







F382 Homer's <b>Odyssey</b> and Society	40
F383 Roman Society and Thought	43
F384 Greek Tragedy in its context	45
F385 Greek Historians	48
F386 City Life in Roman Italy	50
F387 Roman Britain: life in the outpost of the Empire	52
F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World	56
F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World	61
F390 Virgil and the world of the hero	64
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042) Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)	
Chief Examiner's Report	66
F391	68
F392	73
F393	79
F394	83

# **Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Latin H039) Advanced GCE Classics: Latin (H439)**

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

This session saw the first full aggregation of the new GCE specification and with it the appearance of A\* grades. Examiners are very satisfied with the outcomes here and believe that the hard work of both teachers and candidates has been well rewarded by the distribution of grades.

Examiners were delighted and relieved to find that candidates were on the whole very well prepared to face the new A2 units. All the questions proved to be well within the grasp of those who had done their preparation thoroughly. It is worth reminding Centres that one of the design principles of these units was to avoid stereotypical and so predictable questions. This means in practice that there will be more variety among questions that are parallel in demand; some will be more open-ended than others, and often candidates will be required to think 'on their feet' during the examination. This is part of the philosophy of 'stretch and challenge'. The evidence shows that open-ended questions do not disadvantage well-prepared candidates.

Centres had evidently learnt from the first round of the AS units last year, and had prepared their candidates to provide the kinds of responses required within the time limits. There are still many candidates, however, who do not make a clear distinction between style and content in the literary analysis questions.

It is clear that many candidates entered the examination with a set of prepared essay-style responses. These candidates must be prepared to modify these prepared responses to fit the questions. Clearly many did not do this. Allied to this is the need to cover the whole prescribed text in essays; again this was a weakness in many scripts.

Examiners report on injudicious handling of Latin quotations. It should be self-evident that, in discussing style, the relevant Latin words and phrases should be quoted. Less obvious but also important is that candidates should show that they understand the Latin they quote, whether by direct translation or by inference. More thought also needs to be given to the purpose of the quoted Latin: the main function of this is to identify stylistic features, which then need to be analysed and evaluated within the context of the episode in which they are used.

Some Centres have expressed uncertainty over whether their candidates should answer the 25-mark A2 analysis questions sequentially or thematically. Both approaches, as in the Examiners report, are equally acceptable in general terms. In practice some questions lend themselves more readily to one approach than the other. In most cases less secure candidates would be advised to answer sequentially. To answer well thematically requires, and therefore shows, greater sophistication, which, if done well, may help to boost the rating given to the answer.

The new mark schemes, applicable to all units, were found to be workable. All Examiners were confident that these schemes generated entirely fair and accurate differentiation among the candidates.

Centres and their candidates are to be congratulated on the breadth and depth of their preparation for these challenging examinations. It is with the greatest pleasure that Examiners have seen these efforts so justifiably rewarded.

## F361 Latin Language

### General Comments

This year's entry showed an increase of more than 360 over last year's, mostly due, of course, to resit candidates. The overall standard was extremely high.

This year between ten and fifteen percent of the entry attempted Question 3, the English-Latin sentences; and even more had a go at it before crossing it out and offering Question 2 instead; a few left it to the Examiner to choose which one to credit. Analysis of the outcomes indicates that the two alternative questions were of comparable demand and generated comparable marks. In other words, candidates did not disadvantage themselves by choosing one or other option.

Many candidates benefited from the policy of awarding 5 marks for a section even if it contained a 'minor' error. There were a good many who finished with full marks for Question 1 despite having made half a dozen or more errors. Some attempt was made this time round to rationalise further the working definition of major and minor errors. In Questions 1 and 2, errors of construction were generally counted as major errors; sensible but wrong guesses at meanings counted as minor, but wildly wrong meanings counted as major. Inflected words could contain up to two minor errors, uninflected words only one. Errors of tense, voice, number and sometimes case counted as minor errors. In Question 3, similar principles applied, but lexical errors (like the frequent invented words) counted only as single minor errors, while construction errors counted as two minor errors.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Question 1

The story-line was followed to the end by almost all candidates. There were many perfect scores. Errors were mainly of a minor nature and largely predictable.

- 1 *imperator Nero per vias urbis saepe ibat*: all candidates translated this correctly, except for a substantial minority who were unaware that Nero was an emperor; downgrading him to the status of a commander was not penalised here because it was not germane to the story.
- 2 *vestem servi gerebat ne cognosceretur*: very few insisted on making *servi* the subject; rather more were puzzled by the idea of 'waging' clothes; the purpose clause was commonly rendered by the indicative, which strictly would turn it into a result clause; however, this error was regarded as relating to English rather than Latin, and so ignored.
- 3 *multos comites secum ducebat, quibus imperaverat ut omnia bona e tabernis raperent*: a good few candidates did not recognise *secum*, often linking it to *sequor*; most insisted on retaining the dative in the English ('to whom he had ordered'); again this was ignored. Nearly half the candidates missed the pluperfect. There are always a few who do not recognise the neuter plural *-a* ending; here they had 'good women' being carried off.
- 4 *et aggrederentur omnes qui resisterent*: nearly all saw the continuing indirect command.
- 5 *cum multos post dies aliquis Neronem agnovisset*: *cum* was occasionally omitted; *aliquis* was often unknown.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

- 6 *omnes cives mox intellegebant quis tot scelera committeret*; the commonest error here (and a very frequent one) was to take the subjunctive as pluperfect; many did not know *tot*.
- 7 *brevi tempore iniuriae adversus viros feminasque insignes augebantur*: this section provided one of the few challenges of the passage, mainly because *adversus* and *insignes* were often unknown; this led to *insignes* being linked to fire or construed with *iniuriae*.
- 8 *homines enim scelesti credebant se sub nomine Neronis scelera similia tuto committere posse*: the great majority handled this complex sentence commendably well. Nearly all errors focused upon the pronoun *se*, which, as in previous years, wreaks havoc among average candidates whenever it appears.
- 9 *civibus per vias noctu ambulantis periculum erat maximum*: the many who took *civibus ambulantis* as an ablative absolute rather than a dative of disadvantage were not penalised. Weaker candidates missed the superlative.
- 10 *ubi Nero et amici senatorem quendam oppugnaverunt*: the only common error here was caused by failure to identify *quendam*.
- 11 *hic, qui propter tenebras Neronem non agnovit, fortiter pugnando diu resistebat*: there was better discrimination here, because of the presence of two pronouns together, which provided average and weaker candidates with an insurmountable obstacle. The other common error was to treat *pugnando* as a participle instead of a gerund.
- 12 *simulac vero vultum Neronis conspexit, statim veniam imperatoris oravit; qui eum necari iussit*: this is a good example of an error, committed by most candidates, not affecting their mark because the rest of the section was immaculate. The error of course was failure to handle the connecting relative correctly. The best candidates started a new sentence with 'He'.
- 13 *deinde Nero turbam militum et gladiatorum sibi iunxit, quos hortatus est ut gladiis contra cives uterentur*: the common error here was once again the pronoun, *sibi*, which was often mistaken for *ipse*.
- 14 *tandem urbs tanta vi oppressa est ut nemo esset qui non de vita desperaret: tanta vi* provided the main difficulty here, with both words insecurely known. Weaker candidates could not grasp the force of *esset*.

## Question 2

Although the story-line was not as strong as that of Question 1, most candidates followed the sense successfully to the end. There were more candidates than last year (though still a small minority) who scored more highly on this question than on Question 1; it is hoped that this reflects a growing familiarity with Cicero's style. There were many who achieved maximum marks.

- 1 *indiciis expositis, o cives, senatum consului quid fieri vellet de re publica*: weaker candidates were quite unable to handle the ablative absolute intelligibly. Only the better candidates construed *consului* correctly, with weaker ones translating it as 'the consul' and destroying the sense of the rest of the sentence in consequence. Examiners accepted 'to become of' but not 'to become about'.
- 2 *acerrimae ac fortissimae sententiae a primis viris dictae sunt, quas senatus sine ulla varietate secutus est*: stronger candidates chose the sensible 'opinions' or 'judgements' for *sententiae*, while weaker ones were satisfied with the unacceptable 'feelings' or

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

'sentences'. Many candidates failed to see that *a viris* was the agent with a passive verb. 'By the first men' was accepted. The pronoun *quas* posed difficulties for many.

- 3 *et quoniam senatus consultum nondum perscriptum est, ex memoria explicabo vobis quid senatus censuerit*: the commonest error here was to take *senatus* as the subject and the verb as active. Many did not know *nondum*. The other frequent error was with *vobis*, which was unknown to many.
- 4 *primum senatores in hoc consulto verbis amplissimis mihi gratias agunt*: weaker candidates made *primum* an adjective. 'Give me words of thanks' was too big a leap from the literal. Most took *agunt* as perfect. Many thought that *verbis* was some sort of dative.
- 5 *quod virtute, consilio, providentia mea, res publica maximis periculis liberata sit*: many had difficulty construing the ablatives, often making them the subject. Fortunately for most candidates, the superlative was ignored in marking because it had already been assessed in Question 1.
- 6 *deinde praetores, quod auxilio eorum usus sim, merito laudantur*: the discriminator here was *usus sim*, which defeated half the candidates, although many of these made reasonable guesses. The many who made *laudantur* past were not penalised if they had already lost the mark for the same error in *agunt* above (consequential error).

