

---

# AP<sup>®</sup> Latin

## Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

### Inside:

#### Free Response Question 3

- Scoring Guideline
- Student Samples
- Scoring Commentary

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2019 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Question 3**

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

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2019 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Question 3 (continued)**

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

Begin your answer to Question 3 on this page.

In book four of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*,<sup>\*</sup> some of Caesar's men were attacked by ~~them~~<sup>Britons</sup> while foraging. In book five, Ambiorix stages a revolt against the Romans and meets with Sabinus and Cotta. He tricks them, after much debate between Sabinus and Cotta, to set out immediately and march to Caesar. However, his forces ambush the Romans while they were marching. In both the situations, the enemy ambushes the Roman troops ~~and do not fight~~, but they use different tactics.

When Caesar is in Britain, some of his troops are ambushed while foraging. This strategy catches the Romans off guard. The enemy had hidden themselves in woods at night where the Romans had to forage since it was the only remaining place with grain (*Nam quod omni... deliquerant*). This strategy gave the Britons the element of surprise, increasing the chance that their attack would be successful. Moreover, the Romans were dispersed, occupied in foraging, and not holding their weapons when the Britons suddenly rose up (*tum dispersas depositis... adorti*). Since the Roman troops were spread out and, at the time, unarmed, the Britons gave themselves an advantage by being able to attack defenseless, unorganized troops. Furthermore, after they had killed a few Romans, the Britons annoyed the remaining Romans with their "uncertain ranks" and surrounded them with cavalry and chariots (*paucis interfectis... circumdederant*). This clearly shows the Britons' famous use of hit-and-run tactics. Their "uncertain ranks" and rapid cavalry and chariot attacks were hard

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

for the Romans to handle since the legions usually fought in set-piece battles with centers and wings. However, these hit-and-run tactics confused the Romans since they could be attacked from almost any side at almost any time. This strategy was a great advantage to the Britons because it gave them ~~the~~ ~~best~~ a way to more effectively attack the Romans. Lastly, this ambush attack and the fact that the Romans were surrounded made the only way a Roman soldier could escape be outside help. In fact, if Caesar had not suspected that the Britons (aka Barbarians) had formulated a new plan and had not set out with several cohorts (Caesar, id quod... iussit), it is very likely that the entire Roman foraging party would have been wiped out. (Caesar, because he had noticed this, namely that a new plan was begun by the barbarians, he ordered the cohorts which were in stations to set out with him into this part, he ordered two cohorts from the remaining ones to succeed into station, and ordered the remaining cohorts to be armed and to follow him immediately). In all, these strategies, namely the surprise attack and ~~the~~ hit-and-run cavalry tactics, gave the Britons a large advantage in this fight.

Next, Ambiorix's troops also used a surprise attack. When the Romans were marching in their columns, the enemy attacked suddenly and forced the Roman troops to form into a defensive circle. Ambiorix then ordered that it be announced that his troops throw spears/darts, advance no further, and draw back when the Romans make an attack (Ambiorix pronuntiat... i. cedant). Ambiorix also has an advantage



3A 3 of 4

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

because his troops have light weapons and have trained daily (Clenitate armorum et cotidiana exercitatio). Whenever a cohort left from the defensive ring and made an attack, Ambiorix's troops would fall back (Cum unquam cohors in refugiebant). The strategy shown here is the strategy of feigned retreats. By withdrawing ~~from~~ these troops when the Romans made an attack against, Ambiorix was able to lure some Romans away from the defensive ring and into the open. Then, once the Romans who attacked were lured out, it was necessary that this part be exposed and spears were received from the open side. (Interim cum partem nudari necesse erat et ab latere aperto fera redpi). This strategy of feigned retreats exposed sections of the Roman position to spear volleys, causing panic in the Roman lines and increasing the deadly effectiveness of the Gallic spear attacks. Moreover, when the Romans who had broken formation began to be turned back to the place from which they left, they were being surrounded by both those enemies who had yielded and by those who had stood close by (Rursus cum in eum locum... circumventebantur). The feigned retreat strategy allowed Ambiorix to break up the Roman troops by luring them out and surrounding them. This is a sound strategy since it minimized Gallic deaths while nearly maximizing Roman deaths. If Ambiorix had ordered his troops to attack the entire Roman defensive ring, which was a strong defensive formation, Ambiorix would have lost many more men, and the Romans would have lost much fewer since they could defend more easily. Lastly, as Ambiorix continued to

