

GCE

Classics: Classical Civilisation

Advanced GCE **H441**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H041**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2016

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H441)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H041)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
F381 Archaeology: Mycenae and the Classical World	4
F382 Homer's <i>Odyssey</i> and Society	7
F383 Roman Society and Thought	9
F384 Greek Tragedy in its Context	11
F385 Greek Historians	14
F386 City Life in Roman Italy	16
F387 Roman Britain: Life in the Outpost of the Empire	18
F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World	20
F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World	23
F390 Virgil and the World of the Hero	25

F381 Archaeology: Mycenae and the Classical World

General Comments:

Whilst there were no truly outstanding performances this year, there was a definite increase in the number of solid performances when compared with 2015. Candidates generally displayed a sound knowledge of different elements of the content of the specification. Examiners still feel that there is a need for the level of detail included to be increased. Candidates had a tendency to make passing references to objects, sites or archaeologists, without offering specific detail or sometimes without making them relevant to the question. Examiners reported that it was occasionally difficult to identify objects referred to by candidates because non-standard names were used and there was no further description offered to help with the identification.

Of the commentary questions, Q1 was more popular than Q2, though Q2 often received more detailed, focussed responses. Q3 was the most popular of the essay questions, though each essay question had a good number of attempts. What distinguished the best answers was the use of precise references to artefacts, sites and evidence and a clear attempt to analyse and evaluate the selected evidence with reference to the question. Generalised responses do not score well on the assessment grid – there must be accurate subject knowledge and an attempt to use the evidence presented. This year there were far fewer candidates who used diagrams to help explain their answers.

There were no rubric errors reported this year, though some candidates did write rather too briefly to be able to amass many marks. The misspelling of names and technical terms, even those printed on the examination paper, was still evident. The majority of candidates used their time appropriately and there was little evidence of unfinished responses. Examiners felt that candidates could improve their performance on the extended writing questions by making brief plans before starting their responses. Noticeably fewer candidates started their answers to each question on a new page, despite the instructions on the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

Most candidates were able to **name** four different artefacts made from pottery/clay, but it was the level of detail which determined the mark for the question. There was some fine detail offered on the Linear B tablets, the figures from the Cult Centre at Mycenae and various storage vessels. Some candidates offered detailed description of artefacts which were clearly made of other materials, e.g. the Lion Hunt dagger. Candidates should be advised to read questions carefully and take note of words which are highlighted to help them.

1(b)

This question on Mycenaean weaponry and armour attracted some very thoughtful responses. The best answers used the Warrior Vase as the starting point for their discussion and moved on to discuss other archaeological evidence for the weapons and armour. It was pleasing to read answers which went on to link their discussion to evidence mentioned in the Linear B tablets. There were some candidates who limited the scope of their answers by failing to mention the Warrior Vase at all. The AO2 element of the question – ‘how complete a picture’ – was sometimes ignored, with candidates offering a purely descriptive answer. The best candidates

were able to discuss the limitations of the evidence, thereby questioning how complete a picture we have of Mycenaean weapons and armour.

1(c)

There were some lively discussions about whether Mycenaean society was a warlike society. The best answers were those which offered a counter argument before coming to a reasoned conclusion based on the evidence presented. The key words in the question were 'All the evidence' and 'with no interest in anything else'.

A range of evidence was presented, with the most popular elements being the heavily fortified nature of most Mycenaean sites, the weapons found and episodes from Homer's *Iliad*. Some candidates spent too much of their answer describing artefacts, such as the figures from the Cult Centre, the gold face masks, the gold rings and wall paintings, and then came to the simplistic conclusion that such things proved that the Mycenaeans were not a warlike society. A small number of candidates took Mycenaean society to mean just the people who lived in Mycenae.

2(a)

This was a more popular question than Question 2s from previous papers. Candidates did not generally score highly on this question because they ignored one aspect of the question. They described what was shown in the diagram, to a greater or lesser extent, but tended to ignore the second part of the question about other types of diagrams and drawings used by archaeologists. There were a few excellent descriptions of the diagram commenting on the number of skeletons, their position in relation to each other and the grave goods. Only the most observant of candidates commented on the compass point and the scale. There was no expectation that candidates should know the contents of this particular grave.

2(b)

Whilst there were many good responses to this question, some candidates struggled to decide what was meant by 'organic remains'. A surprisingly large number took it to mean any finds from an archaeological site. Some clearly took inspiration from the image of the Warrior Vase in Question 1 and decided that organic remains were pottery/clay based. Candidates described a range of dating methods, but were conflicted about which might prove to be the most useful. Unfortunately, thermoluminescence was often the most popular of the options presented. Other popular choices were dendrochronology and radiocarbon dating.

2(c)

There were some varied responses to the question about how useful organic remains are in teaching us about an ancient society. Examiners were surprised by how infrequently human remains were used to answer this question, especially as the diagram showed a grave with skeletons and the willingness of candidates to discuss human remains in great detail in previous years. The most common remains offered as evidence were the Vindolanda tablets (and the Linear B tablets), the contents of various ship wrecks and various carbonised objects and food from Pompeii and Herculaneum. Discussions of the body of the woman found at Spitalfields proved to be a source of much good relevant information for a small number of candidates. Some candidates ignored the part of the question which required evidence from both Mycenaean and another Classical society.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

Although this was the most popular of the essay questions, candidates tended to answer in a very general manner without reference to specific methods of recording or to individual sites they had studied. Candidates often simply answer Question 1 and Question 3 because they are the first questions in that particular section. They should be advised to read through all the questions carefully and then spend a few minutes planning their response, especially for the essay question. Few candidates went beyond the recording of finds on an excavation; even then they were not specific about **how** the finds might be recorded.

4

Responses to this question were rather patchy. Some candidates simply described a site they had visited and discussed how it was presented to the visitor, completely ignoring the 'opportunities and challenges aspect of the question. Others chose more than one site and made comparisons with how the sites are displayed to the public. There were a few candidates who had clearly been frustrated by their visit to a particular site or sites and took this opportunity to explain how they would do things differently and better! Such candidates were aware that some of the solutions they offered were not practical but they were thinking about opportunities in an ideal situation. They were also fully aware that some of the most difficult challenges to displaying and presenting a site are the visitors themselves, because of different levels of knowledge, different expectations and vandalism. Such responses were a delight to read. The sites selected ranged from the big, important sites such as Mycenae, Pompeii and Ostia, but some opted for more 'obscure' sites so that they could display their local knowledge.