### Question 3

The principle of marking here was to allow one error for 6 marks and up to three for 5 marks. Below that the proportion of accuracy was considered. As in the other questions, many candidates achieved maximum marks here.

**(a) When the ambassadors arrived, they encouraged the senators to give them help.**

Many did not know the Latin word for 'ambassadors', and either made one up or used a word they thought might just be close enough. Many used either *cum* with the indicative or *ubi* with the subjunctive. *Hortatus sunt* was the commonest error with this verb. *Ut* was omitted by half the candidates, who were content with a simple infinitive. Both *sibi* and *eis* were acceptable for 'them', because the lack of a context made it ambiguous.

**(b) The senators promised that they would send a legion as quickly as possible.**

Many could not form the perfect of *promitto*. Half failed to realise that 'promised' introduced an indirect statement; *se* was regularly omitted, and few used or tried to use the future infinitive; some of those that did were unfamiliar with the principal parts of the verb. Most knew *quam celerrime*, though half could not spell the superlative form.

**(c) These soldiers marched through Italy to help the allies.**

Few could cope with 'these', most getting the case wrong. Many did not know a word for 'march'. *Per Italia* was not uncommon. Most identified the purpose clause.

**(d) Having attacked the enemy, they fought very bravely for many hours.**

Only the strongest candidates handled the participial phrase correctly; many tried to use *aggressis* (and often could not spell the word). Sensible ones who were uncertain of the rules of the ablative absolute used *postquam* (which is quite acceptable). Many could not spell *fortissime*. Few could make *multi* agree with *horas*.



**(e) If night had not hindered the battle, they would have killed all the men.**

Although *nisi* was hoped for, *si ... non* was not penalised. Few knew the nominative form *nox*. Even fewer knew the principal parts of *impedio*. Only the best both realised the need for, and correctly formed, the two pluperfect subjunctives.

**Conclusions**

In translating from Latin into English, Candidates struggled more noticeably than ever over all types of pronouns. These would form a useful target for revision.

In translating from English into Latin, more attention needs to be paid to correct spelling of words, particularly superlative and perfect forms, where double consonants were often missed. Also many candidates were let down by a poor knowledge of principal parts.

These errors aside, the Examiners offer their congratulations to the candidates for their ability to handle linguistic complexities with impressive skill.

## **F362 Latin Verse and Prose Literature**

### **General Comments**

The Examiners are confident that the questions in this Unit set the candidates tasks of appropriate difficulty. The Examiners also note that Centres and candidates are likely to feel more prepared and familiar with the structure and demands of the questions in this Unit than they might have been last year, when the Unit was set for the first time. They note that most candidates found the Unit very accessible and even congenial. It covers texts which are worth studying and intrinsically valuable, (and many candidates had clearly very much enjoyed their studies) and its questions gave candidates a very good range of opportunities for showing their skill in handling the texts. Some were rewarded with full marks, so a full range of marks was available and used.

A number of candidates, some of them very good indeed, rather tended to 'over-answer' in this Unit. Where they were asked to make four points, some offered five, six or indeed even more. That knowledge will be taken into account, but the Examiners would wish candidates to be aware of the risk of poor time management if they do this over-answering too often. It was not unknown for such candidates to be clearly writing in a hurry on the last question (2 f) and sometimes their answers to this question suffered. That said there were a number of candidates who must have written at breakneck speed who did produce fine answers to the final questions, but the Examiners would not wish Centres and candidates to feel that that breakneck speed was demanded.

Some candidates are also including discussions of style points (not by any means inaccurately) in questions where that discussion is not required. They should note the need to read the question carefully and note whether the instruction is to cover both content and style. Again, lengthy style discussion, where not needed, is likely to affect their time management.

Some candidates also risked their time management by referring to lines outside those asked for in the question. The questions do give not only the line numbers between which the information required should be sought, but the first and last Latin words as well. A few wrote almost exclusively 'beyond the question' in some Ovid questions, and so scored fewer marks than they might have.

The Examiners were often impressed by candidates' detailed recall of the content of the prescribed texts. This informed their answers to all questions, but particularly in the short essay questions, where a broad knowledge of the 'story-line' is very important. Here the Examiners would particularly like Centres and candidates to note that it is vital to include material in these essays which comes from parts of the text other than that printed on the paper. Having answers confined only to the Latin passages on the paper does suggest poor recall of the rest. It is also important that candidates should shape their essays around the question set, rather than simply regurgitate the story, as some did in the Ovid question. The best essays tended to give a sharper focus to discussion points, for example not merely saying that Catiline was accused of having murdered his first wife and son 'to clear his house for a second marriage', but going on to say that the fact that Rome might fall into the hands of a man with those ethical standards indicated the nature of the crisis she faced.

Translation recall was often very fine indeed, though, as the question-specific comments below suggest, sins of omission are still the commonest and most besetting and it is worth remembering that in this Unit translation is of previously studied material; omission is likely to be seen as a serious error. The Examiners were glad to have sensed measurably fewer examples of inaccurate translation across the work of a whole Centre in this session.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Quality of written communication was excellent in many candidates' work. There was however a more noticeable tendency to illegibility, perhaps connected with over-answering and time management. Spelling was sometimes frustrating: Scylla, Minos, Daedalus and Icarus usually produced orthographic orthodoxy, but not so Catiline/Cataline.

The Examiners applaud the kindness of some candidates who were perhaps aware of their poor legibility and took to writing everything on alternate lines. On the other hand, there are still some who do not obey that instruction in presenting their translations.

The Examiners are, as ever, genuinely impressed by the quality of work they have had the privilege of assessing. This suggests that candidates are well prepared to face A2 work and beyond, and that there are many promising Latinists 'out there'. They therefore send their sincere thanks to candidates and to those who have taught them, for the achievements seen in this Unit.

Some points of advice for Centres to inform their candidates:

1. They should note whether the question requires a style comment or not.
2. They should try to focus quotations from the Latin. In a discussion of a vital style point, it is very important to quote the exact Latin word or phrase being discussed, rather than a 'start' word, three dots and an 'end' word.
3. They should observe the number of points asked for in a question and try not to go too much over that number. They need to develop the habit of discussing only a few lines or sentences rather than a whole passage. Granted that 'If in doubt, don't miss it out' makes sense, they should not prejudice the amount of time they allow themselves. The right number of references to Latin expressions, with an appropriate discussion of each, is better than too many discussion points not supported by Latin.
4. They should observe the line numbers quoted in a question, and the Latin words printed in italics within the question to show where the Latin to be referred to begins and ends. References taken from outside those limits will not be awarded marks.
5. In the essay questions, they should refer to as much of the story possible, and not restrict themselves to the Latin passage or passages printed on the paper. They should always focus discussion points on the question asked on the paper.
6. They must check the translation carefully for any word missed out; often little conjunctions are overlooked, and they can be vital in indicating the connections within the author's argument or narrative.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section A: Prescribed Prose Literature

##### Question 1

- (a) This was generally very well answered, though there were candidates who made Cicero's and Catiline's vigilance for the republic equal rather than comparative by not seeing the full force of *acrius*.
- (b) There were very many very fine answers to this question, including some very well judged assessments of the purpose and effect of rhetorical questions, though some candidates contented themselves with simply mentioning those questions. A number of candidates

made and argued well the point that Cicero's detailed disclosure of his knowledge of Catiline's movement was part of the attack. Some made not always very cogently argued references to the low social status of Sicklemakers' Street or the metaphorical and ethical significance of night time as part of the attack, usually at the expense of better made points.

- (c) This was generally very well answered, often with some cogent discussion of how Cicero could use the testimonies of those who had been with Catiline. Some lost a mark by rather compressing their answers and simply referring to fellow conspirators of Catiline rather than men who had been there at the meeting or there on the significant night. Some did not make their argument clear, so that it was possible to conclude that they thought the senate was meeting chez Laeca. Here and in the translation, the spelling Laecus sometimes occurred, too.
- (d) A good number of candidates were able to make more (sometimes considerably more) than the required four points here, and many were clearly very comfortable with this question. As ever a few candidates confined their answers to points of content rather than style. There were many very sound and perceptive discussions of the effect of stylistic techniques alongside those who liked to display their knowledge of rhetorical and stylistic technical terms, not always accurately. In this session there were very few references to Cicero's use of punctuation, but the use of the caesura appeared to be a fashionable discussion point in some candidates' work. This may have been a misprision of 'clausula' but effective use of the caesura is more commonly found in verse.

Some candidates were quite loose in their quotation of Latin. In questions where stylistic points are under discussion, candidates ought to show more focus in their reference to Latin words and expressions than simply quote the first and last words of sentences with three dots in between. This was not uncommon when discussing the set of short rhetorical questions. As with places where candidates' knowledge of the meaning of the Latin discussed was inaccurate, they were not awarded the mark for the quotation.