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

With the Roman troops with spears and surround groups of troops, the legionaries began to give up on the idea of winning the engagement because even if they were to hold their place, no place was left for victory and they were not able to avoid the spears thrown by such a great multitude of enemies (Sic autem locum... pederant). Using these tactics, Ambiorix was able to devastate the Roman force led by Sabinus and Cotta.

In all, both Ambiorix and the Britons employed the use of an ambush against the Romans though the Britons used hit-and-run tactics while Ambiorix used feigned retreats. The foraging party attacked by the Britons was saved by Caesar however. On the other hand, Caesar could not have reached Cotta's army fast enough to save it from near destruction.

\* Caesar led a campaign into Britain, becoming the very first Roman general to do so. However, his campaign was not too successful since he did not bring enough food to stay long enough for a full campaigning season.



Begin your answer to Question 3 on this page.

The passages each detail the ~~the~~ military strategies of different groups of Gauls against the Romans. Passage A discusses the attack of the Brittons on some of Caesar's men. Passage B discusses Ambiorix's advances on Cotta's army.

Passage A takes place after Caesar and his men have already landed and set up camp in Britain. A storm has also destroyed a lot of ~~the~~ the Roman's ships so they cannot leave for the time being. This has all happened before the passage begins. At this point Caesar has also had the Brittons promise peace. At the start of the passage, Caesar is suspicious of a new plan the barbarians (Britons) could initiate: "Caesar, id quod erat suspicatus, aliquid novi a barbaris initum consilii," (line 1). Caesar suspects that the Britons have taken advantage of the Romans more vulnerable situation — them being stuck in <sup>Britain</sup> ~~Britain~~ because of their ships — to start talking amongst their tribes to create a new plan to ambush and expel the Romans for independance.

Caesar gathers the cohort stationed at the camp and leaves the remaining two cohorts behind to still be stationed.

~~At this point, Caesar has already sent some of his men to the front to expect a battle. He suspects that~~

~~the~~ This is shown in lines 1-3: "cohortes quae in stationibus erant secum in eam partem proficisci, ex reliquis duas in



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

3B 2 of 3

stationem cohortes succedere." Caesar also tells his men to arm themselves. Before the beginning of Passage A, Caesar has already sent out some of his men into the fields to gather grain because the Romans are short on supplies. Caesar thinks that the enemy will attack the men in the fields as part of their strategy: "suas ab hostibus premi atque aegre sustinere," (line 4). Caesar decides to take his cohort and follow the men in the fields. ~~from the~~ Caesar also suspects that the ~~enemies~~ enemy's forces will venture into the forest at night to remain unseen: "suspicati hostes huc nostros esse venturos noctu in silvis delituerant," (lines 6-7). In lines 7-8 the enemy disperses weapons among ~~themselves~~ themselves and simultaneously attack Caesar's remaining men with their cavalry in line 9.

Passage B is about how Ambiorix advances on Cotta's army. Basically Cotta and Sabinus command one of Caesar's legions which is stationed in a winter camp in Gaul. ~~the~~ Ambiorix first attacks ~~the Roman~~ <sup>the Roman</sup> winter camp, then tells Sabinus and Cotta that he was forced to attack them by popular demand of his own people. He also "warns" them that a large force of Germans (which the Romans fear a lot) is supposedly on its way. Cotta advocated to stay and defend the winter camp and Sabinus advocated to leave and join up with another legion.