5

Although this was not the most popular of the essay questions, it did generate the best overall marks for both AO1 and AO2. Candidates were fully engaged with the question and could offer a reasonable level of detail about their chosen sites, though sometimes their 'definition' of what counts as 'ordinary people' was debatable. There was no unanimous decision about which site might be considered the 'most useful in helping us to understand how ordinary people lived in the ancient world'. Some of those offered for consideration were Mycenae, Tiryns, Pylos, Pompeii, Herculaneum, Ostia, Vindolanda, Chester, Wroxeter and Bignor Roman villa.

F382 Homer's *Odyssey* and Society

General Comments:

As ever, this unit remains a popular choice with teachers who have clearly shared their enthusiasm and knowledge. Candidates' enjoyment of this unit was manifest. Their ability to communicate their knowledge, understanding and, in many cases, enjoyment of the epic was highly rewarding. Rubric errors were few and timing continued to be less of an issue than in previous years. Questions 1 and 3 were the most popular, though this year saw more candidates opting for question 2 and question 4. Question 5 was the least popular choice.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

Responses to this question were generally of a high calibre. Most paid heed to the wording of the question which stated 'briefly describe' and avoided writing at unnecessary length. Some candidates wasted time by relaying all that had happened before Odysseus met Circe. There was no penalty for this but no reward either. Any penalty was self-imposed as it shortened the time left for other responses. Overall, knowledge was most impressive and much relevant detail was offered. The experience in the Underworld was especially covered very thoroughly.

1(b)

Candidates should be prepared to respond to the literary qualities in their 'b' responses. It is not enough to merely list what happens; for the highest reward the literary techniques must be addressed as well. Closer reading of the second part of the question would have alerted candidates to this, as well as prompted them to have considered the crew's actions in their responses. There were, however, many good responses which showed autonomy and were well rewarded. Despite the question focusing on skills as a leader, a few responses contained discussions of poor leadership skills especially when Odysseus failed to mention Scylla and Charybdis despite claiming to explain every detail. More sophisticated responses saw that it was good leadership as Odysseus was trying to get through one danger at a time and thus inspiring rather than frightening his men.

1(c)

There was much lively and informed discussion of this question, although very few made use of the passage. The raid on the Cicones was generally understood, as was the episode with the Lotus Eaters. Circe and Calypso were also dealt with well. The episode with Polyphemus was often mentioned but not all saw that the search for *kleos*, although heroic in itself, was disastrous in this case. The events with the Sun-God's cattle were often overlooked. The need to look at both sides of the question cannot be stressed enough and where a candidate did not reach the higher levels, it was often because only Odysseus or the crew had been included or that only their desire to return home or lack of it had been discussed.

2(a)

Answers to this question were generally done well, although a handful unnecessarily limited their recall to the second half of the epic. Candidates appeared to have revised thoroughly and had little difficulty listing many of Athene's appearances even remembering the lighting of the way during the locking away of the weapons.

2(b)

Although there were some very full, detailed and thoughtful responses, there were still many that veered towards the superficial. Many responses made reference to the 'tension' and 'excitement' without explaining how these qualities are created. There was, however, often good work on the sardonic smile, Telemachus and the use of irony.

2(c)

Candidates tended to engage well with this question. Some were too general but their responses did communicate understanding. There were also many responses absolutely packed with detail of the journey to Pylos and Sparta, with very sound work illustrating the stages of Telemachus' development including relevant examples taken from the whole of the epic. Some responses would have benefitted from a closer reading of the second part of the question and offering a consideration of Telemachus' contribution to the epic.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

Candidates seem to have heeded past advice to the effect that they might discriminate between modern views of heroes and classical views. It was good to note how very many candidates could list the requirements of a hero in the ancient world. This made for interesting, informed responses. Very few took the pedestrian approach of agreeing with the question in the first half and simply refuting their agreement in the second. The vast majority wove the ancient and modern well and convincingly into their responses. At times, some responses would have benefitted from having a greater range of relevant examples at their disposal.

4

This question elicited some very thoughtful and detailed work. There were some subtle responses which established the stereotypical and then explored how Penelope, Helen and Arete differ from it and can influence men. The shroud and bed trick were the most commonly cited examples. There was often some interesting work on Nausicaa, who ultimately is under her father's control. Although she can drive a cart well, she has to seek his permission; she might see Odysseus as a potential husband but she will risk neither chastity nor reputation and her marriage will be determined by her father. Many responses also demonstrated the various ways Homeric society tried to keep women in check. In general, this question was well completed.

5

This question was by far the least popular of all the questions attempted on the paper. Of those few, most made reference to the use of similes and the oral tradition without fully considering the suggestions laid out in the prompt to the question, especially the last of these which specified the need to make reference to the *Odyssey*. There were, however, a few who managed to consider a range of relevant ideas and, at the same time, demonstrate their knowledge of the epic.

F383 Roman Society and Thought

General Comments

Candidates generally exhibited a sound knowledge of the prescribed texts and good knowledge of Roman society. There were very few rubric errors and omissions this year. Most candidates completed all questions within the allocated time. As in previous years, misspellings of common names such as 'Domitian' and 'Aria' and technical terms such as 'satarists' were evident.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1 (a)

This was the more popular of the commentary questions. Most candidates were able to list accurately the basic rights of freedmen, although some candidates also provided unnecessary information on the process of manumission. Most candidates covered both elements of the question, 'allowed' and 'not allowed'. There was, however, some confusion amongst candidates over the differing rights for those freedmen who had been formally manumitted and those who had not.

1(b)

Many candidates made good use of the passage, using a range of accurate and relevant quotation. Analysis was, for the most part, well focussed on Ganymedes' misery. However, analysis of the specific *language* features used by Petronius was also required for the highest level of performance. Some candidates merely provided a commentary of the general meaning of the content. A few candidates still just paraphrased the passage in general terms and therefore limited their marks. Some quotes were not well chosen. There was some confusion over the significance of Safinius in the passage with some candidates incorrectly interpreting him as part of the problem rather than an example of the 'good old days'. A very few candidates did not link their answer closely to the passage and provided few, if any, quotations from it.

1(c)

This question required candidates to assess the 'success' of *Dinner with Trimalchio* when Trimalchio was present. The interpretation of 'success' was broad, and included humorous, satirical and the lampooning of Nero. Many made good links with the purpose of the work. Some interpreted the reverse (unsuccessful) as when the dinner party went wrong (falling acrobats, disagreements etc). Some arguments were rather *ad hoc* and in fact contradicted themselves at times; some candidates took 'success' for granted entirely and did not attempt to explain or define it, simply listing what happened at the dinner party without analysis of *why* these events made *Dinner with Trimalchio* successful. The question also required candidates to comment on the passage 'as a starting point' to their response. Some candidates ignored this instruction and therefore limited both A01 and A02 marks. Likewise, the wording 'explain how far do you agree' required a counter argument which was lacking from some answers, again limiting marks.

