

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question in the Catallus section of this course assessment component.

Question 1 (a)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for identifying relevant qualities:

- No one better or more honest and modest than Trebatius **(1 mark)**
- Leads the pack in civil law **(1 mark)**

Question 1 (b)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for explaining Cicero's advice to Trebatius.

- Ride back in a war chariot **(1 mark)**
- Stay among Caesar's friends **(1 mark)**
- His own effort and modesty will help the most **(1 mark)**

Question 2 (a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they explained Cicero's metaphor effectively.

- **(1 mark)** for the assassination of Julius Caesar is compared to a *beautiful feast*.
- **(1 mark)** for both bring joy to the participants.
- **(1 mark)** for the leftovers refers to Mark Antony who was not killed (but should have been in Cicero's view).

Question 2 (b)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they showed a sound understanding of the text but only identified one specific example of language use.

- **(1 mark)** for word choice – *pestis*
- **(1 mark)** for comment that this shows his ‘lowly view’ of Antony
- **(1 mark)** for explaining the line quoted in English, ‘occasionally ... at you’.

To gain the mark for word choice, the candidate needed to identify a specific word or phrase; e.g. *subirascor*.

Question 3 (a)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for identifying a relevant tone and developing their explanation with further reference to the text.

- Respectful tone, ‘lord’ **(1 mark)**
- No one better to guide or educate him **(1 mark)**

Question 3 (b)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they clearly explained Pliny’s main concerns.

- The nature of the charge and extent of punishment **(1 mark)**
- Whether there should be an age distinction **(1 mark)**
- Whether the label itself should be punished if no offences committed **(1 mark)**

Question 3 (c)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they provided three good reasons to support their view that Pliny would be reassured.

- Correct action has been taken = reassuring (**1 mark**)
- Clear language split into short sections (**1 mark**)
- Reassures by removing doubt and confusion (**1 mark**)

Question 4

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they showed a good understanding of ways in which Seneca uses language. For full marks, they needed to be more specific when identifying examples of word choice.

- (**1 mark**) for identifying a rhetorical question.
- (**1 mark**) for comment that this makes the reader think about the effect of crowds on them.
- (**1 mark**) for comment on how being in a crowd can make a good person bad.
- (**1 mark**) for identifying a list of terms, '*more greedy, more self-obsessed...*'
- (**1 mark**) for comment 'that this shows the variety of negative effects'

Question 5

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they identified two interesting philosophical questions within the letter. For more marks, the candidate's discussion needed to be more focussed on the letter's philosophical features, rather than its modern relevance.

- Judge a potential friend in advance (**1 mark**).
- Tell a friend whatever you would tell yourself (**1 mark**).

Question 6

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they discussed three features that characterise this as an informal letter to a friend.

- Concern for Tiro's health (**1 mark**).
- Trusts Tiro to deal with the gardener (**1 mark**).
- Comfortable sharing a joke with him (**1 mark**).

Question 7

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for using textual evidence to justify their impressions of Cicero's mental state.

- Miserable - he has destroyed the letter with tears (**1 mark**).
- Ashamed - he has let his family down (**1 mark**).
- Weak - seeking his wife's emotional support (**1 mark**).
- Extremely unhappy - more miserable than his wife because it's his fault (**1 mark**).

Question 8

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they identified two praiseworthy qualities.

- Intelligence (**1 mark**).
- Frugality (**1 mark**).

Her interest in literature would also have been worth a mark.

Question 9

The candidate was awarded **13 marks** because they developed a clear line of argument with reference to a relevant selection of texts. However, reference to the texts was sometimes sketched in overly broad terms so that some potentially good points, for example, on patronage (letter 10) and on affection (letter 29) were not fully realised.

- Caesar's assassination in letter 6 points to political killings in the modern world (**1 mark**).
- Comparison to a feast reflects disregard for human life then and now (**1 mark**).
- Pliny's arrogant host in letter 14 and class inequality today (**1 mark**).
- Seneca's advice in letter 13 to make friends with someone you trust is still relevant (**1 mark**).
- Developed with reference to social media and prevalence of 'fake' friends (**1 mark**).
- Roman punishment of Christians and religious persecution in the modern world (**1 mark**).
- Continuity between the Christian practices in letter 7 and Christian practices today (**1 mark**).
- Celebrating birthdays (letter 24) is still commonplace today (**1 mark**).
- Bias against Pomponia in Cicero's account of the domestic quarrel in letter 25 and dismissive attitudes towards women nowadays (**1 mark**).
- Seneca's criticisms in letter 16 less relevant as slavery now illegal (**1 mark**).

Structure

3 marks for a clear introduction, a coherent argument and an effective conclusion that reached a final judgement.