
AP[®] Latin

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Free Response Question 3

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

Question 3: Analytical Essay

5 points

General Scoring Note

When applying the scoring guidelines, the response does not need to meet every single criterion in a column. You should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence.

	0 Unacceptable	1 Poor	2 Weak	3 Average	4 Good	5 Strong
DEVELOPMENT OF ARGUMENT/ANALYSIS	The student offers a response that is totally irrelevant, totally incorrect, or merely restates the question.	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 recognizes the passage(s), but presents only a weak essay. It may be confusing and lack organization, or it may rely on summary. It addresses (1) only portions of each passage, or (2) one passage well, but the other not at all.	The student develops an adequate essay analyzing how Laocoon and Cotta seek to persuade their listeners to respond to uncertain situations. The essay reflects some understanding of the passages, OR the essay may be strong for one passage but weak for the other. 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 develops a good essay analyzing how Laocoon and Cotta seek to persuade their listeners to respond to uncertain situations, 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 develops a strong essay analyzing how Laocoon and Cotta seek to persuade their listeners to respond to uncertain situations and consistently aligns it to Latin evidence. Occasional errors need not weaken the overall impression of the essay.
USE OF LATIN	The student demonstrates no understanding of Latin in context.	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 provides little Latin support, taken out of context or misunderstood; or may use no Latin.	The student may provide few accurate Latin citations; they may not be linked to the analysis or may fail to support it.	The student uses examples of Latin that are generally accurate, specific, relevant, and properly cited; while they are not plentiful, they are drawn from throughout both passages.	The student uses copious examples of accurate, specific, and relevant Latin, properly cited, drawn from throughout both passages.
INFERENCES & CONCLUSIONS	The student does not draw inferences and conclusions based on the passages.	The student does not draw inferences and conclusions based on the passages.	The student may make incorrect assumptions or make inferences and conclusions based on the passages only rarely.	The student may display only limited understanding of implied information.	The student makes 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 consistently uses inferences and draws conclusions that accurately reflect the Latin and support the analysis.
CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE	The student shows no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context and provides no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.	The student shows no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context and provides no meaningful discussion of context or contextual references.	The student may show no understanding or a thorough misunderstanding of context; references to context, if any, are irrelevant.	The student may sometimes misunderstand contextual references or fail to connect them effectively to the analysis.	The student uses specific contextual references that support the analysis.	The student is able to use specific contextual references consistently in order to support the analysis.

Sample 3A

1 of 3

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

○ ○ ● ○ ○

Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

In Aeneid Book 2 Laocoön is against the Trojans bringing the horse into the city and tries to persuade the Trojans that they shouldn't trust it. Laocoön tries to convince them of this ~~by using~~ with the ^{manner} ~~way~~ in which he speaks. First, "Laocoön ardens summa decurrit ab arce" (line 2), Laocoön ~~is~~ burning, runs down from the highest citadel. The fact that he's described as burning and because he runs down from the highest citadel, the Trojans would sense his alarm, making them more likely to listen to him. With his first statement, "O miseri, quae tanta insania, cives?" (line 3) Laocoön uses strong language saying, "O miserable citizens what great insanity (is this)?" These strong words, "miserable and insanity, also help alert the Trojans to the dire situation and get their attention. Laocoön also looks to the past and the future to convince the Trojans. When he says "sic notus Ulixes?" (line 5) meaning "thus Ulysses (is) known?" he reminds the Trojans that it isn't normal for the Greeks to give them gifts. This statement causes the Trojans to be wary and makes them more likely to agree with him. Laocoön also talks about what could happen in the future if they let the horse in. For example he says "aut ~~haec~~ haec in nostros fabricata est machina muris" (line 7), "or ~~the~~ this machine was made against ~~to~~ our walls". By saying this, Laocoön makes the Trojans think about what this horse could do to their city. If they believe him, then they won't bring the horse into the city. Finally, Laocoön ~~shows the~~ establishes his own opinion and acts ~~upon~~ on it. He says "quidquid id est, timeo Danae et dona ferentes" (line 10) ~~means~~ meaning "Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even bearing gifts." The Trojans now clearly know what he thinks and they may also begin to fear the Greeks bearing gifts because he does. Lastly, Laocoön "~~validus ingentem viribus... compagibus alium contorsit~~" (lines 11-13), ~~he twists a huge spear into the side of the horse~~ twists a huge spear into the side of the horse. "ingentem viribus hastam... compagibus alium contorsit." (line 11-13)

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

By taking action in accordance with his opinion, Laocoön shows the Trojans that these aren't just words, that he actually means what he says and will act on it.

