Etrusci et vos, o Grais imperdita corpora, Teucri. 4 marks	
	agmina concurrunt ducibusque et viribus aequis; extremi addensent acies nec turba moveri tela manusque sinit. 6 marks	
	hinc Pallas instat et urget, hinc contra Lausus, nec multum discrepat aetas, egregii forma, sed quis Fortuna negarat in patriam reditus. 7 marks	
	ipsos concurrere passus haud tamen inter se magni regnator Olympi; mox illos sua fata manent maiore sub hoste. 6 marks	
	Mark out of 30 and then divide by two.	

Question	Answer	Marks			
2(a)	EITHER	13			
	/irgil, Aeneid 10.1–30				
	Lines 1–15 (<i>panditur foedus</i>): discuss the representation of Jupiter in these lines.				
	 omnipotent describing Olympus in line 1 may reflect on Jupiter two titles in line 2; the nature of his house in line 3; lines 3–4: all–seeing; lines 6–15: Jupiter addresses the gods lots of angry rhetorical questions (up to line 20) lines 11–15: firm statement of what the future holds 				
	Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.				
2(b)	Lines 16–30 (<i>luppiter arma</i>): discuss the tone of Venus' response. Ilines 16–17: Venus not replying in a few words respectful address (line 18) plaintive question of line 19 complaint of lines 20–2 lines 22–25: statement of the situation lines 25–6: another sharp question lines 26–30: her complaint put into (mythical) context Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.	12			
	Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.				

© UCLES 2017 Page 4 of 14

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	OR	12
	Virgil, Aeneid 10.719–44	
	Lines 1–13 (venerat cruentat): how does Virgil makes these lines dramatic?	
	 verb starts the passage; introducing a new character, Acron lines 3–4: stunning activity and appearance of Acron (purple) the epic simile of lines 5–9 line 10: Mezentius as active and decisive lines 10–12: the bloody death of Acron 	
	Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.	
3(b)	Lines 14–26 (atque viderit): discuss the characterisation of Mezentius in these lines.	13
	 Mezentius as wanting to deal with an opponent face-to-face, rather than with deception; as triumphalist as unfazed by prophecies or fate cruel? 	
	Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.	

© UCLES 2017 Page 5 of 14

Question	Answer	Marks		
4	4 Ovid, Amores 1.3.1–14 Translation			
	iusta precor: quae me nuper praedata puella est, aut amet aut faciat cur ego semper amem. 5 marks			
	a, nimium volui: tantum patiatur amari; audierit nostras tot Cytherea preces. 5 marks			
	accipe, per longos tibi qui deserviat annos; accipe, qui pura norit amare fide. 4 marks			
	si me non veterum commendant magna parentum nomina, si nostri sanguinis auctor eques, 4 marks			
	nec meus innumeris renovatur campus aratris, temperat et sumptus parcus uterque parens: 4 marks			
	at Phoebus comitesque novem vitisque repertor hac faciunt et me qui tibi donat Amor 4 marks			
	et nulli cessura fides, sine crimine mores, nudaque simplicitas purpureusque pudor. 4 marks			
	Mark out of 30 and then divide by two.			

Question	Answer	Marks			
5(a)	EITHER				
	Ovid, <i>Amores</i> 1.6.1–28				
	Lines 1–16 (ianitor habes): discuss the tone of these lines.				
	 comic, playful indignation in the address of lines 1–2; the (playful) appeal of lines 3–4; Comedy of lines 5–8; pathos of lines 9–10; Cupid's intervention in lines 11–12; lines 13–16: the speedy arrival of love, refocusing on the door. Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.				
5(b)	Lines 17–28 (aspice riget): how effective are the lover's appeals in these lines?	10			
	 cruelty of the door; tears (lines 17–18); quod pro quo argument of lines 19–24; final appeal of lines 25–8–it's in your interests, door! Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.				

Question	Answer	Marks				
6(a)	OR	13				
	Ovid, <i>Amores</i> 1.9.1–30					
	Lines 1–16 (<i>militat nives</i>): discuss the comparison made in these lines between the lover and the soldier.					
	 boldness of the opening line; lines 3–6: war and love happen at a certain age lines 7–14: all the various tasks performed by both lovers and soldiers lines 15–16: the rhetorical question stressing endurance. balance of comparison to be discussed. Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.					
6(b)	Lines 17–30 (<i>mittitur cadunt</i>): how serious are these lines?	12				
	 the comparisons: spying, besieging, breaking down gates, attacking at night, etc. to be evaluated; is Ovid stretching the point? If so, is that comic or playful? are the comparisons overblown? the final epigrammatic couplet, with its amusing double-entendre. 					
	Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.					

