

# Commentary on Candidate Evidence

## Literary Appreciation Candidate 1 Total marks: 48/60

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this Course Assessment component.

### Section 2 – Ovid – 25/30

#### Questions 8

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. These were awarded for correctly identifying 3 relevant aspects of their relationship.

#### Question 9a

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. These were awarded for correctly identifying 3 relevant actions of Thisbe.

#### Question 9b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. This was awarded for identification of 1 relevant action.

#### Question 10

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. This was awarded for explaining an effect of repetition. The other information is not directly relevant to repetition.

#### Question 11a

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. These were awarded for identifying 3 relevant actions.

#### Question 11b

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. One mark for correctly inferring that Baucis and Philemon are unaware of their visitors' status, and a further 2 marks awarded for 2 pieces of relevant evidence.

#### Question 12

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. These were awarded for relevant characteristics of country life, identified from the text.

#### Question 13

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. Three relevant details were identified from across both texts.

**Question 14**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. Marks are awarded for valid points plus comment. The first mark for Thisbe being portrayed as a beautiful girl, deeply in love. Second mark is awarded for reference to her starting to cry and the third mark for Thisbe manifesting her grief by killing herself and comment on its credibility. Fourth mark for suggesting that relighting the fire was a realistic portrait of someone's actions. The candidate did not achieve all available marks by giving simple narrative without explanation, and by confusing the word "simplistic" with "simple". To gain full marks for this question, greater evaluation was needed.

**Section 4 – Pliny 23/30****Question 21**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for 2 separate accurate details.

**Question 22**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. These were awarded for accurate identification of 2 accurate details.

**Question 23**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**. The candidate has identified 4 correct literary techniques, but only made 1 comment on effectiveness. Where the candidate has identified exciting episodes, the implicit judgement on their effectiveness has been accepted.

**Question 24**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. They have correctly inferred 4 relevant details about the literary practice of Roman historians.

**Question 25**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. These were awarded for 4 relevant points with comment on effectiveness.

**Question 26**

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**. The candidate has made 4 relevant judgements about Pliny's description, with 2 additional developed points in support. 2 further marks could have been gained by identifying further valid comments on Pliny's character.