2(a)

Only a small number of candidates were able to provide enough information on the 'origins of Roman satire' to score highly. Centres are reminded that the 'origins of Roman satire' is a stated requirement on the specification.

2(b)

Although most candidates made good use of the passage, using a range of accurate and relevant quotation, weaker responses simply provided a list of Juvenal's targets. Rhetorical questions were rather taken for granted and commented upon generally rather than in reference to the language used. Analysis of the specific *language* features used by Juvenal was required for the highest level of performance. Very few candidates did not link their answer closely to the passage and provided few, if any, quotations from it.

2(c)

Many responses merely assumed that Juvenal was 'useful' and did provide reliable information on Roman Society, simply listing what Juvenal tells us about Rome. Candidates had to define 'useful' to score highly, and sustain their line of argument. Some used other writers such as Pliny and Petronius to corroborate Juvenal's evidence, but this led in some cases to the focus being taken away from Juvenal as the main target of the question. Better responses provided a counter-argument describing the limits placed on the information as a result of Juvenal's purpose in writing and his particular style. The question also required candidates to comment on the passage 'as a starting point' to their response. Some candidates ignored this instruction and therefore limited their marks. Likewise, the wording 'how far do you agree' required a counterargument which was lacking from some answers, again limiting marks.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

This question was the least popular of the three options. Most candidates agreed that Pliny gave a perfect view of himself but not of his society. Many candidates displayed excellent and detailed knowledge of the letters but some merely paraphrased them. Discussion of both elements of the question (Pliny AND his society) were required for a top score; some candidates ignored the society element of the question.

4

This was a popular question. Most found Juvenal to hate Rome more based on the bitterness of his content and the frequency with which he attacked Rome. The question focus for Horace was sometimes lacking, as candidates wrote generally about Horace's philosophical beliefs while not linking it to "Rome". Some candidates used a line of argument in which Horace attacks the people of Rome rather than Rome itself and this was acceptable. Some made good points about Horace exhibiting his dislike by not living there, while Juvenal ranted about Rome but did not move to the country. The fact that Horace had a wealthy patron who provided him with the opportunity to live away from Rome was seen as important. The gentler style of Horace was contrasted successfully with the ranting style of Juvenal in reaching a decision on who hated Rome the most.

5

This was also a popular question. AO1 marks were available by providing both evidence from the texts and knowledge of the rights of both women and slaves. A high number of candidates used all three writers effectively as evidence to support their analysis. Some candidates incorrectly used Pliny's attitude and behaviour towards Zosimus the freeman as evidence of how slaves were treated. A few candidates ignored the instruction to refer to the works of at least two authors and used only knowledge of Roman Society to support their views. This approach limited their marks as the question instructions required both.

F384 Greek Tragedy in its Context

General Comments:

Greek Tragedy once again proved popular with a large number of candidates. As in previous years, the enjoyment and appreciation of the plays by the students was obvious through their answers. The candidates engaged with the plays and provided a large amount of personal opinion on the plays studied, with all the questions producing widely differing ideas and evaluation. All the candidates found something to say about the plays they chose for their answers.

There were the usual issues of spelling which appear every year 'Euripedes', lots of variations on Iphigeneia, and even 'Media' made an appearance. Many answers referred to Medea appearing on the '*deus ex machina*'.

The commentary questions were generally well-answered, with only a few answers dealing with events before the section mentioned in the question, or going beyond the passage. Essay questions revealed a good knowledge of the texts of the plays, and the information given was, for the most part, fully relevant to the answers given. There was, however, some confusion between *Agamemnon* and *Electra* with evidence from one play being used in the other. Some candidates even considered the two plays to be part of a trilogy.

There were no rubric errors recorded, although it is a shame that the vast majority of candidates ignored the instruction to start each answer on a fresh page. This made life more difficult for the assessors, especially where additions were crammed in or had to be placed at the end of the booklet or additional pages, leading to a lot of jumping to and fro during the assessment.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

Most candidates knew the main elements of the events from the entry of Teiresias, especially Creon going to free Antigone and the suicide of Haemon. Many described what happened as a story, without mentioning the messenger's role. Fuller answers gave details of the omens described by Teiresias and the argument with Creon, and a detailed account of Haemon's suicide. A lot of candidates placed Eurydice's suicide before the passage, rather than her simply going into the palace.

1(b)

Candidates were able to draw upon the passage, and extract references and quotations which they used to analyse how Sophocles made the audience feel sympathy for Creon. These included not only the language used, but Creon's realisation of the effects of his actions, and the reactions of the messenger and Chorus Leader. However, a large number of answers did not mention the situation on stage – better answers not only discussed the bodies being present, but also the effect they had.

1(c)

Most candidates produced arguments which included some balance, looking at both how Creon contributed to his own suffering, and other factors such as the situation in Thebes and the behaviour of other people. Better answers referred to the whole play, but many candidates simply discussed events in the play without any reference to the passage. There was a lot of

sympathy and understanding of Creon's plight, finding himself as king of Thebes and trying his best for the state. There was also mention of factors beyond his control – all the deaths were suicides, thus the decision of those who died, not his. However, a lot of answers considered his stubborn streak and refusal to listen to advice, which is borne out by his words, and those of others, in the passage. Better answers considered both aspects.

2(a)

Most candidates knew of the main events from the arrival of the messenger to the start of the passage, including the description of the deaths of Glauce and Creon in varying detail. There were, however, a large number of candidates who believed that Medea's internal debate over killing her sons occurred after the arrival of the Messenger, rather than before. Medea's appearance received a variety of descriptions, from being in the chariot to being in the *skene* to being on the ground with the bodies.

2(b)

There were many good analyses of the language used in the passage and the linguistic techniques used by Euripides. Candidates were able to quote from the passage with examples of insults, questions and the use of *stichomythia*, without always being able to explain why the chosen examples made the passage dramatically effective. However, just like 1(b), many answers did not deal with the situation on stage, even if the answer to 2(a) had mentioned the dragon chariot and dead bodies.

