

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 21

‘Heroism in the *Aeneid* shows a greater focus on morality than heroism in the *Iliad*’. How valid is this statement? Refer to the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **15 marks** for this question.

Analysis – 6 marks awarded

The candidate shows a solid grasp of events in the *Aeneid* and some awareness of events in the *Iliad*. The candidate makes at least four points which were well developed analysis and was awarded 6 marks. No points were informed by wider reading.

Evaluation – 4 marks awarded

The large number of points covered seemed to prevent the candidate going into any depth. The candidate certainly did try to evaluate, though. However, the candidate rarely achieves any well-developed reasoning. For example, there is no attempt in the essay to address what morality might be. The response rarely tells us *why* a particular act was moral which we would need to see in order to award higher marks.

Argument and conclusion – 5 marks awarded

The argument is coherent in the sense that it chronologically surveys the *Aeneid* and then the *Iliad*. However, it is not sufficiently focused on the question to achieve highly for coherence. There is also no clear development of logic explaining *why* the *Aeneid* seemed to show more morality. Perhaps the implication that more points were made about the *Aeneid* was the intent. There is no sense that the conclusion builds on the logic of the argument.

Candidate 2

Question 22

‘Revenge is the main motivation for heroic action in the *Odyssey*.’ Discuss, with reference to the *Odyssey*, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **19 marks** for this question.

Analysis – 6 marks awarded

This essay shows a great deal of knowledge of the text and relates it well to aspects of the heroic world. It also addresses the question in a sophisticated way hinting at the overlap between revenge and the heroic code. The analytical points are all well made. The candidate includes part of the *Odyssey* not prescribed, however, no marks can be awarded for this. It is possible that the candidate was using this as ‘wider reader’, but marks are not awarded for analysing wider reading; they are awarded for using wider reading in support of an analysis (or evaluation) of the prescribed text.

Evaluation – 6 marks awarded

The evaluation is well-developed and there are plenty of points. As with the analysis above, there is no use of wider reading in the evaluative points.

Argument and conclusion – 7 marks awarded

The argument is coherent and directed well at the question. However, it does not develop all the areas that it suggests as well as possible. For example, the points about family honour do not seem thoroughly justified. And the extensive use of material outwith the prescription shows that they argument is not skilfully constructed.

Candidate 3

Question 21

‘Heroism in the *Aeneid* shows a greater focus on morality than heroism in the *Iliad*’. How valid is this statement? Refer to the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **12 marks** for this question.

It starts very promisingly; the candidate lays out clearly how they plan to address the question – this candidate has fully absorbed the importance of making four points for analysis and for evaluation as well. However, there is only scant merit in the very sweeping statements in the introduction. An essay at Advanced Higher level needs to be more than a collection of statements: it needs to show understanding of how we reach those statements.

Analysis – 5 marks awarded

The candidate does make a good range of analytical points when we consider the content of all the paragraphs including the introduction and conclusion. And the answer is addressing the question at an Advanced Higher level. However, we could not say that there were four separate points all well enough developed to merit 6 marks.

Evaluation – 4 marks awarded

The candidate has made three points which respond to the question and show wider understanding.

Argument and conclusion – 3 marks awarded

While the proposed line of argument is coherent and responds to the question, the actual line of argument delivered does not. Due to the extensive laying out of intention in the introduction and conclusion, the candidate gives little actual substance to answer the question in the context of all the books of the poems that they had read. The sheer presence of a conclusion, making assertions which have not been justified in any argument can gain no marks at all.

Question 22

‘Revenge is the main motivation for heroic action in the *Odyssey*.’ Discuss, with reference to the *Odyssey*, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **20 marks** for this question.

Analysis – 6 marks awarded

This answer shows a very sound grasp of the *Odyssey* and relates it well to a thorough understanding of the heroic age. However, despite so much analytical comment, the candidate does not attempt to deepen points with reference to wider reading. Candidates are only required to make four well developed analysis points in their essays. They push their analysis mark higher by showing greater quality of analysis, which means referring to wider reading in their points.

Evaluation – 6 marks awarded

There are a lot of very good evaluative points made but there is no attempt to draw on wider reading in any of the evaluations.

Argument and conclusion – 8 marks awarded

This is an excellently constructed essay with a coherent approach, very well executed. However, the conclusion just lacks a little nuance of judgement regarding the points raised to merit full marks.

Candidate 4**Question 24**

‘Ovid’s heroines in *Heroides* reveal the powerlessness of women in the ancient world.’ How valid is this statement? Refer to *Heroides* 1, 3 and 7, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **18 marks** for this question.

This answer is a good illustration of the best marks that can be expected when a candidate does not attempt to go into detail or discuss issues in depth. A greater quantity of superficial analyses or evaluations will not yield a higher mark.

Analysis – 6 marks awarded

The answer shows a solid grasp of the subject matter and the candidate is able to adequately relate what is there to their knowledge of heroic society. There are

at least four well developed analytical points drawn from the three poems. There is no attempt to refer to wider reading.

Evaluation – 6 marks awarded

The candidate makes plenty of reasoned judgements about the evidence discussed, but, as with analysis, there is no attempt to bring in wider reading to further examine any points.

Argument and conclusion – 6 marks awarded

The structure and approach of this essay is well handled. It is coherent and does a solid run through the key judgements from a summary of the content of the poems. And the conclusion is based on what has gone before. So, it clearly merits 6 marks. However, there is nothing to suggest that this is a particularly skillfull or nuanced argument.

Candidate 5

Question 21

‘Heroism in the *Aeneid* shows a greater focus on morality than heroism in the *Iliad*’. How valid is this statement? Refer to the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, and your own knowledge.

The candidate was awarded **17 marks** for this question.

Analysis – 6 marks awarded

There is a wide range of analytical points and at least four are well developed. However, there is no evidence of using wider reading within the points to deepen or illustrate any points.

Evaluation – 5 marks awarded

There is a similar range of evaluation points and some attempt to address what may constitute morality in the heroic age. Some reference is made to aspects of the heroic code. It was good to see the candidate discuss Hector though the misunderstanding over Patroclus’ body invalidated the candidate’s key point.

Argument and conclusion – 6 marks awarded

The line of argument is coherent and addresses the question. The conclusion is also derived from the argument. However, the lack of detailed comment about the action of the book – it summarises what happens rather than discusses any details – means that it lacks the sophistication to be awarded more.