- (e) There were many examples of completely accurately recalled translations. The usual besetting sins of omission appeared too, however.

In the first section *igitur* was often omitted, *illa* was translated as 'last' and some rendered *apud Laecam* as 'among the Laeca, Laeci or even Laecae'. *quemque* very often appeared as 'who' and many scripts lacked reference to *placeret*

In the section section the Examiners did not feel that 'delegated' was right for *delegisti*, or 'stay' for *relinqueres*.

In the second section, *confirmasti* was quite often reduced in meaning to 'said', *tibi*, *ipsum* and (very often) *mox* were missed out, as was *etiam*. In translation of prescribed texts it is well worth remembering that omission could easily be seen as a serious error.

- (f) This was generally very well and fully answered. Quotation from the Latin was often very well focused here on key words such as *vixdum*, *maioribus praesidiis*, and *praedixeram*. It was disconcerting, however, to be told not a few times that Cicero had predicted the assassins' arrival 'with much and the utmost strength'.
- (g) There were many fully detailed and lengthy answers to this question. A fine number of candidates covered all or most of the points in the mark scheme, in some cases deserving 12 or 13 out of 10, if such a thing were possible. The details of the speech had clearly been very well covered and taught in Centres. Surprisingly few, however, mentioned the state of Rome illustrated by Cicero in the first few lines of the speech. Those who did, though, often quoted every detail from it.

A majority of candidates were readily able to use their knowledge of the structure and shape of the speech to argue about the nature and extent of the crisis in a broad and scholarly way, going lucidly beyond the picture of Catiline himself which they might have examined from last year's paper. A good number felt able to question the validity of Cicero's picture of the crisis, and often argued that case quite well too, speaking of hyperbole and exaggeration. Some said that Cicero's intelligence network's revelation of the conspiracy meant that the conspiracy had no force any longer; they had not considered that Cicero made his revelations to prove to a sluggish Senate that the conspiracy was real, extensive and dangerous. Cicero's contention that that senatorial sluggishness was an important aspect of the nature and extent of the conspiracy was picked up by the best candidates and discussed thoroughly.

There were however quite a number of candidates who did not go beyond the points made in the Latin passage. These excluded themselves from the highest marks and Centres might wish to stress the vital importance of the set text as a whole in these questions.

## Section B: Prescribed Verse Literature.

### Question 2

- (a) There were some candidates here who only mentioned the use of the word *puer*, and excluded the other five lines referred to in the question. Those who saw beyond that easily achieved high marks. Latin quotation was often good here and focused on a few essential words provoking thoughtful discussions of naivety and inexperience of danger, quick movement across a range of activities, and inappropriate playfulness. Candidates who referred to Icarus' marvellous play went unrewarded for that Latin reference, however.
- (b) As with Section A there were many completely accurate translations, and faults were of omission rather than commission.

In the first section *coepto*, *opifex*, *ipse* and *geminas* were quite often missed out, *libravit* was translated as 'placed' and *in alas...corpus* read as if it had been *alas... in corpus*. A surprising number of candidates also translated *postquam* as if it had been *postea*.

In the second section the Examiners felt that something more speedy than 'go' was needed for *curras*. *Icare*, *et*, *ait* and *moneo* also disappeared from the thinking of a number of candidates.

In the final section *ne* was often omitted.

- (c) Many candidates were very familiar with this section and able to make more than the requested four points. The Examiners accepted 'metaphor' for what might more often be thought of as the simile of the bird, fledgling and nest. There were excellent discussions of this based around the caring femininity of *ales quae ...*, and the vulnerability of the fledgling in *teneram prolem*, though again some candidates quoted just the first and last words of the whole simile and did not achieve enough focus in their Latin reference.
- (d) This was generally very well answered indeed.
- (e) Though there were some stylistic discussions here which suggested grasping at straws, such as 'the m alliteration here clearly evokes the pathos', there was no shortage of very fine, very full, very detailed and very confident answers on this clearly well taught, understood and enjoyed set of lines. Some candidates' discussions suggested they seemed to have read *nudus* rather than *nudos*, and some thought that *nudos* referred to simply 'unclothed' rather than 'wingless' arms, but there were some very well judged and

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

very clearly thought out discussions of just how each of Icarus' last moments were constructed to evoke pity in the reader.

- (f) A few candidates chose to discuss the Daedalus and Icarus story at this point, which did not win them any marks.

Most candidates easily saw the essential substructure of this question: what are the emotions skilfully aroused and which moments in the story arouse them. There were a number of rewardingly long answers which kept up the detailed recall and perceptive discussion of the story very well throughout, making valid and perceptive points about the choice of words to give visual focus in the reader's mind's eye or the use of direct speech to give immediate contact with the speaker's feelings.

The range and progression of Scylla's emotions were generally very well understood, and well illustrated in her review of Minos' physique and attributes, her internal dialogue on how to respond to her feelings, then his response of horror and her response of anger to that response.

In some cases time was perhaps pressing on candidates who did not make quite as much as they might of Scylla's last speech to Minos with its angry questions and insults about his home life.

Some candidates made some interesting and worthwhile suggestions about the humour with which Ovid treats these human emotions.

Some candidates thought that Scylla beheaded her father in order to obtain the purple lock; others discussed the final few lines of the prescription confusing metamorphosis and resurrection.

## F363 Latin Verse

### General comments

The first sitting of this paper in the new Specification was felt by Examiners to have provided a suitable test for the very best candidates ('stretch and challenge') while remaining sufficiently accessible to less strong candidates.

Virgil was marginally the preferred set text author over Catullus and Examiners were pleased to see that the questions on the set authors, though different in nature, produced comparable scores. The Ovid unseen passage proved a stiff test, as expected, but very few candidates failed to make any sense of it at all, the majority scored well on the comprehension/appreciation questions, and a pleasing number scored full marks on the passage for translation.

Many chose to answer the Ovid section before the set texts, presumably to leave themselves with as much time as possible for the set text questions.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section A: Virgil

- 1(a) Candidates were almost always well-prepared on this passage and were able to make plenty of points to show how Virgil makes Venus' speech persuasive. The tendency was to write a chronological commentary on the rhetorical features of the passage, which suited the question perfectly well. Better answers often began by summarising the main planks in Venus's argument (as the question required) before analysing her argument in more detail. For a candidate to score top marks, they needed to comment on the *whole* passage (ie refer to the Latin from the beginning, middle and end of the speech). The use of quotation was mostly impressive, though some candidates quoted Latin without showing that they knew what it meant and others who translated their quotations were sometimes sloppy in the accuracy of their translation (eg by saying that Venus was mulling over the cares in her heart when the accusative *iactantem* clearly shows that it must refer to Jupiter). Answers analysing the rhetorical features of the Antenor section did not always show how the story of Antenor fitted into Venus' argument.
- 1(b) This question was not as easy it may have first looked, as candidates were required to comment briefly on the printed passage before identifying and analysing parts of the rest of Book One which show Aeneas' qualities as a leader. Most spent about half to one side of A4 dealing with the printed passage before proceeding to the answer the 'essay' question, though some concentrated almost wholly on the passage and made little or no reference to the rest of the prescription. Many, confronted with a question about 'leadership', tended to regurgitate a pre-prepared essay on Aeneas' character or his qualities as a hero with too little reference to the question in hand. In this respect, the more open-ended Catullus essay question on his merits as a poet was more straightforward. Answers which fail to address the question adequately are likely to score less highly on Assessment Objective 2 (AO2), which assesses a candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate. Examiners were surprised that perhaps the single most relevant episode in the book, Aeneas' motivating speech to his men while suppressing his own fears and doubts (lines 198-207), was infrequently mentioned as an example of his leadership, perhaps because it fell outside the lines prescribed for study in Latin. Centres are reminded that knowledge of the *whole* of the book is required (ie lines not set for study in Latin should be studied in English translation).

## Section A: Catullus

- 2(a) There were some excellent answers to this question. As on the Virgil, better candidates were able to make comments from all parts of the poem. The best were also able to go beyond a mere commentary by identifying and analysing the overall features of the poem which make it so effective. The same points about the use of quotation and mistranslation mentioned above applied here too. Candidates who had learnt a translation without properly studying the Latin were often exposed, for example those who commented on Catullus' use of imperatives in lines 1-2 ('cease to be a fool', 'consider lost what has died') when, in fact, the verbs here are jussive subjunctives not imperatives.
- 2(b) Most candidates spent no more than half a side of A4 commenting on the Suffenus poem before addressing the main point of the question about Catullus' own merits as a poet. What may have appeared to be a dauntingly open-ended question worked perfectly well as it allowed stronger and weaker candidates to produce an assessment of the poems in the prescription at their own level. The best answers referred to a *range* of poems and explicitly identified some of their features which make Catullus a poet worth reading. The features most often identified were his versatility (ie range of subject matter and handling of different metres), wit, ability to express emotion (and emotional detachment), vivid pictures of everyday Roman life and *doctrina*. A few, even those who so eloquently discussed Catullus' withering comments on the length of Suffenus' poetry and Catullus' pursuit of the Callimachean ideal of conciseness, themselves wrote at inordinate length on this question. Their answers tended to accumulate like a snowball rolling down a hill, thus risking a loss of marks under AO2 for the structure and organisation of their essay. Catullus would not have approved!