2(c)

Candidates were able to analyse Medea's behaviour throughout the play to assess how far they agreed with the statement. Most candidates took the quotation and addressed it as a whole, although better candidates looked at the two elements of the quotation separately, discussing how cold-hearted Medea was, and then how scheming. Candidates not only looked at the play, but also the background details of the murders of Apsyrtus and Pelias. Many concluded that she was scheming, but not cold-hearted, but did not always give evidence from the text. Those that did referenced her manipulation of Creon, Jason and Aegeus as examples of her scheming, and her emotional outburst at the beginning of the play, as well as her love for her children to back their claim that she was not simply cold-hearted. Once again, like 1(c), answers which discussed the passage were in the minority.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

This was the most popular essay. Virtually all candidates were able to discuss some reasons which led to Agamemnon's death, and whether these were valid reasons for him dying. Many candidates, as well as considering arrogance as the ancient concept of *hybris*, also looked at Agamemnon's attitude to his wife as an example of his arrogance. Better answers looked at his arrogance and whether he deserved to die as separate issues. There were a number of answers which considered that he did deserve to die as he broke his marriage vows to Clytaemnestra by sleeping with Cassandra. Many candidates also included Sophocles' version of the story in which Agamemnon killed one of Artemis' deer, which led to her demanding the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, rather than the eagles and hare omen.

4

Candidates considered a range of characters, analysing how they behaved in the play. Almost everyone disagreed with the quotation because of the portrayal of the Peasant, universally declared to be both likeable and admirable. Another character most candidates liked was the Old Man for his loyalty to the House of Atreus. Virtually every character was found to have some traits which could be liked or admired, although for the most part these were submerged in negative traits. Electra was admired for her love of her father, but her self-pitying attitude and

bloodthirsty nature negated this opinion. With Orestes likewise, his return to avenge his father was balanced by the way he did it. Many candidates admired his reluctance to kill his mother, but despised his weakness in giving in to Electra. A number of answers dealing with Clytemnestra and Aegisthus discussed their portrayal in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, not Euripides' *Electra*. Those that did noted how their portrayal in the play went against the norm of their traditional reputation.

5

This was the least popular essay. Most candidates who tackled it decided to discuss all four plays with a range of detail. There were some good answers which mixed the intervention of the gods, whether direct or indirect, with human fallibility. The killing of Artemis' deer in *Agamemnon* made an appearance in quite a few answers, causing the argument to be less valid. *Agamemnon* was cited as the play with the most divine intervention, *Medea* the play with the least. Better answers considered the indirect influence of the gods in plays such as *Antigone*, but surprisingly few candidates remembered that Orestes only returned to avenge his father because of Apollo's oracle, and the comments of Castor at the end of *Electra*. A range of candidates did feel that although gods can influence what happens, ultimately all the suffering within the plays was caused by decisions made by mortals, who had free will in the choices they made.

F385 Greek Historians

General Comments:

Candidates generally had a sound grasp of the details of all three historians' work. Commentary Question 1 proved to be the more popular, but there was not much difference, while of the essays, Question 3 was answered by a large majority of candidates; few attempted Question 5. Spelling and legibility were more of an issue this year, not helped by the fact that virtually all candidates did not follow the instruction to start each answer on a new page. A number of candidates answered the commentary question in reverse order, which sometimes led to them not considering a full range of factors in the (b) questions.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

There were some good answers to this question, giving precise details of the Greek preparations, but many candidates only mentioned general details such as forming alliances and Athens' creation of a navy. Some even went back as far as describing the events leading up to the Battle of Marathon, which was not relevant to the question.

1(b)

Candidates were able to pick out features of Herodotus' writing style from the passage, with relevant examples. These included his personalising of Callias and Artaxerxes, the use of direct conversation about which he could have known nothing, and his comments on his sources. However, candidates were not always able to find parallel examples from the rest of the text. A number of candidates, especially some who had done part (c) first, concentrated on the sources to the exclusion of other features. Better answers also mentioned features seen elsewhere (e.g. in the battle scenes) which are not found in the passage, such as the supernatural.

1(c)

Candidates were generally able to use the several references in the passage to where Herodotus claims he got his information, and were able to make sound comments about what Herodotus says, and how reliable this makes his stories. Candidates also referred to other parts of the text, such as the meeting between Croesus and Solon and the Persian debate over attacking Greece as examples of how Herodotus recorded history. Several did discuss the idea of the work being an 'Inquiry' rather than a history, and the extent of Herodotus' travels and ethnographic writings. Only a few candidates mentioned the written and physical records to which Herodotus had access.

2(a)

Although slightly less popular than Question 1, there were still a good number of answers. Most candidates were aware of the internal conflict within Epidamnus, and the subsequent conflict between Corcyra and Corinth and their attempts to woo the Athenians. However, there was a great deal of confusion over the precise relationship between Epidamnus, Corcyra and Corinth

2(b)

Candidates were generally able to pick out certain features of Thucydides' style from the passage. Most answers concentrated on the military aspects of the passage, giving details of the technical language used. A number of candidates found an either a pro or an anti-Athenian bias in the passage, and were able to argue their case effectively for both points of view. However,

fewer candidates were able to use typical features of Thucydides' work (speeches, dating) not found in the passage.

2(c)

Most candidates were able to draw upon the passage to find examples of Thucydides' meticulous attention to detail in describing military conflict. Virtually all answers mentioned his role as a *strategos* in the Athenian forces. Better answers drew upon other battles in the work, such as the siege of Plataea or Phormio's campaigns. A number of candidates used his analysis of the causes of the Peloponnesian War as part of their answer, a perfectly acceptable approach to the question. However, a number of answers became sidetracked into whether Thucydides was a good historian in general, citing his speeches, pro-Periclean bias and even the plague as evidence for their argument without making it specifically relevant to him being an excellent military historian.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

This was overwhelmingly the most popular essay question. Virtually all the candidates were able to provide details of supernatural events recorded by Herodotus. These included a range of oracles, prophecies and omens, with many mentioning Hippias' dream and tooth loss, and the Croesus story, especially the storm which put out the pyre. Most candidates only considered the effect of superstition on Herodotus as an historian, without considering any other aspects of his work. There were answers which looked at his description of battles such as Marathon and Thermopylae, as well as his ethnographic details to state that he does have merit as an historian, although exaggeration of numbers and pro-Greek bias do cause issues. Some candidates argued that his use of superstition makes Herodotus a good social historian shedding light on the beliefs and attitudes of the time.

4

Although not answered by many candidates, this question did produce some good answers. Candidates showed a familiarity with both biographies, although they did not always use precise detail as evidence to back up their argument. Most candidates disagreed with the quotation, citing his own use of sources, and the details he gives of the involvement of his subjects in the events during their lifetimes. Some answers effectively used comparisons drawn from Herodotus and Thucydides to state that in certain cases Plutarch is a better source (e.g. the Megarian Decree) than the earlier historians.