In De Bello Gallico book 5, Ambiorix warns the Romans of an attack by all Gaul along with the Germans. He ~~warns~~^{warned} that the Gauls were planning on attacking all the Roman camps on the same day. The ~~legions~~ Romans he tells this to are very worried ~~and tell the council about it~~. Cotta believes that they shouldn't go along with Ambiorix's advice of fleeing the camp and tries to convince the other Romans.

First, he takes a step back and reminds the others of the most ~~responsible~~^{responsible} things to do. He believes that "nihil temere agendum" ^(line 6), nothing should be done recklessly and that "ex hibernis missa Caesaris discoendum", ^(line 6) they shouldn't leave the winter camps without Caesar's order. Cotta also makes sure to address the main concern, that the winter camps will fall to the enemy.

Cotta ^{and the others who agreed with him} "quanta suis magnas etiam copias Germanorum sustineri posse munitis hibernis doce bant", they were showing that the camps could sustain ^{as great a} ~~any~~ number of German troops (line 7-8). He proves this point with past precedent: "rem esse testimonio... illatis fortissime sustinuerint" (lines 8-9). Here he reminds them that in the previous attack of the enemy the Romans were most bravely fighting and they were able to sustain with many wounds. This helps the others remember that they've fought against the enemies before ~~and they~~ so their camps won't fall if they're attacked, ^{again}. ~~in addition,~~

* because they ^{were} scarcely able to believe that the unknown and humble state of the Eburones ^{would} dare to ~~attack~~ make war on the Roman people by their own will, "quod ~~ad~~ civitatem ignobilem... ~~vix~~ vix erat credendum" (lines 2-4). Therefore, they ~~tell the~~ bring the situation down to the council, "Itaque ad consilium rem deferunt" (line 4).

Sample 3A

3 of 3

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5



Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

Finally, Cotta looks at the situation as a whole in order to convince the others. He points out three things. First, "re frumentaria non premi" (line 9), that they weren't pressed by the grain supply. Next, "interea et ex... conventura subsidia" (lines 9-10), that help would come from the nearest winter camps and Caesar. These two statements help establish that they don't need to be worried about what Amblonix said and further provide evidence for his previous statement that they shouldn't act recklessly. Cotta ends by commenting on the fact that they're having this disagreement. He ~~to~~ says "quid esset levius... rebus capere consilium" (lines 10-11), what is more trivial or disgraceful than to make a plan about the highest (most important) situations with the enemy as an advisor? With ~~these~~ ^{this} statements Cotta forces the others to take a step back and ~~look at the~~ ~~world~~ think about what they're doing and realize that they shouldn't take advice from the enemy.

Therefore both Laocoon and Cotta use numerous tactics to attempt to persuade others to agree with them.

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5



Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

~~Throughout~~ Throughout both passages, the scene is set for an impending attack from the enemy. Both Laocoon and Cotta ~~attempt~~ attempt to persuade the larger group about the merits of their ideas, potentially determining their ultimate destruction or survival. In the case of Laocoon, the critical decision is whether or not to accept the giant likeness of a horse into their city as a gift from the Greeks. For Cotta and his soldiers, the choice is whether or not to leave their camp and move to the nearest winter quarters. Both Cotta and Laocoon adopt the ~~an~~ less popular argument, however, both differ significantly in how they choose to convey their opinions. Whereas Laocoon seeks to speak to a broader audience using rhetorical questions and invocations of the past, Cotta directs his argument directly to his intended audience and employs the use of practically deduced outcomes to bolster his position. Both are similar, however, in how they employ descriptions of the enemy.

Both Cotta and Laocoon differ widely in their audiences to which they address their arguments. Laocoon must persuade the Trojan people ~~to~~ to see the danger that lies within the Greek gift ~~to~~, meaning the very fate of the city lies in the outcome of his persuasive abilities. Consequently, Laocoon seeks to ~~to~~ convey his ~~argument~~ ^{argument} to as large of an audience as possible in this case, the Trojan citizenry ("O miseri, ...