## Section B: Ovid unseen translation, comprehension and appreciation

It is hoped that Centres which were worried about the potential unpredictability of the comprehension and appreciation questions were reassured that the first paper, as promised in advice to Centres, was modelled closely on the published specimen paper. When the questions went beyond what have been traditionally known as 'comprehension' questions into the area of literary criticism, candidates often rose very well to the challenge (see below).

- (a)(i) Most realised that Paris could feel the ground moving but surprisingly few understood that *pedum pulsus* meant 'with the beating of feet' (the feet of Mercury and the goddesses, not his own feet). Over-literal answers which did not show comprehension were not fully rewarded (eg 'the earth was being moved towards him with the driving of feet'), whereas more confident candidates who simply wrote that Paris felt footsteps and the ground shaking won full marks.
- (a)(ii) Many commented convincingly on the alliteration of *pedum pulsus* or the effect of the elision *vis(a) est*. Those who showed that they knew that the middle of the line is dominated by the slow spondees of *pedum pulsus visa est* before the more dactylic *mihi terra moveri* and commented on the jerky rhythm of the line were well rewarded. Those who talked more vaguely about the lines being dactylic, or spondaic, or having a mixture of spondees and dactyls were not. It had been hoped that some might comment on the conflict of ictus and accent in the first half of the line, but few, if any, did. Candidates showed on question (e) that they are well able to scan lines if asked and they could therefore usefully be taught about ictus and accent.
- (b) Most realised that Paris was saying that the story he was about to tell was true, but many produced such a literal translation of *veri vix habitura fidem* (eg 'scarcely being about to have the trust of the true thing') that they failed to score the second mark. What they simply needed to say was that the story could scarcely be believed.



- (c)(i) This was a relatively straightforward question. For *actus*, a variety of descriptions were accepted (including 'flying') but an understanding of *velocibus* was required for the second mark. Many misidentified *velocibus* with *ferocibus* or were forced to guess.
- (c)(ii) This was answered well by almost all candidates, though some (too many?) associated *teneras* wrongly with some part of *teneo*.
- (d) Marks were won relatively easily on this question as there was plenty to say. Not all knew the literal meaning of *obstipui*, however, and it was mildly disappointing to see that many candidates still seem to think that Roman authors wrote using commas!
- (e) The scansion question was generally done very well, though some failed to mark the feet divisions and many failed to use this question to help them identify the case of *forma* for the following question. The lines selected for a scansion question will sometimes be deliberately chosen to alert candidates to a quantity needed for the correct understanding of the line in a subsequent question (often a final -a to identify a nominative or ablative, as in this case).
- (f) The first half of the answer ('stop the contest of the goddesses!') was sometimes omitted, but it was pleasing to see that so many picked up the available mark for saying that Paris was to choose which goddess was beautiful enough to defeat the other two (either by correctly construing the difficult line 10 or, perhaps more likely, using their prior knowledge of the well-known story).
- (g) As is always the case on the unseen translation of lines from Ovid, this question proved a stiff test. In the first line, more than half the candidates did not recognise *convalui* or were unable to make a sensible guess that fitted with the following phrase about boldness coming. *quamque* was, as expected, relatively rarely known, though it was a pleasure to see a good number of candidates who both recognised it from *quisque* and were bold enough to adapt the meaning of *vultu* to fit the context (eg 'and I was not afraid to cast my eye over each of the goddesses with my gaze'). In the next couplet, many predictably failed to make sense of *tantaque vincendi cura est* (the best wrote something like 'they were so keen to win') but most made good sense of the rest. Line 15 surprisingly proved the most difficult of the passage as most did not appreciate that the main verb *iactat* governed both the nouns *regna* and *virtutem*. Surprisingly at this level, many wrongly read *regna* as *regina* ('the queen wife of Jupiter') and took *virtutem* with *filia* to mean a 'virtuous daughter'. Line 16 was hard for candidates who took *potens* as a noun and/or did not recognise *velim*. In line 17, too few appeared to recognise *dulce* as an adverb ('sweet Venus' was the norm) and few saw that *tangant* was subjunctive ('do not let these gifts sway you'). In the last couplet, a variety of translations of *quod ames* were allowed, though very few came up with what the examiners had hoped for ('I will give you something to love'). Worse still, many were careless enough to take *pulchrae* with *filia* rather than *Ledae*. The best, who tended to know *amplexus*, were appropriately bold in their translation and wrote something like 'and the daughter of beautiful Leda, that even more beautiful girl (*illa*, nominative not ablative) will fall into your arms', thus tending to win the two marks available for attempts to improve on a literal translation - this is what is meant by the advice on the paper that 'extra credit will be given for good English'.

## Conclusions

The paper was designed to be accessible to all candidates while incorporating elements of 'stretch and challenge'. It is hoped that all candidates felt they had chance to show what they knew and could do, and the very best students felt suitably extended. The fact that the mean mark was so high is a reflection on their success. That so many scored a mark in excess of 90

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

out of 100 on such a demanding paper is testament indeed to their high level of ability and preparation. One of the best measures of candidates' success was that Examiners emerged from their marking of the set text questions feeling that their appreciation of the Virgil and Catullus passages printed had been heightened by some of the things candidates had to say about them. It is always a pleasure for examiners to read such a good number of perceptive, thoughtful and thought-provoking responses to literary texts. Candidates and their teachers are therefore to be warmly congratulated.

## F364 Latin Prose

### General Comments

Tacitus proved the overwhelmingly popular author, with approximately 90% of candidates preparing this text. Comprehension/Unseen was unsurprisingly the more popular option for Section B – perhaps 75% of candidates opted for this.

The set text questions were felt to be of comparable difficulty, although candidates sometimes made things difficult for themselves (see below).

The Examiners were once again pleased to note that the vast majority of candidates followed the rubric. Where they did not, it was in a minor way, for example not writing translations on alternate lines.

The Examiners felt that the paper was of a suitable standard and provided the opportunity for stretch and challenge at the highest levels.

There was perhaps some evidence of candidates being pushed for time in what is now a paper which combines skills from what used to be several, discrete papers.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A: Tacitus

1a: *Show how Tacitus gives a psychologically interesting account of the thoughts and deeds of Nero and Anicetus.*

This was usually the more successful of the two Tacitus questions. There was some very high quality work here. Candidates tended to cover the whole passage and even link it via the *igitur* in line 1 to the previous chapter; candidates who did this made valuable comments. There were many comments on the historic infinitives *vitare* and *laudare* and the possible implications of the subjunctive *capesseret* were also raised. *ubicumque haberetur* was well handled, as was *praegravem ratus interficere constituit*, although the simplistic "it has a lot of verbs" did not get to the point; the force of the compound *praegravem* was not often spotted. The polysyndetic tricolon *veneno ... alia vi* was a fertile source for comment, as was the following *placuitque primo venenum*. Discussions of Nero's internal debate about the pros and cons of the various methods were tackled on the whole successfully, but in varying amounts of detail. Some candidates also wrote about Agrippina's description (*usu scelerum ... intentae* and *ipsa praesumendo ... corpus*) without then telling the examiners what this showed us about Nero; the candidates seemed to have missed the point that the description of Agrippina is part of Nero's internal musings. The hendiadys *ferrum et caedes* was managed well, but the rest of that sentence less so.

It was when the text moved on to Anicetus that significant differences emerged between candidates. Many did not tackle Anicetus' description well. *obtulit ... Anicetus* was usually spotted and the tricolon description of his rank (*libertus ... educator*) commented upon; few candidates picked up the implications of the *pueritiae Neronis educator* particularly in light of the later *ergo navem posse componi docet*. *mutuis odiis Agrippinae invisus* was usually spotted (although often only partially quoted: either the *mutuis odiis* or the *invisus*, seldom both). This phrase was often misunderstood to mean that Anicetus and Nero shared a hatred of Agrippina. *ignaram* was sometimes spotted, but its emphatic position and the implication for Anicetus' character were regularly missed. *nihil tam ... quam mare* and the

rhetorical question *et si naufragio ... deliquerint* were usually commented upon effectively. The very last sentence was usually misinterpreted by candidates: this is still part of Anicetus' plan so it is an insight into him, NOT Nero. That aside, the comments on this final sentence were usually effective.

There were one or two unexpected delights. Some candidates commented on the fact that Nero does not refer to his mother by any name or title in his musings (indeed, it is not until line 8 that we even know the gender of the person against whom he is plotting, although it is obvious from what Tacitus has to say). Agrippina is mentioned by name only in Anicetus' plan where she is also callously referred to as *defunctae*. The analysis that Nero is surely trying to distance himself from the matricidal element of his plan is inescapable.

This particular extract lent itself to a systematic, "as-it-appears-in-the-text" approach. Candidates who adopted a thematic approach sometimes lost the sense of development of Nero's thought processes (eg *postremo, sed, atque*).