5

Not many candidates attempted this question, and those that did generally found it hard to give precise details as evidence for their argument. Some did not refer to all three authors in their answer, or were unbalanced in their approach, dealing in detail with one or two authors, and ignoring or skipping over the others. Those that answered this question went for Plutarch or Herodotus as their choice – Thucydides barely got a look in.

F386 City Life in Roman Italy

General:

Candidates who entered for this unit communicated an enjoyment for their studies and more often than not, a clear understanding of what life was like in cities of Roman Italy. Sadly, there was an increase in rubric errors where candidates chose to mix together parts of both Q1 and Q2. Candidates are advised to read the question paper through very carefully and then answer all of Q1 or all of Q2. Section B should also be read carefully including all bullet points so that candidates are aware of the responses required and to select relevant details to support their argument.

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

There was a range of responses. At the lower end of the range, responses were very general confining detail to that of any standard set of baths including discussion of the palaestra which is not present in the Suburban Baths at Herculaneum. Finer responses offered detail on the decorative marble and stuccoes and commented on the light from the windows and skylights.

1(b)

The principal focus was on the House of the Stags/Deer and candidates who steered away from this to discuss the House of Menander or of Octavius Quartio could not reach high levels. On the whole though the house was well known especially when suggesting that the atrium did not follow Vitruvius' recommendation for men of status. Candidates were able to link successfully details from the passage to their argument. On the whole candidates felt that the House of the Stags/Deer would be suitable as a holiday retreat but not a main residence.

1(c)

Candidates understood fully 'the many generousities' of individuals like Balbus. Credit was given to those who referred to the Emperors as individuals and also as the government in discussion of Ostia. Details of the sponsors of the amphitheatre at Pompeii and the Forum Baths in Ostia were pleasing to see. Perhaps what was more often lacking was any counter argument. Candidates either agreed or did not agree with the statement. The most perceptive responses suggested that whereas cities of Roman Italy did benefit from philanthropy, the individuals possibly gained more success as a result.

2(a)

In parallel with Q1(a), at the lower end of the range, responses were very general confining detail to that of any standard Pompeian atrium-style house. A few responses were based only on the plan provided. Most responses did mention the advertising mosaics of amphorae in support of general discussions of an atrium. Better responses offered detail beyond the plan.

2(b)

Candidates appreciated that the House of Umbricius Scaurus was in an excellent location for his business, but felt that the overall impression to a visitor would be 'tacky' due to his 'shameless self-promotion'. Nearly all candidates agreed that the Houses of Menander and Octavius Quartio were much more sophisticated and were able to offer appropriate supporting detail.

2(c)

The term 'well-planned' was interpreted in several ways. Some ignored the prompt in the question. Less successful responses concentrated solely on the layout of individual houses. The best discussed the old part of the town and the grid-like expansion which occurred later. Quite a few responses felt that the amphitheatre was best placed in the north/south/east/west to avoid the smell and to keep the damage from rioting to a minimum.

Section B: Essay Questions

There was a good balance of responses to all three questions.

Question No.

3

This was a popular question. The most common approach was to divide the response into two halves - religion and bathing. Better responses extended the range of references to private religion and tied the two halves together with discussion of the Baths of Mithras, where religion and bathing existed together, or the Forum Baths, Ostia and the shrines within.

4

Some very fine responses showed clear understanding of the social position of both men and women in cities of Roman Italy. Most candidates discussed Eumachia and Naevoleia Tyche, though a few restricted their response to just these women. Consideration of both sides of the argument was required for a thorough response.

5

As with Q4, consideration of both sides of the argument was required from the most successful responses. Several responses used only evidenced from their own knowledge (carbonised bread and plaster casts). Though this evidence was given credit, some discussion of the prescribed material was expected. The most perceptive responses considered the word 'only' and in the counterargument offered a range of literary evidence and evaluated inscriptions.

F387 Roman Britain: Life in the Outpost of the Empire

General Comments:

Examiners felt that there were many more fine scripts and far fewer weaker ones this year when compared to scripts from 2015. The performance at both ends of the grade range showed improvement. There is still a tendency, however, to argue from a very generalised basis rather than the specifics of particular sites, artefacts and inscriptions. Examiners noticed an increase in the amount of inaccurate examples employed by candidates in their answers.

An increasing number of candidates chose to start by answering the essay question. For some this proved to be a good tactic, but for others who did not keep track of time this often meant that they did not have sufficient time to do justice to the commentary question. There were quite a few examples of unfinished scripts or ones with a very short last questions. Most often these were candidates who started with the essay. It was felt that candidates could use planning to good effect to overcome timing issues and issues of logical argument. Candidates also ignored the instruction to start each question on a new page of the answer booklet.

Whilst the quality of written communication seemed very much the same as in previous years, the quality of handwriting seemed to have deteriorated and this meant that many scripts took a considerable time to decipher. Many wrote at great length which meant additional booklets and answer sheets. It was sometimes difficult to follow answers which had additions scattered throughout the script.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

The question on why Romans built roads was the most popular question on the paper. The level of responses varied tremendously from those who used the map with care to those who completely ignored the map. Those who chose the latter approach described in very general terms why the Romans built roads and did not refer to a single named road or any specific piece of evidence. Better answers referred closely to the map and could come up with a range of reasons for the Romans' road building programme. Many candidates seemed unaware that the primary reason for building roads was a military one.

1(b)

There was a variety of approaches taken to this question on whether the road system made 'very little different to the people of the province, both military and civilian'. It did not matter whether candidates agreed or disagreed with the view, provided the response was well-argued and supported with contextual knowledge and appropriate, specific detailed examples. Some candidates did not deal with both the military and civilian aspect of the question, which limited both AO1 and AO2 marks for their answers. Better responses could offer a wealth of detail about particular roads, and other relevant evidence such as the Vindolanda tablets and milestones.

2(a)

The inscription question was significantly less popular than last year's equivalent. The question was either very well answered or very poorly answered. Some candidates struggled to balance the use of the maps with the use of the inscriptions. Most were able to comment competently on the maps, but not many dealt effectively with the 'how useful' part of the question or commented on what the maps did not show, i.e. before the 3rd century. There was a good deal of interesting comment on the inscriptions, but it was not always linked closely enough to the question of how the Romans governed Britain.

