

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Question 33(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because three accurate details about the temple have been given. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ In Agrimentum not far from the forum
- ◆ very holy
- ◆ housed a beautiful statue of Hercules

The focus of the question was on the temple, so no mark was awarded for “greatly revered”. The candidate does not refer to what was “greatly revered”. If it is a reference to the temple, there would be no mark awarded, as the mark has already been awarded for “very holy”. If it is a reference to the statue, there would be no mark awarded, as the question is about the temple. However, the candidate has written enough to gain the full three marks for this question.

Question 33(b)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. The question asks the candidate to describe how the guards behaved, and three descriptive details of the guards have been given. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ The guards attempted to resist at first
- ◆ The guards ... were badly beaten away with the slaves’ sticks and clubs
- ◆ They also let out a cry in order that news would spread

Question 34

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. This question requires the candidate first to consider the news that reached the people of Agrimentum and then, to gain the marks, to make a judgment about what items of news would have shocked the people the most. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ They were being attacked by armed slaves
- ◆ The slaves were from the governor’s household

Although both points made were about the slaves in the story, there were two separate points made about them, that they were armed and that they were from the governor, and so the two marks were awarded.

There was no mark awarded for “they were not being attacked by pirates or their enemies”, as this in itself was not shocking. To gain the mark, the candidate would have had to explain why it was not shocking. However, the candidate still gained the full marks available.

Question 35

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because all three parts of the question were covered. The five marks can be distributed in any way. To gain each mark, the candidate needed to consider how Cicero used mockery, rather than simply re-tell the story. Marks were awarded for:

Verres’ men:

- ◆ He describes them trying to pull the statue down with levers and cords for over an hour but to no avail
- ◆ (He was) making fun of their strength even though there were so many of them

What Verres’ men stole:

- ◆ He describes the men ultimately failing at stealing the bronze statue and instead they got away with two very small statuettes

Verres being like Hercules:

- ◆ Verres’ attempted theft should be included with the other labours of Hercules

Question 36

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because two reasons were given as to why Cicero described the weather in great detail. There were no marks awarded for merely describing the weather, nor for describing Sopater’s treatment by Verres. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ To make the listeners feel pity towards Sopater
- ◆ To portray Verres in a more negative light

No marks were awarded for “the weather was so cold and wet” nor for “he had to get tied to a statue naked”.

Question 37

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because four valid points were made about how Roman governors in general might have behaved, based on how Verres behaved. The response was correctly restricted to the content of Extract 4, in accordance with the rubric of the question. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ Some are very abusive of their power
- ◆ Some intimidate their people
- ◆ They are very powerful
- ◆ They are very violent

Question 38(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because two separate points of evidence about Verres' cruelty were made. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ Sopater is described as scarcely alive
- ◆ (he is) almost frozen

Although there is no direct reference to the weather, it is implied in "he is almost frozen" so the mark was awarded. There was no mark awarded for "he is taken down from the statue", as the candidate did not explain that Sopater had been tied to it, which is the evidence for cruelty. There is no cruelty attached to taking someone off a statue.

Question 38(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because two reasons explaining the Senate's hesitation were given. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ They did not want to disrespect the gods
- ◆ They might have thought he was bluffing

There was no mark awarded for "they didn't want to get involved with Verres", as the Senate clearly was already involved with him. There was no mark awarded for "they were scared of Verres", as being scared of someone implies giving in to them at once, which the Senate did not do.

Question 39

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the candidate made four valid points about Roman statues based entirely on the reading of the story. Marks were awarded for:

- ◆ (Statues) were very heavy
- ◆ They were very valuable
- ◆ They were beautifully made
- ◆ They were of gods, heroes or important historical figures

There would not have been a mark for “the statues were very important”, as further explanation would need to be given based on the reading of the story. However, the candidate still achieved the full four marks for this “Roman Culture” question.