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5



Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

cives"). In addressing the Trojan citizenry as a whole instead of just its leaders, Laocoon emphasizes the dirtiness of ~~his~~ this decision to his audience. He implies that his warnings about the Greek gift implicate each and every Trojan citizen in some way. This method of conveying an argument runs contrary to the approach Cotta took, in which he attempted to ~~convey his~~ direct his argument to only those in charge ("compluresque tribuni militum et primorum ordinum centuriones"). By taking this approach ~~instead~~, Cotta differentiates himself from Laocoon's attempt to broaden the appeal of his argument and instead elevates it in importance. Rather than talk to the common soldiery, which would implicate them in his argument, he cuts out any risk of being contradicted by them. Instead, he goes right to who needs to hear his words. ~~This is a more direct~~ ~~to convey to a more~~ ~~smaller, less diverse~~ ~~audience~~ Rather than him having to pander to the opinions of a significantly more diverse crowd of opinions, Cotta can expedite his argument and continue to build onto it.

Cotta and Laocoon further differentiate themselves in their arguments through their approaches to rhetoric, with Laocoon using rhetorical questions to raise doubt about the validity of the Greek gift and Cotta ~~using simple~~ laying out outcomes as statements for what will come as a benefit to his plan. Whereas Laocoon warns of danger,

Sample 3B

3 of 5

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

○ ○ ● ○ ○

Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

Cotta outlines a brighter future if his argument is adopted. This can be clearly seen ~~in which~~ when Cotta ~~the~~ describes the resources they would get from Caesar and the winter quarters ("ex proximis hibernis et a Caesare conventura subsidia"). At a time when the Roman army seemed to be desperate, awaiting an attack at any moment from a ferocious enemy, the prospect of more resources would probably appeal to many in charge. This is something that Cotta understands and therefore employs in his argument for ~~staying~~ ^{staying}. This method of painting a pretty picture of the future with predictions is something wholly ignored by Laocoon, who differs from Cotta in that he uses grim rhetorical questions that essentially make the Trojans doubt the validity/purity of the Greeks' intentions. One such instance of this occurs when Laocoon asks whether or not the Trojans actually believe the Greeks have been carried away ("Creditis avertos hostes"). After incredibly long periods of time spent fighting a gruesome war, Laocoon points out through the use of this question the low likelihood that the Greeks would just one day decide to leave. He further continues this line of thought by asking whether or not, even if they did leave, would they leave gifts ("Aut ulla putatis dona carere dolis Danaum"). Laocoon asks this to clearly point out the foolishness in such a belief

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

○ ○ ● ○ ○

Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

that the ~~the~~ Greeks just left. The doubt that questions such as these stir up gives credibility to Laocoon's argument in the end.

~~Both~~

Both Cotta and Laocoon are similar in their argumentative approaches in that they characterize their enemies in a way that favorably bolsters their argument. In the case of Laocoon, he is convinced that the Greeks have sent the gift as a trick. In order to convey this message in his argument, he conjures up the image of the famous Greek Ulysses, who used tricks and mischief to ultimately get his revenge. ("Sic notus Ulixes?") In doing this, Laocoon attempts to classify the entire ~~the~~ Greek army as being similar to ~~the~~ Ulysses. ~~Similarity~~. A similar characterization of the enemy is employed by Cotta to encourage the army to stay put. Cotta calls the enemy brave and able to sustain many wounds ("quod primum hostium impetum multis ultra vulneribus... fortissime"). By characterizing the entire enemy force in this manner, he ~~characterizes~~ gives credibility to his argument to stay, which would limit this fierce enemy from being provoked into a battle.

In both the cases of Cotta and Laocoon, they must persuade a larger group to their position. Their success in doing so ultimately determines the fate of both groups. Despite this surface-level similarity

Question 1



Question 2



Question 3



Question 4



Question 5



Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

in situations, both take generally different approaches to doing so, with Cotta painting bright pictures of the future and Laocoon ~~making~~ using rhetorical questions to seed doubt about the Greeks' true intentions. Furthermore, they differ in the size of the audience to which they appeal, with Laocoon favoring the entire citizenry and Cotta only the people making the decisions. Despite this, both use characterizations of the enemy ~~as~~ to bolster their positions to no success.

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5



Begin your response to each question at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

Both Laocoön and Cotta are specific leaders in both passages and both show them speaking about the uncertain situation.

In Passage A, Laocoön describes about the Trojan war and tries to persuade his listeners to plan out what they should do. In lines 4-6, he lists out some of the soldiers from the enemy side and explains that they need to devise a way to ambush them in battle. In lines 8-9, he also suggests ~~we~~ they build the Trojan horse to sneak into the territory unnoticed. This will soon lead to the horse being brought in as a gift and then the Greeks ambush/attack the Trojans. Laocoön persuades his listeners through careful planning and persuasive tone.