2(b)

The question allowed for a number of different approaches, all of which were valid. As with Question 1(b) it did not matter whether candidates agreed or disagreed with the view, provided the response was well-argued and supported with contextual knowledge and appropriate, specific detailed examples. Most candidates argued that, whilst the Romans did look after their own interests, they were also keen to promote the benefits of being part of the Roman Empire, citing Tacitus as evidence. Examples tended to focus on the promotion of towns, roads, trade and the building of villas and amenities such as bath complexes, theatres, amphitheatres and temples. Few mentioned stable government, Roman law or the *Pax Romana* as benefits of Roman rule.

Section B: Essay Questions

There was a much closer balance between the numbers answering the two essay questions, with slightly more favouring Question 4 on art in Roman Britain.

Question No.

3

Most candidates were well-prepared for a question on the economy of Roman Britain. Relatively few, however, were able to tailor their knowledge to the question of the extent of the contribution of the Roman army to the growth of the economy in Roman Britain. Some candidates decided within the first sentence that the army had no effect at all on the economy and wrote about other issues. Some repeated verbatim material from Question 1(a) or 1(b) or simply referred the examiner to a page earlier in their answer book. Candidates need to handle material with care and mould their information and examples to answer the question posed. The best answers recognised that the Roman army acted as a stimulus to the economy in Britain and that later in the history of the province there were other factors which became more important.

4

The question of the extent to which artistic styles in Roman Britain were completely dominated by Roman culture proved a very familiar topic for most candidates. Candidates could describe in detail many pieces of artwork from the province. Better examples were able to assess the extent to which they were truly Roman or Romano-British – this determined the level of the AO2 mark. Knowledge of what constituted Celtic art or Celtic influence was much more limited. Candidates were so familiar with the artwork set out in the specification that examiners were a little disappointed with the level of argument offered by some of the responses; AO1 marks tended to be much higher than the AO2 marks.

F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World

General Comments:

Greek Art once again proved a popular topic with a substantial number of the candidature studying this unit. For the most part, candidates' knowledge of the specified material is impressive, as is their engagement and appreciation. At the top end, candidates displayed insight and originality in their approach to the material and the questions. Differentiation was achieved through the quality of the argument and the fine supporting detail, especially where candidates were able to offer a counterargument. Sometimes material was rather less deftly handled and in some cases there were instances of misidentification of particular statues and sculptors, and pots and painters. As is often the case on this unit, virtually the whole mark range (0-97) was used.

Examiners noted many more rubric errors this year, mostly focussed on Question 1(a), Question 1(b) and Question 4. Candidates should be encouraged to read questions very carefully and to take note of the key words and topic covered in a particular question. There were also more incomplete scripts or scripts with very thin answers at the end of the examination. With a two-hour slot, candidates should have enough time to answer the required number of questions, if the timing is adhered to and some planning has taken place. Candidates seem to under-estimate the value of planning their responses. Most candidates did not start the answer to each question on a new page, despite the instruction on the front of the examination paper and the reminder at the start of Section B. Many candidates wrote enthusiastically and at great length which meant quite a large number of additional booklets and answer sheets. It was sometimes difficult to follow answers which had additions or afterthoughts scattered throughout the script.

Legibility and quality of written communication seemed a little better this year. There were no truly illegible scripts. Candidates communicated their ideas effectively, although their use of descriptive and/or critical vocabulary was, in some cases, limited. The misspelling of technical terms included the usual suspects [symmetry, repetition, drapery, kouros, korai, Parthenon, Erechtheion, contrapposto], but there was much evidence of some new favourites this year, particularly with reference to sculptors and statues: Praxytiles, Polykleiteles, Approximenos and Dorydoumenos. Often candidates used 'sculptor' and 'sculpture' interchangeably and this led to some confusion in the quality and logic of their arguments.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

Vase-painting continues to be the most popular medium of art for candidates studying this unit, with over 81% of candidates attempting this question. The question was well-answered on the whole, with only a small number not able to place the scene, or the characters, even with the information given. A not insignificant number of candidates chose to answer this question on Pot A rather than Pot B. The placement of the question below the illustration it was referring to, and the emboldening of Pot B in the question, was designed to help candidates avoid making this mistake.

The best responses took care to relate the *Odyssey* content to the detail of the composition and the draftsmanship. Some particularly thoughtful comments and personal responses were offered on the inclusion of Hermes and the arrangement of figures that included the sacrificial rams (Odysseus surrounded by symbols of death and Elpenor separated from Odysseus by death).

Other answers tended towards a general critical appreciation of the scene, thus making the issues of whether the scene was ‘moving’ and/or ‘serious’ implicit rather than explicit.

It was pleasing to note that many were aware of the work of Polygnotus, the wall painter, and his influence on the work of painters such as the Lykaon Painter.

The spelling of Elpenor was frequently incorrect and sometimes he was identified as a range of characters from other units, e.g. Euripides, Eurycleia, Eurydice and Exekias. As always a small number of candidates answered the question purely from observation of the picture printed rather than bringing in their own knowledge of the pot. Examiners were surprised by the number of candidates who found the scene a purely comic one in the manner of some of the Pan Painter’s work. It was apparent that a few candidates still think of red-figure as white-figure (presumably they have not seen colour images of the pots) and that many are convinced that the detail is incised rather than painted on with varying concentrations of slip with brushes of different sizes.

1(b)

This question elicited many strong responses both in favour and against the quotation. The best responses referred not only to the pieces pictured on the paper, as instructed, but also to a range of relevant, and sometimes irrelevant, examples. The candidates really engaged with the pots and provided a good deal of personal opinion on the scenes in relation to the quotation. All the candidates found something interesting to say about the pots they chose to illustrate their arguments. The best answers started by identifying a number of different emotions in the selected scenes and explaining how the painter depicted them. Only the very best answers attempted to define standards by which mastery could be judged. Some candidates took ‘range’ to be in one pot, whilst others sought ‘range’ in across the whole period. Some were able to distinguish between emotion portrayed through facial expression and emotion evoked from audience through pose. A large number of candidates could find no emotion at all in the work of the Chicago Painter or the Pan Painter. A significant number of answers used pots which were from the 6th century, for instance the Herakles and the Amazons and the Three Men Carousing pots. The latter pot was used to support the argument that scenes were more often comical than serious, but examiners were unconvinced by the arguments.

