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## 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 <br> at non caede viri tanta perterrita Lausus, <br> pars ingens belli, sinit agmina: primus Abantem <br> oppositum interimit, pugnae nodumque moramque. <br> sternitur Arcadiae proles, sternuntur Etrusci <br> et vos, o Grais imperdita corpora, Teucri. <br> agmina concurrunt ducibusque et viribus aequis; <br> extremi addensent acies nec turba moveri <br> tela manusque sinit. | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |
|  | hinc Pallas instat et urget, <br> hinc contra Lausus, nec multum discrepat aetas, <br> egregii forma, sed quis Fortuna negarat <br> in patriam reditus. <br> ipsos concurrere passus <br> haud tamen inter se magni regnator Olympi; <br> mox illos sua fata manent maiore sub hoste. | 4 marks | 6 marks |


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


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


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


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5(a) | EITHER <br> Ovid, Amores 1.6.1-28 <br> Lines 1-16 (ianitor . . . habes): discuss the tone of these lines. <br> - comic, playful indignation in the address of lines $1-2$; <br> - the (playful) appeal of lines 3-4; <br> - Comedy of lines 5-8; <br> - pathos of lines 9-10; <br> - Cupid's intervention in lines 11-12; <br> - lines 13-16: the speedy arrival of love, refocusing on the door. <br> Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded. | 15 |
| 5(b) | Lines 17-28 (aspice . . . riget): how effective are the lover's appeals in these lines? <br> - cruelty of the door; tears (lines $17-18$ ); <br> - quod pro quo argument of lines 19-24; <br> - final appeal of lines 25 -8-it's in your interests, door! <br> Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded. | 10 |


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

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


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 7 | Virgil, Aeneid 10.1-117, 426-605, 689-908 <br> EITHER <br> Discuss the representation of the gods in Aeneid 10. | 25 |
|  | For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required. |  |
|  | For AO3 the following might be commented on: <br> - the council of the gods at the beginning of the war <br> in particular the relationship between Jupiter, Venus and Juno <br> - gods as not united <br> gods involved on the battlefield <br> Juno and Jupiter observing the battlefield <br> fate and the gods |  |


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | OR | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
|  | Compare and contrast the charactersations of Mezentius and Pallas in <br> Aeneid 10. |  |
|  | For AO1, accurate and relevant reference to the text is required. |  |
| For AO3 the following might be commented on: <br> $\bullet$ <br> Pallas as a good leader, brave and so on <br> as a serious warrior, with many kills to his name <br> the encounter between Pallas and Turnus <br> Mezentius as warrior, cruel, triumphalist and so on |  |  |


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


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

## 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

| Level | AO1 descriptor | Mark | AO3 descriptor | Mark |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Excellent knowledge and <br> understanding of linguistic structures <br> and literary features of either the set <br> texts or the passage. Thorough <br> historical, political, social and cultural <br> knowledge, where appropriate. | $\mathbf{5}$ | Close analysis of text. <br> Authoritative selection of <br> appropriate material. <br> Engagement with secondary <br> literature where appropriate. <br> Confident use of technical terms. <br> Well-structured, well-developed <br> and coherent response. | $\mathbf{1 7 - 2 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Sound knowledge and understanding <br> of linguistic structures and literary <br> features of either the set texts or the <br> passage. Good historical, political, <br> social and cultural knowledge, where <br> appropriate. | $\mathbf{4}$ | Clear ability to analyse the text. <br> Relevant selection of material. <br> Familiarity with secondary | $\mathbf{1 3 - 1 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | literature where appropriate. <br> Some use of technical terms. <br> Clear and logically structured <br> response. |  | Some knowledge and understanding <br> of linguistic structures and literary <br> features of either the set texts or the <br> passage. Some historical, political, <br> social and cultural knowledge, where <br> appropriate. | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Some analysis of the text. <br> Material selected but not always <br> to best effect. Some reference to <br> secondary literature included <br> where appropriate. Occasional <br> correct use of technical terms. <br> Uneven structure and <br> development of the response. | $\mathbf{9 - 1 2}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Limited knowledge and <br> understanding of linguistic structures <br> and literary features of either the set <br> texts or the passage. Limited <br> historical, political, social and cultural <br> knowledge, where appropriate. | $\mathbf{2}$ | Weak analysis of the text. <br> Material unfocused. Attempt at <br> correct use of technical terms but <br> some confusion. No progression <br> of argument. | $\mathbf{5 - 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Basic knowledge and understanding <br> of linguistic structures and literary <br> features of either the set texts or the <br> passage. Basic historical, political, <br> social and cultural knowledge, where <br> appropriate. | $\mathbf{1}$ | Very limited attempt at analysis of <br> the text. Basic material. Limited <br> evidence of technical terms. Little <br> attempt at structuring the <br> response. | $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | No rewardable content | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | Unseen Literary Criticism <br> Lucretius, De Rerum Natura 3.995-1013 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
|  | The following might be commented on: <br> - the pathos of Sisyphus' plight <br> - in particular, the vanity of power <br> - the repetition of never/not ever (numquam/nec umquam) <br> - the pathos and absurdity of the human condition <br> e the various images of the above (all filling out the original Sisyphus <br> exe final and definitive rejection of Cerberus and Tartarus |  |


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


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 13 | OR <br> Discuss how the mythical setting of Virgil and the historical setting of <br> Lucan affect the depiction of war in the two poems. | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
|  | For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the two texts is required. <br> For AO3 the following might be commented on: <br> - war as (mainly) homeric in Virgil; <br> - war as (not only) homeric in Lucan; <br> mythical war in Virgil allowing a consideration of recent, historical <br> war; <br> the other way round in Lucan; <br> the key figures: Aeneas, Turnus, Julius Caesar |  |


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


| Question | Answer | Marks |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 15 | OR | To what extent does the focus on one lover in Propertius produce a <br> 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: <br> - <br> eme discussion required of Cynthia in Propertius <br> and Corinna in Ovid; <br> does the focus on Cynthia give Propertius' poetry a more obsessive <br> and tortured quality; <br> does the lack of such a focus give Ovid room to be a different sort of <br> poet? |  |