-11-

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

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

The legion ends up going with Sabinus' plan. Ambiorix then leads the Roman legion away from the rumored Germans and straight into an ambush of his own Gauls. This is all previous events that provide context for the situation and Ambiorix's strategy in passage B. Ambiorix leads Cotta's army into a valley and starts attacking his men. Ambiorix diligently observes which cohorts take refuge: "Quo praecepto ab eis diligentissime observato, cum quaedam cohors ex orbe excesserat atque imperum facerat, hostes velocissime refugiebant," (lines 3-5). In these lines he also orders his men to surround certain cohorts of Cotta's army so that the Romans are less effective. In line 7: "et ab qui cesserant et ab eis qui proximi steterant circumveniebantur," <sup>Ambiorix</sup> ~~the Gauls~~ has the Gauls tightly circle the Romans to close them in and prevent them from forming their fighting formations. <sup>Ambiorix</sup> ~~the Gauls~~ then locates the remaining Roman men in line 8 and ~~the Gauls~~ has his men kill them. ~~the Gauls~~

The Britons and the Gauls are two different groups of barbarians and attack the Romans with their own unique strategies in passages A and B.

In most cases, the Gauls defend their homeland with a passion like none other. For them, their entire realm is on the line. Thus, they typically resort to the use of guerrilla-like tactics in which they can adapt to fit their needs. Despite the blatant geographical differences between the Belgae and the Britons, they both seemingly adopt the same fighting style, specifically that of well placed ambushes and defense tactics.

In the case of the Britons, one of the main modes of dealing damage is via projectiles. Many times Caesar's legions were subject to spears being cast from all sides [conferty... animaverit]. By doing this the Gauls not only have power in numbers, but they distance themselves from most hand to hand combat. Additionally, the Britons, like all Gauls, use various scouting tactics ~~was~~ when fighting on their own front. In this case, the Britons

explore throughout the woods at night; something which puts Caesar on edge. [Suspici...  
... delictuant]. By moving as an unseen force, the Gauls can shift their battle strategies based upon intel gained via espionage. The Britons also train their soldiers to use vehicles such as chariots or even plain horses. In the case of this attack, the axe-wielding charioteers overwhelm the Romans and confuse them with their gang tactics. [pauis... circumdedant]. Although the use of chariots is unique to the ~~Brit~~ Northern Gauls, the same trend of many overwhelming few is seen transdemographically.

In terms of Cotta's demise, many similarities are present. First, Ambiorix orders his troops to lob spears at the Romans, catching them off guard and injuring many. [iobet... fecerint]. This strategy is especially deadly ~~for~~ for the Romans, as the Gauls manage to ambush them under unusual conditions. Unlike the



3C 3 of 4

Britons, the changes made in ~~the~~ the attack are immediate. Rather than sending out scouts, Ambiorix actively tracks the battle, and notices the incoming Roman response to the spear. [Quo...fecerat]. This fluidity strengthens the Gauls as they are able to preemptively adapt to the yet unknown legion tactics. When Sabinus and Cottus attempt to counter attack, however, Ambiorix doesn't act. As the soldiers advance, they left their flanks exposed; this allows for an easy counter. The Gauls begin to overwhelm the Romans from all exposed ~~sides~~ sides (by throwing more spears) and this hurts ~~the~~ Cottus' Army even more. [Elesserant...vellent]. By using the Gaugy method, Ambiorix attacks the Romans and prevents any reconstruction of Rank, as it becomes impossible for them to Reform.

Both Gallic Attacks varied greatly, but fundamentally they followed the same

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

3C 4 of 4

pattern. Ranged weaponry such as spears and slings initially hit the Romans, then the masses of Gauls overwhelm the discomfited foot soldiers. Additionally, the Gauls rely heavily on impromptu changes, something which Caesar still has trouble with. ~~Although~~ Although the enemies' scouting varied circumstantially, as one battle was against a camp while another was an ambush, it gave the  ~~Romans~~ Gauls an upper hand which ultimately <sup>helped</sup>  ~~gave~~ them  ~~the~~ win. This may be attributed to the Gauls lack of formality, as the Romans follow a very different style of fighting, and are easily overcome by playing dirty; a factor which the Romans eventually adopt for themselves.

# AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN

## 2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

### Question 3

**Note:** Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

#### 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: 5

The essay represents a strong effort to analyze the strategies of both armies. The student makes use of copious examples and references to the Latin text, and also draws upon a sound knowledge of the context to develop a cogent analysis.

The treatment of Passage A is particularly thorough: “When Caesar is in Britain, some of his troops are ambushed while foraging. This strategy catches the Romans off guard. The enemy had hidden themselves in woods at night where the Romans had to forage since it was the only remaining place with grain (*Nam quod omni ... delituerant*). This strategy gave the Britons an element of surprise, increasing the chance that their attack would be successful.” The essay also integrates lines 1–3 (*Caesar ... iussit*), which describe Caesar’s suspicions about the Britons’ new strategy, into the discussion by proposing that his maneuver likely prevented the enemy from wiping out the foraging party.

The discussion of Passage B is almost as thorough except that it omits a reference to lines 3–4, where the Gauls are described as carefully observing Ambiorix’s battle tactics (*Quo praecepto ab eis diligentissime observato*). However, the essay presents a convincing analysis of Ambiorix’s strategy: “Whenever a cohort left from the defensive ring and made an attack, Ambiorix’s troops would fall back (*cum quaepiam cohors ... refugiebant*). The strategy shown here is the strategy of feigned retreats. By withdrawing these troops when the Romans made an attack against, Ambiorix was able to lure some Romans away from the defensive ring and into the open.” The essay successfully draws upon the text to make inferences and advance arguments.

#### Sample: 3B

##### Score: 3

The essay is an example of a general understanding of the content accompanied by an uneven treatment of the two passages; while the student provides several citations and correct translations for Passage A, the Latin support for the argument presented for Passage B is scanty.

The student cites and correctly translates Latin from throughout Passage A to support the discussion of the strategies: about Caesar’s suspicions regarding the enemy plans; about his disposition of the cohorts; about the enemy’s plan to hide in the forest; and finally about the enemy’s use of cavalry in the attack. Although the student provides more background information than necessary, that information is followed by an adequate discussion of the Britons’ strategy.

The treatment of the Latin for Passage B lacks the accuracy and completeness shown in the discussion of Passage A. In translating lines 3–5, the student mistakenly states that it is the Romans who take refuge, not the enemy. One additional citation, about the Gauls encircling the Romans (which the student cites as *et ab qui cesserant et ab eis qui proximi steterant circumveniebanture*), is handled more successfully. Again, unnecessary background information is provided. However, in this case the Latin support does not rise to the level of that provided for Passage A.

**AP<sup>®</sup> LATIN**  
**2019 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 3 (continued)**

Because of the uneven treatment of the Latin and the basic understanding of the passages, the essay earned a score of 3.

**Sample: 3C**

**Score: 2**

This essay reflects a knowledge of the content and offers a general discussion, but it does not effectively marshal the textual evidence.

Throughout the treatment of Passage A citations of the text seem disconnected with the discussion so that they do not advance the student’s argument. For instance, lines 6–7 (*suspicati ... delituerant*) are misconstrued to mean that the enemy explored the woods at night. Lines 8–9 (*paucis ... circumdederant*) are cited to support the statement that “axe wielding charioteers overwhelm the Romans.” On the other hand, the student fails to note evidence of the enemy’s strategy in attacking the Romans when they are away from camp or harvesting grain (lines 3–4, 7–9).

In the treatment of Passage B the citations again do not fully advance the discussion. This is apparent in the citation of lines 3–5 (*Quo ... fecerat*), where the student omits the last three words of the sentence that actually depicts the enemy’s tactic of quickly withdrawing (line 5: *hostes velocissime refugiebant*). Again, when describing the enemy’s effective use of spears, the student cites only lines 7–8 (*cesserant ... vellent*) and omits Caesar’s vivid depiction of the predicament (8–9: *nec virtuti locus relinquebatur, neque ab tanta multitudine coiecta tela conferti vitare poterant*).

The essay would have been strengthened by exploiting the full text and developing more coherent citations that align with the arguments in the essay.