2(a)

Though clearly lacking in popularity when compared to Question 1, this year’s architecture question elicited a significant number of responses when compared to a similar question on the 2015 paper. This wording of the quotation was deliberately polarised to help candidates construct a balanced response and most candidates attempted to tackle the description head on in their responses. Very often the quality of the argument surpassed the quality of the factual content – indeed, there was much ‘faction’ in the responses to this question, e.g. Periclean marble, the number of columns and metopes, the location and content of the continuous frieze, the extent of the combination of the orders and even the appearance of the first Corinthian columns. Whilst some reference to the sculptural decoration of the temple was desirable, the focus of the question was on the architecture of the Parthenon. Candidates who spent too much time describing the sculptural detail tended to limit both their AO1 and AO2 marks for this question.

2(b)

The question on the Periclean building programme triggered some lively and thought-provoking discussion which examiners thoroughly enjoyed reading. With this question it was clear that candidates felt able to express different opinions, whereas with other questions they seemed to feel that they had to agree with the statement expressed in the quotation, no matter what evidence they had presented *en route*. Knowledge of the period and context was reasonably sound in most cases and familiarity with handling textual sources seemed good. The responses generally yielded a good standard of argument, supported by a greater or lesser amount of supporting evidence. Some referred to the Parthenon alone, others to the Acropolis as a whole and a few to the Hephaestion and the environs of the Acropolis. A common mistake was to offer

standard descriptions of the Parthenon and other buildings on the Acropolis. A handful of candidates used Acropolis and Parthenon interchangeably.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

As the most popular question on the paper, this question elicited a wide variety of responses. Virtually all of these responses were characterised by sound knowledge of the salient features of Greek free-standing sculpture, though accurate dating and chronology still proved to be something of a challenge for some candidates. The essays which tackled the question by theme and considered the words 'bold' and 'innovative' separately were the ones which often stood out for examiners, as did those which did not write off Archaic statues as merely 'copying Egyptian' statues. The very best answers offered pleasing definitions of being bold – ranging from working to the limit of your capacity and/or materials and/or audience expectation and/or sculptural function, with strong supporting evidence. There was, however, a slight tendency towards name-checking statues in relation to general comments without providing any specific detail as a link. Weaker answers were usually those which became a survey of the evolution of Greek sculpture rather than a consideration of what might be thought of as revolutionary. It was sometimes difficult for examiners to identify which statues were being discussed because of non-standard names being used, a lack of detail and some misidentification. For example, one candidate referred to the 'Athena of Knidos' – it was only much later in the essay that it became clear that the statue was the Aphrodite of the Agora; in another case 'Athena of the Agora' was in fact Hestia Giustiniani.

4

Not only was this question on architectural sculpture the least popular on the paper (attempted only by 6% of candidates), but it was also the least well-answered of all the questions. Candidates frequently did not read the question with sufficient care. A significant number of the answers either combined Question 3 and Question 4 or turned their answer into Question 3 part way through the essay. Others were unable to identify adequate relevant material which depicts gods and goddesses. Some of the examples offered were the Centauromachy *metopes* from the Parthenon and Medusa and her children from the pediment on the temple of Artemis at Corcyra. There were also a few candidates who struggled to distinguish between scenes found on *metopes*, *friezes* and *pediments* and those found on pots.

F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World

Section 1: General Comments:

This was the first year in which Aristophanes' *Clouds* and Plautus' *The Brothers Menaechmus* were specified. Questions 2(b), 3 and 4 were therefore designed to enable candidates who were re-sitting to find a pathway through the paper. The majority of candidates had studied the correct plays and seemed to have enjoyed them. All four questions received a healthy number of responses, with Q1 & Q2 receiving an almost equal number of responses and Q4 only marginally fewer than Q3. Allocation of time seemed less of a problem this year: very few candidates gave the impression of having had to curtail or interrupt their final responses. There was often evidence of careful thought and personal engagement with the material.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

These two commentary questions enabled candidates to show their knowledge and understanding of one or two aspects of the plays or of the authors' respective techniques. Successful responses demonstrate such knowledge and understanding by clear reference to the contents of the stimulus passage and material from elsewhere in relevant plays.

Question No.

1 (a)

'Using the passage as a starting point' is a prompt to candidates to refer both to the passage and to other parts of the play. Utterances by the Magistrate and Lysistrata in the passage could be supplemented by references to any appropriate material from elsewhere. Most candidates commented sensibly on the differing views about war and politics expressed in the passage, though some needed to consolidate their understanding of the wool/fleece analogy. From elsewhere in the play, most used other parts of the *agon*, the Reconciliation scene and the opening. A few cited the information about religious ritual mentioned by the Female Chorus. Strong responses were characterised by accurate reference to the passage, clearly-specified examples from elsewhere in the play and a logical conclusion arising from the discussion. Very thoughtful responses unpacked the question, discussing 'War' and 'Politics' as two separate concepts.

1(b)

Stronger responses identified in an opening paragraph what they regarded as the serious messages in each play and the criteria by which 'effectiveness' would be judged. There was no one 'right' answer. Good responses concentrated on looking at how the 'message' was delivered and what the effect would be on an audience. They used the terms *agon* and *parabasis* correctly and were able to summarise the main points made. There were some good assessments of whether humour supported or undermined the serious message(s). Some candidates made good use of supplementary reading about Socrates, in particular the reference to *Clouds* in the context of his trial, to supplement an already competent response. Candidates who simply argued that one play was more serious than the other because its theme was intrinsically more important would have benefited from considering the wording of the question. The question of whether Aristophanes had a feminist agenda in *Lysistrata* can be a legitimate matter for discussion, but not to the detriment of demonstrating knowledge of the play and understanding of the late 5th century Athenian context.

2(a)

Most could comment sensibly on Philocomasium's portrayal in the passage but were less clear about the rest of the play. Stronger responses covered a range of material, including the information gained from Palaestrio's prologue and her behaviour when leaving Pyrgopolynices. Other candidates would have benefited from knowing when she was or was not acting the role of 'Honoría'.

2(b)

The key phrase in the question was 'to the plots'. Stronger responses were able to discuss the difference between deliberate deception (*Swaggering Soldier*) and genuine confusion over identity (*Brothers Menaechmus*) and how that contributed to the overall structure and unity of action of the play. One or two made the additional very subtle point that Pyrgopolynices (*Swaggering Soldier*) was mistaken about his own identity in the sense that he didn't really understand his own character, and part of the plot was his journey to self-knowledge. There was scope to discuss *Pseudolus* in this question, had it been necessary. Many weaker responses discussed only what mistaken identity contributed to the humour of the play, or the extent to which disbelief had to be suspended if the play was to be enjoyed. Those who simply narrated key events of the plays found it difficult to make effective comparisons.