© UCLES 2017 Page 7 of 14

Section B

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	Mark	AO3 descriptor	Mark
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 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

Question	Answer	Marks
7	Virgil, Aeneid 10.1–117, 426–605, 689–908	25
	EITHER	
	Discuss the representation of the gods in Aeneid 10.	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required.	
	For AO3 the following might be commented on:	

Question	Answer	Marks
8	OR	25
	Compare and contrast the charactersations of Mezentius and Pallas in Aeneid 10.	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required.	
	For AO3 the following might be commented on: Pallas as a good leader, brave and so on as a serious warrior, with many kills to his name the encounter between Pallas and Turnus Mezentius as warrior, cruel, triumphalist and so on	

Question	Answer	Marks
9	Ovid, Amores 1.1–3, 5–7, 9, 11–12, 14–15	25
	EITHER	
	Discuss the representation of desire in <i>Amores</i> 1.	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required.	
	 For AO3 the following might be commented on: the representation of desire as a poetic game (poems 1 and 15); the working through of standard love elegy conventions, e.g. servitium, militia, door; violence and desire (in poem 7); the atmosphere of desire (e.g. poem 5); lightheartedness and possible artificiality (e.g. poems 11 and 12). 	

Question	Answer	Marks
10	OR	25
	To what extent is playfulness Ovid's central focus in Amores 1?	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required.	
	 For AO3 the following might be commented on: poem 1: is Ovid more interested in the poetry of love poetry? poem 2 and the (painful) onset of love; Ovid—or the poet—seems happy to take on the <i>servitium</i> of love; poem 3 and the first introduction of the girlfriend; the use of standard love elegy conventions. But are they used knowingly or ironically? poem 5: sultry; poem 6—the address to the door. Another convention worked over. poem 7: some violence, but is it serious? 	

Section C

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 5 marks AO3 20 marks

© UCLES 2017 Page 11 of 14

Level	AO1 descriptor	Mark	AO3 descriptor	Mark
5	Excellent knowledge and understanding of linguistic structures and literary features of <i>either</i> the set texts <i>or</i> the passage. Thorough historical, political, social and cultural knowledge, where appropriate.	5	Close analysis of text. Authoritative selection of appropriate material. Engagement with secondary literature where appropriate. Confident use of technical terms. Well-structured, well-developed and coherent response.	17–20
4	Sound knowledge and understanding of linguistic structures and literary features of <i>either</i> the set texts <i>or</i> the passage. Good historical, political, social and cultural knowledge, where appropriate.	4	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.	13–16
3	Some knowledge and understanding of linguistic structures and literary features of <i>either</i> the set texts <i>or</i> the passage. Some historical, political, social and cultural knowledge, where appropriate.	3	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.	9–12
2	Limited knowledge and understanding of linguistic structures and literary features of <i>either</i> the set texts <i>or</i> the passage. Limited historical, political, social and cultural knowledge, where appropriate.	2	Weak analysis of the text. Material unfocused. Attempt at correct use of technical terms but some confusion. No progression of argument.	5–8
1	Basic knowledge and understanding of linguistic structures and literary features of either the set texts or the passage. Basic historical, political, social and cultural knowledge, where appropriate.	1	Very limited attempt at analysis of the text. Basic material. Limited evidence of technical terms. Little attempt at structuring the response.	1–4
0	No rewardable content	0	No rewardable content	0

Question	Answer	Marks
11	Unseen Literary Criticism Lucretius, <i>De Rerum Natura</i> 3.995–1013	25
	 The following might be commented on: the pathos of Sisyphus' plight in particular, the vanity of power the repetition of never/not ever (numquam/nec umquam) the pathos and absurdity of the human condition the various images of the above (all filling out the original Sisyphus example) the final and definitive rejection of Cerberus and Tartarus 	

Question	Answer	Marks
12	Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> 10.1–117, 426–605, 689–908 Lucan, <i>Bellum Civile</i> 1	25
	EITHER	
	Discuss the representation of leaders in Virgil and Lucan.	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the two texts is required.	
	For AO3 the following migbt be commented on: the definition of heroism; the shadow of Homer; the relationship between Aeneas and Augustus; between Aeneas and stoicism; the bloodiness of war in Lucan; Julius Caesar as hero?	

Question	Answer	Marks
13	OR	25
	Discuss how the mythical setting of Virgil and the historical setting of Lucan affect the depiction of war in the two poems.	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the two texts is required.	
	 For AO3 the following might be commented on: war as (mainly) homeric in Virgil; war as (not only) homeric in Lucan; mythical war in Virgil allowing a consideration of recent, historical war; the other way round in Lucan; the key figures: Aeneas, Turnus, Julius Caesar 	

Question	Answer	Marks
14	Ovid, <i>Amores</i> 1.1–3, 5–7, 9, 11–12, 14–15 Propertius 1	25
	EITHER	
	Which of Ovid and Propertius is the cleverer poet?	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the two texts is required.	
	 For AO3 the following might be commented on: each poet's use of love elegy conventions (servitium, militia, door, letters, cheating on the husband); each poet's references to myth, other poetry, etc. some discussion of 'clever'; 	

Question	Answer	Marks
15	OR	25
	To what extent does the focus on one lover in Propertius produce a representation of love different from that in Ovid?	
	For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the two texts is required.	
	 For AO3 the following might be commented on: some discussion required of Cynthia in Propertius and Corinna in Ovid; does the focus on Cynthia give Propertius' poetry a more obsessive and tortured quality; does the lack of such a focus give Ovid room to be a different sort of poet? 	