

# Commentary on candidate 1 evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of question paper 1: literary appreciation.

## Question 1a

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they understood that Cicero wants 'Treatius to stop feeling homesick'. To achieve the second mark here, the candidate needed to show a firmer grasp of the text.

## Question 1b

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because the point of comparison is forgiveness not homesickness. The response shows no understanding of who Medea is.

## Question 1c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for engaging with the question and their comment that 'Cicero is turning Treatius' feelings of anxiety and separation into a joke'. This showed implicit understanding of the final quotation, although there was no specific reference to any of the quotes.

## Question 2

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**.

- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for discussing the friendliness implicit in Caesar's apology for the brevity of his letter.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for discussing the less friendly way in which responsibility is delegated to Furnius; 'Furnius will tell you more'.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for the candidate's comment on the tone of Caesar's request (a text reference would have consolidated the point).

## Question 3a

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because their response did not adequately address the issue of snobbery.

### Question 3b

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**.

- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for the reference to rhetorical questions substantiating the comment that 'frustration ...is shown'.
- ◆ **2 marks** were awarded for comparison of the spectators to 'bloodthirsty animals'. Elliptical quotation of the Latin is not to be recommended, but the candidate has shown understanding of the text and made a valid comment.

No further marks could be awarded as the final paragraph was too general and lacked the specific quotations required for a question on use of language.

### Question 4

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for commenting, with text references, on:

- ◆ Pliny's fairness (**1 mark**)
- ◆ his equal treatment of guests (**1 mark**)
- ◆ being 'smart' in drinking cheaper wine (**1 mark**)

### Question 5

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for:

- ◆ repetition building suspense (**1 mark**)
- ◆ the discussion of 'punchy' short sentences (**1 mark**)
- ◆ the use of parenthesis, with quotation (no translation but 'horrible' implies understanding), to pause the sentence (**1 mark**)
- ◆ the further comment that this keeps the reader engaged (**1 mark**)

The comments in the final paragraph related to material outwith the lines cited so no further marks could be awarded.

This question was not specifically on language use so, candidates could discuss content or language, or a mixture of both.

### Question 6a

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for:

- ◆ discussing the informal tone of 'my Tiro' (**1 mark**)
- ◆ commenting on Cicero's concern for Tiro's health (**1 mark**)
- ◆ drawing out a further implication from his advice to follow doctor's orders (**1 mark**)

### Question 6b

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because, with reference to the text, they gave a good account of the way Pliny's apparent concern for Zosimus' health ('heart would be softened') quickly turns into a list of the benefits he stands to lose. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ his apparent concern **(1 mark)**
- ◆ Pliny listing Zosimus' qualities as if bragging **(1 mark)**
- ◆ Pliny's fear of losing something that would be hard to replace **(1 mark)**

### Question 7

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they made a relevant point about sending items of clothing.

### Question 8

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they made a relevant point about women having little say in who they married. Their discussion of Pliny's friendship with the girl's uncle would have been worth a further mark if their comments had been directed towards the way the marriage was arranged.

### Question 9

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**. They disagreed with the statement, which was allowed, but the way in which they did so left little scope for analysis or evaluation.

The candidate was awarded marks as follows:

#### Content

- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for commenting, with reference to the text, that Letter 1 by Plautus 'draws emotion from the reader'.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for commenting in their discussion of Letter 2 by Cicero on the insights it gives into Cicero as a person and a politician and **1 mark** for their interpretation of the text.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for in their discussion of Letter 6 by Cicero, for their comment, with reference to the text, on Cicero's being 'two-faced' and a further **1 mark** was awarded for their comparison of his 'moral greyness' with modern politicians.
- ◆ **0 marks** were awarded for the comments on Letter 9 from the Vindolanda tablets as they were unrelated to the question.
- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded in their discussion of Letter 13 by Seneca, for the importance of true friendship and a further **1 mark** was awarded for the comparison with social media.

- ◆ **1 mark** was awarded for their discussion in Letter 16 of Seneca's attitude to enslavement.

### **Structure**

- ◆ **2 marks** were awarded for including an introduction and conclusion.