Section B: Essay Questions

The number of plays to be considered was deliberately left open. Both were very open questions and it would have been perfectly possible to gain full marks by discussing a suitable quantity of evidence from one play by each author. Most candidates discussed two plays by each author; appropriate discussion of any other plays by either Aristophanes or Plautus was credited, as was other relevant contextual knowledge.

Question No.

3

This question required more than just how easy it was to find the jokes, scenes, plots or characters funny. The strongest responses looked at the word 'appreciate' from a wide range of angles, and also took into account the term 'performance.' Good comments were made about what could be regarded as universally-understandable notions – opposition to war, family relationships and trendy educational ideas were often cited, as was the conflict between science and religion. Some candidates had clearly experienced modern performances of one or more of the plays. Many were familiar with similar themes in more modern satire, drama or television comedy, and were able to use them to illuminate the discussion; this worked best when linked closely to hard evidence from the plays. Some were so eager to demonstrate their wider reading of modern criticism that they forgot to refer to the plays themselves.

4

It was deliberately left to candidates to decide on their approach to this question. There were several possible approaches and examiners looked for more than just 'which author used a larger number of stereotypical characters'. Some arguments were based on societal norms in the ancient world and the extent to which presentation of characters goes against those norms – e.g. *Lysistrata* as going against the expected norms for women in Athens or *Palaestrio* against what would be expected of slaves. These exhibited a good knowledge of context as well as content. Many strong responses considered the contrast between the 'real' and the 'stage' representation of Socrates and the difference between Socrates and the Sophists, some showing impressive background knowledge. The majority discussed the function of stock characters and stereotypical representations in drama in relation to audience expectations, with some showing awareness of standard masks in Roman comedy. Stronger responses often distinguished between 'stock character' and 'stereotype' and discussed the extent to which a 'stock character' is represented as not entirely consistent with the expected stereotype for that stock character – e.g. whether Pleusicles is the stock 'wet young man' of Roman comedy or Messenio the stock 'clever slave'. There was some misunderstanding of the presentation of Lampito in *Lysistrata*, with many candidates unaware of the Athenian view of Spartans. Candidates would also benefit from understanding the distinction between a Roman Comedy 'Parasite' (*Artotrogus/Peniculus*) and slaves.

F390 Virgil and the World of the Hero

General Comments:

F390 remains the most popular choice of A2 units on the Classical Civilisation specification. For the most part, the knowledge of the candidates is impressive and their engagement with the topic manifest. Some of the scripts are a privilege to mark, especially those whose insight and originality of thought have space in which to come to the fore. The most popular combination of question was 1 and 3, although it was pleasing to see that more candidates attempted question 2. Rubric errors were very few, unsurprising given the length of time this specification has run, and timing seldom posed a problem.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Commentary Questions

Question No.

1(a)

A surprising number of candidates only wrote about the passage. Perhaps this was due to a lack of revision, but candidates should be aware that the passage is a springboard to use before launching into discussion of the other relevant books of the epic. Generally, the entirety of the passage was well discussed. Most saw Diana as the goddess of the hunt, though few saw her as the chaste goddess and so lost opportunities to extend the discussion. It was especially rewarding to note how many candidates were able to make reference to both the Carthaginian wars and Cleopatra and consider the question from an Augustan perspective. Those inclined to be more sympathetic to her end showed good command of the text itself when they considered Dido's curse as not being only on Aeneas himself but upon his descendants and therefore on Rome. Thus they concluded that Romans would have strongly disapproved of her. Some answers would have benefitted from possessing a more detailed knowledge of the relevant parts of Books 1, 4 and 6 and consideration of what had happened to Dido before she met Aeneas.

1(b)

There was a considerable mixture in the quality of response to this question. Sometimes candidates were hampered by a lack of knowledge of specific examples of Aeneas' leadership. For instance, Book 6 was often entirely overlooked. Most saw Aeneas' inaction on seeing his men as being poor leadership although some responses profitably argued that it was an example of good leadership. There was often good work on the storm, the scouting, and the providing of food. Some very good responses considered Aeneas' leadership in battle especially those which saw this as actually undercutting the bigger task to follow Hector's advice and leave Troy. Not many, however, saw that the apparently good idea to use Greek armour backfired. Most responses focused on the delay with Dido while some saw that he was a good leader for remembering his mission when prompted and paid little attention to the long delay. Candidates who included relevant examples from Books 3 and 5 were credited although their inclusion was not necessary to achieve a Level 5 mark.

2(a)

Responses to this question were generally good and candidates were well versed in tackling this type of question. Use of the whole of the passage was common and more candidates were explaining in much greater depth how their chosen examples were demonstrative of Jupiter's power. There were also many more responses considering the counter argument and the role of Fate in connection with Jupiter's authority. Nearly all candidates considered Jupiter's control over the forces of nature and his grandiose exit. Seldom was the simile at the beginning of the passage discussed.

2(b)

Although there was generally greater consideration of Passage 1 than in previous years, responses still could be general, lacking the necessary depth of detail or analysis of both passages. Most candidates elected not to write comparatively but those who did rose well to the task. Responses considered their involvement with the plot, their interaction with the other deities, their compassion, or lack of it, their authority and the role of Fate. Having got off on a sound comparative foot most continued in a similar fashion and were successful. Weaker responses struggled to recall specific examples of Zeus' and Jupiter's involvement in the epics or failed to address the question directly and just considered the effectiveness of each god in turn without a comparison of each.

Section B: Essay Questions

Question No.

3

A popular choice of essay question but some candidates tended to list when and assess how each hero in the poems suffered or offered self-sacrifice. What was absent in some answers was an explanation of how this suffering and self-sacrifice linked to heroism. Better answers could do this as well as provide examples of where heroism was achieved without suffering and self-sacrifice. The number of responses which tackled this question comparatively was less than in previous years and this compromised their AO2 mark. In many cases, however, this was offset by the volume of the detail included and gained credit under AO1, especially those responses which had broadened the scope of their answer to include other relevant characters in addition to Achilles, Hektor and Aeneas. It was rewarding to see the command of detail in the vast majority of the responses.

4

This question elicited some highly perceptive, subtle and interesting responses which considered both the promotion of moral values and the effect of this upon characterisation. Other responses would have been strengthened by a greater awareness of the moral values which are being promoted in the *Aeneid* and by possessing a more comprehensive command of the epic. General claims about character needed to be supported by evidence from the text. Some responses tended to list all the moral qualities that could be remembered and not to use the epic to illuminate them. Characterisation could, in some cases, be problematic, not only because of assertion lacking evidence, but also in mere listing of all the characters in the epic with limited comment on how character is presented.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