1b: *How does Tacitus create a vivid picture of the various reactions to Agrippina's death?*

This was the less successful of the Tacitus questions, possibly the result for some of pressure of time, although it was evident that this passage was not as well known as the first. This passage lent itself to a thematic approach (Nero [at the beginning and end, forming most of the passage], the praetorian officers under Burrus, *amici* and then *proxima Campaniae municipia*). Many candidates blurred groups together, usually the *amici* and *municipia*, thereby losing an opportunity to discuss the *coepto exemplo*.

Many discussed the unusual opening sentence, making sensible comments on the word order, *demum*, the juxtaposition of *scelere* and *magnitudo*, but oddly not the passive construction. *modo ... saepius ...* was often remarked upon. Almost every candidate mentioned *defixus* and *pavore exsurgens*, although the fact that this is a wonderful image which helps us to visualise the scene was sometimes not stated. The force of *mentis inops* was often mentioned only in passing and the clause *lucem opperiebatur ... adlaturam* was not well handled by those who spotted it. Later on in the passage (lines 10ff) the text returned to Nero. Most spotted that Nero was faking it (*diversa simulatione*), but not all noticed that this phrase also implies that the reaction of everyone else was also a pretence. The *quasi ... inlacrimans* clause was usually included by candidates but the force of the *quasi* was often lost. Lines 12-13 (*quia tamen ... gravis aspectus*) proved difficult for candidates in terms of effective comment and understanding. Not many understood the Latin fully and therefore comments on it proved somewhat random. *et erant qui ... audiri* was generally understood, but not properly analysed in terms of the question, somewhat surprising since it is surely a vivid image of supernatural goings on. The last few lines of the passage (*Neapolim concessit ... scelus paravisset*) were usually glossed over, although better candidates made useful comments on all aspects of the Latin.

Whilst most spotted that the praetorian officers were congratulating him (with much comment on the repetition of *-um* in the *prensantium ... gratantiumque*), not all saw that this was done *auctore Burro* and hence feigned (or at the very least not spontaneous); some did comment on *auctore Burro* without drawing the obvious conclusion. There was often discussion of the *quod discrimen ... evasisset* clause, often in terms of a hendiadys, but less commonly but more effectively in terms of the implications of the subjunctive. The gradual sense of a build up (*prima, dehinc, et coepto exemplo*) was seldom commented upon explicitly. Many drew interesting conclusions from the *testari*; less effective were remarks about the alliteration of *legationibus laetitiam*, which Examiners found tenuous at best.

Answers to this question were unusually naive compared with those for 1a. Many wrote about genuine outpourings of joy in this passage (mistaking it for the earlier chapter when

Agrippina's survival of the shipwreck became known, perhaps?). A common problem here was candidates treating this question as though it were 1a and offering psychological insights into Nero which were not specifically required by the question; such comments could have been made relevant to the question, but were usually left dangling. A few candidates also simply paraphrased the entire extract without drawing any conclusions at all; as a consequence they scored poorly.

## Section A: Livy

2a: *How does the speaker show skill in persuading the people?*

Whilst a few candidates took a thematic approach (identification with the ordinary people, concern for their welfare, giving them power, concern for the survival of the state, etc.), most adopted a more chronological through-the-speech tactic. Both techniques proved effective.

*quod saepe optastis* and its dependent *ut supplicii ... potestas esset* clause were well handled, especially the *improbo ... senatu*, from which Calavius (the speaker) tries to distance himself. Many candidates commented to good effect on the various pronouns and such words as *singulorum/singulos*. Not many noted the force of the verb *expugnantes*, although the remainder of that sentence proved to be a rich source of inspiration for most, particularly the contrast between *cum summo ... periculo* and *sed ... ac liberam*. The tricolon diminuendo of *clausos ... inermes* was noted, as was the imperative. The triple adverbial phrase *raptim aut forte temere* was spotted, although not many noticed that there are three adverbs here. *de singulorum capite ... poenas pendat* was dealt with well, but the following sentence (*sed ante omnia ... vestram habeatis*) was not clearly understood and often omitted. The contrast between individuals and institutions in the sentence *etenim hos, ut opinor ... habere non vultis* was observed but not fully understood (despite the eerily modern parallels with our own MPs' expenses scandal!). All picked up on the contrast between a senate and a king and handled it effectively, but no-one seemed to understand that *abominandum* is **not** a noun meaning "an abomination". The ease with which the orator rushes over this section, presenting quickly the two choices without giving the crowd a chance to think of the numerous other alternatives was commented upon by a few. The juxtaposition of *capite* and *vos* and the sense of power that this gave the people was generally remarked upon as was the emphatic *fiet*. The sting in the tail of the piece, by which time the crowd is firmly on Calavius' side, was nicely dealt with by most (the final sentence).

2b: *What makes this a forceful speech?*

There was an abundance of good material for candidates to draw upon here, and most candidates made sound, occasionally exceptional, use of it. Most took the obvious chronological approach when answering the question. There was much sensible discussion of pronouns and their positions (eg *per ego te, nobis, tu, me ipsum, meum, ille tibi, preces apud te meae, sicut pro te*). The relationship between a father and his son featured prominently in all answers (*fili, quaecumque iura liberos iugunt parentibus* and later *pater filio meo*) with much made also of the word order. *precor quaesoque* was dealt with well as was the later *ante oculos patris*, but the *omnia infanda* was usually ignored. The huge number of rhetorical questions was a significant part of most candidates' answers, although the exact number seemed to vary (there are 10!); weaker candidates simply observed the number of the rhetorical questions without commenting on what each question was about and the language used within each. The main ideas that candidates selected included: oaths and religious obligations and right hands; hospitality; one man against many; the reputation and fearsome presence of Hannibal; and the father's previous success in winning Hannibal over to his son. All these points were made and well

supported by both suitable quotations and discussions of the Latin. A key point made by most (but usually not supported by both the references in the text: *me ipsum ferire ... sustinebis* AND *atqui per meum ... transfigendusque est*) was the willingness of the elder Calavius to shield Hannibal from harm with his own body; choice of vocabulary and word order featured prominently in candidates' analyses. Not many candidates tackled the rather nice *sed hic te deterreri sine potius quam illic vinci*. The better candidates picked up the final sentence, noting especially the way in which it was framed by forms of the verb *valeo*.

### General Comments on Section A

Candidates should not comment upon the position of words within the line or even mention enjambment in an answer on a prose text. Whilst there were instances in both the Tacitus and Livy of assonance and alliteration, candidates need to be sure that such comments are justifiable.

There was sometimes a tendency to quote a tiny bit at a time from the Latin, rather than to give the proper quotation in full. To give one example, in Tacitus q.a, many candidates wrote such things as "he deliberated whether to kill her with poison (*veneno*) or the sword (*ferro*) or some other means (*alia vi*)"; it would have been much easier simply to quote the whole phrase *veneno an ferro vel qua alia vi* and then discuss it. The answer will flow more smoothly. Candidates who broke the phrase down into its component pieces sometimes failed to spot the polysyndeton. Some candidates did all their reference to the text via English paraphrase or line numbers. This can be acceptable (for example when noting the number of rhetorical questions in the second Livy passage), but direct quotation and evaluation of the Latin is preferable. This is essential if the candidate is trying to discuss such effects as juxtaposition or antithesis.

### Section B: 3. Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

- a) The unseen translation: most candidates were able to accrue at least a few marks on this question. Difficult words/phrases included: *tantam* (perhaps one fifth of candidates knew this), *vallum*, *accedere* (taken as *ascendere*), *auderent* (taken as *audirent*); *pugnandum esse*, *existimabat*, *quendam*; *callidum* (the Examiners noted that often a hot Gaul had been chosen), *fieri*, *clam*, *educturum esse* (often taken as a passive), *auxilii* (often taken as *auxiliorum*) and *profecturum*.

There were many opportunities to render the passage into fluent English (marks are available for this). Most candidates had a go; only a small number scored the maximum of 2 marks for quality of translation. Oddly, nearly all candidates recognised the *auxilii ferendi causa* construction, but then insisted on translating it "for the cause of ...", instead of the obvious (and more stylish) purpose clause.

- b) The gerundive of obligation (which formed part of the answer) was not always spotted.
- c) There was a tendency for candidates to pick perhaps a single word, translate it (sometimes incorrectly), then say this shows that the Gauls were over-confident. Examiners wanted to see candidates engaging with the text and explaining how whatever they had chosen established their over-confidence. For example, many put "*conclamant omnes*: they all shouted, which shows that they were over-confident". This scored nothing. If they had commented, as many did, on the word order of the clause and noted the effect of the compound *conclamant*, they would have scored 2 marks for the point.
- d) This was generally handled better than in previous years, with most spotting (i) and (ii). Part (iii) was the tricky one, with dative being a common answer, rivalled only by ablative describing *virgultis*.