In passage B, Cotta describes about the ~~at~~ winter season as his army travels to the German territory. In lines 3-4, Cotta explains the travel plan as they travel through the Eburones mountains and face ~~in~~ many battles. He said that Rome shall stay strong and fight until it's over. Later in lines 9-10, Cotta also talks about the distribution of grains to the soldiers. He explains to his listeners that food rations are scarce and that ~~in~~ it's important to distribute the food in a way so that there's enough to survive the winter.

Both Laocoön and Cotta persuade their listeners through tone and careful planning.

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, analysis of the effects of language usage and stylistic features in Latin texts.

Sample: 3A

Score: 5

The essay presents a strong analysis of the speeches of both Laocoon and Cotta, which consistently aligns with copious Latin evidence. The student also consistently uses inferences and draws conclusions from the Latin text and uses specific contextual references to support the essay’s analysis.

The student draws textual support from throughout both passages to discuss the motivations of both Laocoon and Cotta. Thus, for instance, in order to support their claim that Laocoon tries to convince with his manner of speaking, the essay cites line 2 (*Laocoon ardens summa decurrit ab arce*). It then continues with the detailed inference: “The fact that he’s described as burning and because he runs down from the highest citadel, the Trojans would sense his alarm, making them more likely to listen to him with his first statement, ‘*O miseri, quae tanta insania, cives?*’ (line 3).” The essay also quotes accurately from Lines 5 and 7, and nicely concludes the discussion with “Laocoon shows the Trojans that these aren’t just words, that he actually means what he says and will act on it.”

Concerning Passage B, the essay wades into the discussion of the situation saying that, advising against Ambiorix’s suggestions, Cotta “reminds the others of the most responsible things to do. He believes that ‘*nihil temere agendum*’ (line 6), nothing should be done recklessly and that ‘*ex hibernis iunussa Caesaris descendum*’ (line 6), they shouldn’t leave the winter camps without Cesar’s order.” The student juxtaposes Ambiorix’s arguments with Cotta’s, using ample Latin citations from through Lines 2-4, 7-8, 9, and 10-11, to support their argument that Cotta both “address[es] the main concern, that the winter camps will fall to the enemy” and “looks at the situation as a whole in order to convince the others.” The essay concludes by saying that Cotta forces them to “realize that they shouldn’t take advice from the enemy.”

Sample: 3B

Score: 3

This essay presents an adequate analysis of the rhetorical strategies of both Laocoon and Cotta, but the overall quality of the essay is weakened by the presence of only a small number of accurately translated Latin citations, superficial or misconstrued inferences, and a weaker treatment of the context for Passage B.

In their discussion of either passage, the student rarely uses explicit, accurate citations to the Latin text to support their arguments. For Passage A, the student does not cite lines from throughout the passage (only from lines 3, 4, 4-5, and 5). In these citations the strongest inference comes when they argue that Laocoon reinforces his argument for Greek trickery by “conjur[ing] up the image of the famous Greek Ulysses [...] (*Sic notus Ulixes?*)” but the inference could have been stronger by relating the point specifically to the whole Latin citation. For Passage B, the student only cites lines 5, 6, and 8-9. And of these, in particular, the essay’s contrast between the audience of Laocoon—all of Troy—and of Cotta— “only those in charge” —using “*Compluresque [...] centuriones*” as support represents a superficial inference. Moreover, the essay’s suggestion that Cotta discussion of the Germans in lines 8-9 represents a favorable representation of the enemy illustrates the essay’s weaker discussion of the context of Passage B.

Question 3 (continued)

Despite a sustained analysis of the rhetorical strategies of both Laocoon and Cotta, the relative lack of accurate Latin citations and specific conclusions drawn from these citations earned this essay a 3.

Sample: 3C

Score: 1

This essay presents poor quality analysis because the response doesn't indicate any specific recognition of the passages themselves or their context. For instance, the response's introduction represents a vague restatement of the prompt: "Both Laocoon and Cotta are specific leaders in both passages and both show them speaking about the uncertain situation." The response provides no specific and accurate Latin support, and where it cites lines from the passage, it misinterprets them: for example, the response cites Passage A lines 4-6 as an explanation of how the Trojans "need to device a way to ambush [the Greeks] in battle." However, the misunderstanding of general context is more pronounced for Passage B than Passage A. While the essay does include inferences about the Latin, namely that "Laocoon and Cotta persuade their listeners through tone and careful planning," these inferences are flawed due to the lack of understanding of the Latin.