- e) (i) was handled reasonably well, with many getting it right; (ii) was more tricky because Examiners wanted some sign of addressing the force of the *ut*.
- f) *concido* was the most popular wrong answer, although *concesso* was also quite common.
- g) Purpose clause (after *quibus*) was the desired answer; those who put purpose after *ut* were not penalised. Note that a translation in lieu of correct terminology had to demonstrate unequivocally a purpose clause.

## Section B: 4. Prose Composition

Examiners observed that most candidates here were competent and tended to know their constructions quite well. A few, however, were really weak and would have been better off attempting the Unseen.

Phrases that caused problems included:

- a warlike people – often tackled with a relative clause with varying degrees of success;
- would soon attack – although most spotted the verb of fearing construction, the tense of the subjunctive required was not always known;
- did not know whether – too many occurrences of *utrum*, or worse, *si*;
- he had a bridge made – the hardest phrase in the prose. Most attempted it, with varying degrees of success, using an indirect command. It was heartening to see that a few candidates knew *curo* + gerund;
- in one day (and later on in twenty days) – "time within which" proved difficult for a large number of candidates;
- with us – the preposition was often (incorrectly) omitted.

Vocabulary problems included:

intend (*in animo habēre*); allies (*socius* m); people (*gens* f); territory (*fines* m pl); river (*flumen* n; *fluvius* m); same (*idem*); twenty (*viginti*); live (*habitare*; *vivere* is to be alive; *habēre* is something altogether different); wish (*cupere*, or *velle* – but the conjugation of this is irregular; there was much evidence of "wherever you fly"); ancient (*antiquus*; *priscus*); ago (*abhinc*).

There were numerous attempts at style, with most candidates getting 4 or 5 out of the maximum 10. It was gratifying to see that the best candidates notionally scored 13 or more style marks (only 10 counted, however).

# **Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)**

## **Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)**

### **Chief Examiner's Report on the Specification 2010**

Most candidates at AS and for the new A2 Greek specification continued the tradition of their predecessors in producing work of a high standard and gaining high grades.

At AS, the language paper (F371) was found to be a little more challenging than in the previous year, especially the Lysias unseen, but nevertheless most coped very well. A minority of candidates attempt the English-Greek sentences, but those who do usually do very well, and there is no reason why this option should be regarded as beyond the scope of the average student. In the literature component (F372), most knew their texts well, and the only overall cause for concern is that of timing: there is a lot to do in this paper, so it is important that the texts *are* thoroughly known, so that candidates can complete the translation and context questions efficiently (and not write at excessive length on the latter), so as to leave plenty of time for the 10 mark 'essay' questions.

The new style A2 papers, F373 (Verse) and F374 (Prose) also contain more things to do than the old style ones, but it was encouraging that here timing did not seem to be a problem for the great majority. Some pursued a policy of doing one of the literature questions first, then the language section, and then the other literature passage, or in some cases of doing the language section first, which seemed to work well. The translation elements of the language sections were done as well as in previous years, though some would be well advised to think more carefully about the shorter questions and what they are actually asking for. On F374, the composition option was taken by a (substantial) minority, and these were very successful: it was good to see that this was regarded as a viable option and, as at AS, larger numbers might well consider attempting it. In the literature sections, candidates obviously relished the opportunity to write extensively and in depth on quite long passages from their texts; some indeed, wrote at enormous length, which is not necessarily a guarantee of success: more concise responses were sometimes better focused, and gained higher marks. It must again be emphasised that although translation of texts is not specifically required, detailed knowledge of the Greek is essential, and answers must both quote the relevant Greek and translate it accurately.



## F371 Classical Greek Language

### General comments

Most candidates tackled the unseen translation in Section A very successfully and were able to cope with both the overall storyline of the passage and the grammatical points contained within it. The fact that the passage consisted almost entirely of direct speech did not cause any noticeable problems. A minority of candidates scored less than half marks, but overall there was a large number of excellent scripts.

There was, once again, a significant preference among candidates for the unseen translation in Section B over the sentences – more than three quarters of candidates opted for the former. The Lysias unseen was found by candidates to be more challenging and there was a greater spread of marks here than for the Xenophon unseen; the Examiners were therefore careful to give credit for partially correct work, rather than solely penalising errors. There was less variation of marks from candidates who chose to do the sentences; the vast majority gained at least two thirds of the available marks and many scored significantly higher. Overall, it seems that the two options in Section B provided a pleasing level of differentiation between good and excellent candidates.

### Section A: Xenophon

The vast majority of candidates had several sections where they understood the passage well and translated very accurately; the same sections – such as the conditional clause – tended to cause problems across the board.

Line 1 κα, . . . ἐδε

The first sentence was translated very well indeed by most candidates, as was the introduction to Seuthes' speech, providing a positive start to the passage for the vast majority of candidates. πᾶς was occasionally translated as 'why' and a few candidates omitted ἐδε.

Lines 2-4 Μαισ}δης . . . βασιλεῖς

The deceptively simple structure of ἡκε·νοῦ δὲ ἄν {ρεῖα caused some confusion, but the Examiners accepted a variety of ways of denoting Maisades' rule over the tribes, which encompassed most candidates. Vocabulary proved a problem in ἡκελθε·ς, as well as the separation of τῆς κάρας from ἡκε ταῦθης, but the rest of the sentence was understood very well.

Lines 4-7 ἡπε, . . . {πολιτῶν

The phrase εἰς {λλοτράνην πεζαν {πολιτῶν provided good differentiation, particularly with candidates who thought the participle was part of βλήπτω. Weaker candidates had the adjective agreeing with the speaker, which was concerning, and many candidates incorrectly put the participle at the end of the sentence. The Examiners were generous in dealing with this phrase and sought to reward what was correct. The construction after δοῖται caused some difficulty, with a significant proportion of candidates thinking that δυνάτην and ἔνδρα were in agreement.

Lines 7-11 ἡκε τοῦτο . . . βοῦλομαι

The majority of candidates coped very well with the first two sentences here; there was a pleasing variety of renderings for ἡμῶν γένηται, but some confusion over the tenses of ἔσται and ζῆ. Many candidates were unsure of the precise meaning of παραγνωσται but there was much ingenious guessing.

### Section B1: Lysias

There is no doubt that candidates found this second unseen harder than the first, as it was designed to be, but there was a very wide range of marks and several really excellent scripts.

Lines 1-2 [AmazÇnej . . . sidfrê

The majority of candidates did well or very well here, although there were vocabulary problems with p}lai and àplism™nai. Strangely, a significant number of candidates omitted per , aî~j.

Lines 2-4 prãton . . . guna<sup>1</sup>kej

Almost all candidates grasped the idea of the Amazons mounting horses, and pleasing differentiation between good and excellent candidates was provided by oÃj<sup>2</sup>roun. There was some confusion over the cases of the participles and the voice of ÷nom·zonto.

Lines 5-6 {koÐousa . . . {p™qanon

pote was frequently mistranslated or omitted here, and there was a disappointing tendency to consider dÇxan a verb. The majority of candidates understood that many of the Amazons died after encountering good men, and the Examiners accepted a wide range of responses for tucoÐsai.

Lines 7-8 doÐsai . . . kat™sthsan

Many candidates found this final paragraph more challenging, as is fitting for the last sentence of the harder unseen. The majority of candidates understood the idea that the Amazons had made an immortal memory of Athens, but fewer understood the effect on the Amazons' own country. Despite the DVL's statement that candidates should be prepared to tackle Greek words which have an obvious English meaning, {nãnumon caused some difficulty, although a pleasing number of candidates worked it out.

### Section B2: Sentences

There was a range of marks received here, although many candidates did very well indeed. It was noticeable that most candidates got the breathings totally accurate or repeatedly had them wrong or absent.

- (a) This sentence was translated very well by the vast majority of candidates; although a significant number incorrectly wrote tÇn nautikÇn.
- (b) The construction after ÷lp·zw was not universally known, and many candidates wrote oî instead of m£.
- (c) Not all candidates correctly translated the purpose clause and there were problems with the ending of {sfal£j.
- (d) A large number of candidates employed a genitive absolute successfully and the second half of the sentence was translated very well.
- (e) There were some vocabulary problems with 'old man', but it was pleasing to see that very many candidates were familiar with ka·per and the participle.

## F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

### General comments

In the second year of this specification, most candidates showed that they had responded well to the literature they had studied, and were able to demonstrate a commendable grasp of detail of the set texts. They coped very well both with the questions focused on recall of detail and with those focused on the style of the author. Candidates had a good deal to say; for a few, this caused problems at the end of the paper.

The translation sections were generally completed to a very high standard. Some candidates omitted or transposed words, but in general the translation were clear, and it was easy for the examiners to feel convinced that the translation reflected what the Greek said. Detailed knowledge of the text was equally important on other questions, some of which (eg 1(c)) required close knowledge of what the passage said. One significant issue arose with the Homer translation: a number of candidates translated lines 1-5 of the first Homer passage, rather than the second. While in this case examiners sought to ensure that no candidate was disadvantaged, candidates should be familiar with the layout of the paper: the questions for each passage are placed directly underneath the relevant section of text.

Candidates did not always organise their responses as clearly and effectively as they might. Answering questions for 8 or 10 marks in one long paragraph can make it more difficult for examiners to identify the different points made. If questions call for a number of separate points, these are best presented in separate paragraphs, preferably with a line between. Where the question asks for reference to the Greek, it is important to quote specific phrases from the Greek in support of what is being said. Most candidates did this very effectively, but some revealed a lack of detailed knowledge by inaccurate quotation, and others obscured their meaning by the use of an ellipse (eg *ὥστε ... πεποίηκε* (Lysias 34)), especially if the words they were discussing were not included in the quotation. Examiners are looking for effective communication of the answer to the question.

Some candidates make excessive use of technical vocabulary; this only impresses the examiners where it is used to make a clear and concise point. In too many cases, the technical term communicates very little because it obscures, rather than clarifies, what the candidate is trying to say. It is much more important to discuss the example chosen in context, and the examiners will credit responses that concentrate on the text without resort to complex language (in some cases, misunderstood). Imprecisely used technical vocabulary does not impress.

A very few candidates left out individual questions. This can have a significant impact on the final total for a paper, so candidates should always check that they have answered every question. This is more difficult for those who choose, perhaps for good reasons, to answer the questions in an order other than the one they appear on the paper.

As was noted last year, examiners do not expect candidates to include accents on any Greek they quote, but they should include breathings. It was disappointing to see that a relatively large number of candidates, under the stress of exam conditions, did not consistently do this.

Q.1(a) Most candidates were able to identify the immediate context of the passage and kept their answers to an appropriate length. There were relatively few overly long answers. Candidates who did write excessively in this and 2.(a) could put themselves under time pressure by the end of the exam.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Q.1(b) This question was answered well.

Q.1(c) The best answers focused precisely on the demands of the question, but there were some responses that were rather over long: the line references were designed to guide the candidates towards the relevant section of text, but in some cases uncertainty over the meaning of the lines resulted in less precise answers. There was no requirement here to refer to the Greek text, and candidates who did so lengthened their answer considerably.

Q.1(d) The translation question was generally answered very well, with very many candidates producing an excellent version, though some made a minor error. A variety of translations were accepted for *ταῦτα διανοηθεῖς*, and a number of candidates omitted *ἔδει με*.

Q.1(e) The majority of candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of the passage linked to the question.

Q.1(f) This proved a much more demanding question, and it was clear that many very good candidates were not always sure when they had made effective points in response to the question. The very best answers were concise and clearly laid out, but candidates whose responses were less confident were still able to secure full marks. Most candidates heeded the injunction to refer to both the content and style of the Greek, though there were some who made limited reference to the Greek text in their answer: this limited the effectiveness of their answer. Many were able to identify Lysias' use of rhetorical questions (especially the one word *ἀπειρηφίσασθε*; (line 2), though fewer commented on his use of antithesis in this passage (*ἢ ὡς ... ἢ ὡς* (line 3)), or on the emphatic position of *ῥαδίαν* in line 4. Many candidates used *πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ἀστῶν καὶ τῶν ξένων* to good effect. A number of candidates latched on to the word *τύραννοι* (line 8) but misinterpreted it in context. The end of the passage was misinterpreted by some.

Q.1(g) There were some very good responses to this question, though many of these, though scoring effectively, were relatively unstructured. The very best candidates organised their answers and imposed a clear structure on what they wanted to say. The relatively short time available to produce an answer was a significant factor here, though this was more an issue in the corresponding question on Homer (2(f)) There were some good discussions of the introduction, though not many were able to give a succinct summary of what was included there. The best candidates were able to show how Lysias used his references to the 30 to implicate Eratosthenes in all aspects of their activities, and engage the sympathies of the jurors by linking their experiences with his. Many used the cross-examination of Eratosthenes as a good example of a different approach in the speech. The majority of candidates made use of the Arginousae incident, though they could perhaps have made more of it, and there were some effective discussions of the impact of the description of the removal of Polemarchus' wife's earrings and the impact on an Athenian audience of the neglect of burial customs.

Q.2(a) This question generally produced full marks for candidates, though there were some very lengthy responses.

Q.2(b) There were some excellent responses to this question: a very few focused solely on content. There were some good discussions of *νήπιος* and its position, so too of *μέγ' ἀάσθη* (though there were also some mistranslations of this). Many candidates commented on *κῆρα κακῆν μέλανος θανάτοιο*, but failed to make it relevant to the question. The lines on Zeus (lines 5-8) were generally well used, though the analysis did not always focus on the question. Many emphasized the significance of the apostrophe in lines 9-10, as well as *σε θεοὶ θάνατον δὲ κάλεσαν*.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

Q.2(c) There were some excellent answers to this question, and a number covered far more points than was necessary for the 10 marks available. Weaker responses sometimes quoted Greek at excessive length, without making clear how exactly the quoted text related to the point being made. Many noted the repetition of *τρίς* (lines 19-20), though not all commented on the significance here of *μὲν* and *δὲ*. There were some good discussions of vocabulary (eg *θῦεν* (line 16), *ἀπεστυφέλιξεν* (line 20), *ἀθανάτησι* (line 21)). Candidates often brought out the contrast between man and god, making good use of *δαίμονι ἴσος* (line 22), and the emphatic introduction of Apollo in line 17.

Q.2(d) The majority of candidates picked out the significance of *χάζεο* (though many did not transcribe it correctly). Some candidates here failed to observe the requirement to comment on both content and style.

Q.2(e) This translation was generally well done, though a number of candidates misinterpreted the paper and translated lines 1-5 of the first passage on the paper. One common error here was that a number of candidates translated *ὡς φάτο* (line 1) as if Patroclus had been speaking; a surprising number omitted *ἐκατηβόλου* (line 2). The examiners accepted a range of meanings for *μῶνυχας* (line 3), though some candidates omitted it.

Q.2(f) Time pressure was an issue for some candidates; there were some short responses, and some that were a series of bullet points. Weaker responses generally showed a sound understanding of the set text, but produced something of an unstructured list, while the better candidates were able to organize their answer and make it very convincing. Knowledge of the text was very good, and some showed an impressive recall of detail. There were some excellent discussions of Patroclus' death and his earlier *aristeia*.

## F373 Classical Greek Verse

Candidates appeared to have adjusted well to the new specification and to the way in which literature and language elements are now combined in the two A2 papers. There were very few or no indications that time had been a problem: many wrote at great length on the set text questions and did good work on the language sections. Nearly 40% of candidates decided to do the Unprepared Translation and Comprehension section first, and this approach seems to have served well those who did it. As one would expect, there was generally a good correlation between performances on the two sections of the paper, though there were of course those whose literary skills or interests outweighed their linguistic ones, and *vice versa*. Examiners were slightly disappointed that those candidates opting for Euripides vastly outnumbered those who chose to answer on Aristophanes, so much so that there were not really enough Aristophanes scripts to pinpoint any recurring trends or problems. Outcomes on the two texts were broadly comparable, although there was, given the larger entry, a much greater variation in quality in the Euripides answers, and a higher proportion of the Aristophanes scripts were A-grade; perhaps Centres which have previously been shy about reading Aristophanes might be thus encouraged to give him a try next year. Comments on specific questions and sections will be found below, and should be read in conjunction with the Mark Scheme for the component.

### Section A: Prescribed Literature

Some general points about approaches to literary questions:

- Greek *must* be quoted and translated (or its meaning made clear). Some candidates, who may have been well-informed and able, failed to do themselves justice because they did not make clear that they understood fully the examples they quoted. Candidates are not specifically asked to translate the texts in the examination papers; but those who rely on a knowledge of the text in English and a vague awareness of what the Greek says never do particularly well.
- Care must be taken with the way in which the Greek text is cited: other than direct mistranslation, there are two main things candidates do which reduce the effectiveness of their answers. One is 'bitty citation', the other is failing to match 'collar and cuffs'. Take this example from an answer to Q.1(a):

This can be seen through the portrayal of the sea as 'foaming much' (perix {fronpolun [sic]) intensified by the alliteration of 'r's to emphasise the size of the wave (kuma) and drama is then raised through the fact that it is approaching (cwrei) the headland where the chariot (Åcoj) is.'

- The first citation (which is an example of mismatched 'collar and cuffs') includes the word for foam ({{frÈn), to be sure, but as the candidate refers to 'foaming', the quotation needs to include kacl}zon to provide the verbal element. Similarly, as the candidate does not refer to p™rix in his/her discussion, why include it in the citation? Is it because s/he is not fully in command of the text? The other bits of Greek quoted are all examples of 'bitty' citation – constructing a point using comfortable known words (especially nouns) rather than engaging with the text in the form of whole phrases, clauses or sentences: are the Greek words for 'wave' and 'chariot' really that significant on their own? An extreme example of 'bitty citation' is a comment that starts like this, 'The author uses words like ...', and then quotes a number of tenuously linked words from different parts of the passage which give no sense of context or overall meaning whatsoever.
- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates who did this tended to write better structured answers and to avoid missing important points. They were also in a better position to trace the sequence of thought through a passage or demonstrate their knowledge of the context of their citations than those who looked – for

- example – for instances of ‘emphatic positioning’ of words throughout the passage, and then started again to look for something else.
- Coverage of the whole passage (which is not the same as ‘making every possible point the Examiners thought of in their Mark Scheme’) is important. Making brief notes on points to refer to in an answer, or indicating important points on the question paper, might well be helpful. Some candidates start well, write very fully on the first half of a passage, and then run out of steam, or time. What happens at the end of a passage may be at least as important as what happens at the beginning.
  - A list of points shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures (for example) do not just happen to be there; they are supporting some important point, which should be mentioned as the reason for their use.
  - Unless otherwise specified, answers should make reference to both content and style. Some passages, necessarily, will contain more of one than the other, but answers which concentrate wholly on the one to the exclusion of the other will not reach the top level. (See the Marking Grids in Mark Scheme: ‘Characteristics of Performance’.)
  - Technical terms should be used with care. Examiners have (regrettably) come to acknowledge that alliteration and assonance are apparently indistinguishable from one another. But the wrong use of a technical term may spoil an answer which is otherwise going in the right direction. If a candidate notices that several clauses begin with the same word, thinks it is significant, and quotes them and says so in straightforward English, this is better than calling it by the wrong name.
  - Candidates should make sure that the literary devices they discover in passages actually work. A plural genitive absolute, for example, is quite likely to have several words ending in *-wn*, because that is the only way in which it can be done, so it is very unlikely to mean very much, in literary terms. A special favourite this year – as every year – was ‘emphatic position’, which (apparently) can be either (1) the beginning of a line, or (2) the middle of a line, or (3) the end of a line. Not everyone can be right: the fact is that a word in ‘emphatic position’ is a word where one wouldn’t expect it to be – which may be by no means easy for the average A-level candidate to spot; so this, like all other ‘rhetorical devices’ has to be handled with care.

*Note that specific examples of textual points expected to be referred to in answers are in general not listed in the remarks below, but may be found in the Mark Scheme for the component.*

### Q.1(a)/2(a)

A surprisingly large number of candidates felt obliged to start their answers with unasked for ‘The Story So Far’ paragraphs, thereby delaying the earning of marks!

The exact meaning of *{noidys}n... fusmati* (lines 1-2) and *frikadej {ntefq}gget* (line 7) often eluded candidates. Examiners saw frequent mistranslations and failures to match ‘collar and cuffs’ (see general points above), eg ‘He first describes the wave as “swollen and seething foam” (*kapeit’ {noidhsan te kai perix {fron}*).’ Why does the candidate include *k,,peit’* in the Greek quotation, as he does not discuss it, but not *kackl}zwn*, which would have done for ‘seething’?

‘*kara grauwn te sarkaj* – smashing his head against the rocks’ was another even more blatant example of a candidate betraying an imperfect knowledge of the text by not accurately matching Greek citation to English translation/comment. Such mistakes will certainly affect the number of marks awarded to a candidate – not necessarily pulling him/her all the way down to Level 2, as suggested on the Mark Scheme (‘inaccurate detail’), unless the mistakes are numerous, but certainly compromising the likelihood of achieving Level 5.

Candidates were usually struck by the nautical simile and metaphors (they rarely knew the difference between the two, by the way) in lines 12, 15 and 18. Those whose knowledge of the text was less sound than others used up a lot of space stating at great length how important sea

metaphors were to the Athenians and elaborating upon their naval history. The other candidates simply drew attention to them and then moved on to the next point.

In line 20 candidates often translated  $\epsilon\beta\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\nu\ \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\cdot\nu\nu\ \hat{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\nu$  as 'the horses, maddened by fear' rather than 'maddening [referring to the bull – the word  $\tau\alpha\delta\rho\omicron\jmath$  immediately precedes this phrase] the four-horse team with fear'.

### Q.1(b)/2(b)

Essays were generally competently done, though the best reads seemed to come from candidates writing about Aristophanes rather than Euripides. Candidates had almost no problems judging how much to write on the printed passage and how much on the rest of the play: the Principal Examiner found one example of a candidate who wrote about the character of Hippolytus in the printed passage and the rest of the play but virtually ignored the other characters, and that was it. On the other hand, nearly all the answers would have benefited from the inclusion of more (or, in many cases, any at all) direct textual reference, ie, quotation in English or Greek, or explicit referencing of lines/sections of the text. There were a lot of bald statements about the various characters in the play which really should have been given supporting evidence. While accurate quotation in Greek is of course impressive, the inclusion of odd Greek words (unless important) is completely pointless, eg 'he wants to washout [*sic*] his  $\epsilon\tau\alpha$  [*sic*], ears'.

## Section B: Language

### Q.3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) (Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Mark Scheme)

- 1 This was usually translated well.
- 2 This was usually translated adequately.
- 3  $\beta\cdot\alpha\nu$  was occasionally translated as 'life'.  $\iota\gamma^{\circ}$  was frequently misinterpreted, usually as being from  $\mu\gamma\omega$  (eg 'is it not shameful to lead him saying false things?'), or ignored.
- 4 This was usually translated extremely well, contrary to Examiners' expectations!
- 5  $\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha\nu\ \tau\iota$  frequently became 'whatever' rather than 'whenever ... something'.
- 6  $\pi\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota$  was often treated as part of  $\tau\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota$  (eg 'he does not turn to hesitate').  $\mu\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  was occasionally conflated with Latin *moliri*.
- 7 'Only he will take these bows to Troy', and similar, were common renderings.

Overall, though, the translation was well done, with a good number of correct or almost correct versions, and generally good use of English.

(b) (i) This question usually posed no problems.

(b) (ii) A not infrequent answer was 'Neoptolemus would not take Troy without Philoctetes, and Philoctetes would not take it without him', or similar. Examiners awarded one mark only for this rendering:  $\kappa\epsilon\cdot\nu\nu$  and  $\delta\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha$  must refer to  $\tau\sim\tau\zeta\chi\alpha$ .

(c) Few candidates got this completely right.  $\gamma\eta\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota$  was treated as an imperative rather than a verbal adjective (a common answer was that Neoptolemus was telling Odysseus to get the weapon himself), and  $\epsilon\gg\pi\epsilon\rho\ \epsilon\delta\prime\ \gamma\epsilon\iota$  became 'if he has it' *vel sim*.

(d)  $\delta\rho\chi\alpha\jmath$  was often labelled as second person singular future indicative.  $\epsilon\tau\rho\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota$  was constantly translated as 'bring' or 'carry' rather than 'win' or 'gain' ('bringing two gifts to Philoctetes').  $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  was more than once described as 'a superlative', and occasionally translated as 'spear(s)', 'halls' and 'masters'.  $\rho\omicron\cdot\omega$  was not often commented upon – the Examiners did not



*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

expect this, as the question was about what Odysseus, not Neoptolemus, was saying – but more often than not when it was cited it was treated as being part of the verb ‘to do’.

**(e)** Predictably, »τω caused problems, frequently being translated as ‘I will go’.

**(f)** The most common errors were to scan σ } ε ’ as long (did candidates think phi was a double consonant?) and to scan the last syllable of both lines as long, despite the fact that they ended in a first person singular weak aorist indicative active, the pronunciation of which should be reasonably familiar to candidates. In the latter case the Examiners applied their customary discretion and did not count them as errors.

## F374 Classical Greek Prose

Candidates appear to have adjusted well to the new format, as exemplified in F374 and combining literature and language elements. There were few indications that time had been a problem, and many wrote at great length (and very well) on the set text questions, as well as doing good work on the language sections. Some decided to do the Unseen/Comprehension or Composition section first, or in the middle, between the two text passages, and this approach seems to have served well those who did it. As one would expect, there was generally a good correlation between performances on the two sections of the paper, though there were of course those whose literary skills or interests outweighed their linguistic ones, and *vice versa*. Rumours of the demise of prose composition (not to mention allegations of its assassination) proved to be premature; those who did it, as opposed to the unseen, were a minority, but a sizeable one, and their average mark was higher. Outcomes on the two texts were comparable, though the second Plato passage was of slightly different nature to the other three passages set. Comments on specific questions and sections will be found below, and should be read in conjunction with the Mark Scheme for the component.

### Section A: Prescribed Literature

Some general points about approaches to literary questions:

- Greek *must* be quoted and translated (or its meaning made clear). Some apparently well-informed and able candidates failed to do themselves justice because they did not make clear that they understood fully the examples they quoted. Candidates are not specifically asked to translate the texts in the examination papers; but those who rely on a knowledge of the text in English and a vague awareness of what the Greek says do not do well.
- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates who do this tend to write better structured answers and avoid missing important points. They are also in a better position to trace the sequence of thought through a passage than those who look – for example – for instances of 'emphatic positioning' of words throughout the passage, and then start again and look for something else.
- Coverage of the whole passage is important. Making brief notes on points to refer to in an answer, or indicating important points on the question paper, might well be helpful. Some candidates start well, write very fully on the first half of a passage, and then run out of steam, or time. What happens at the end may be just as important as what happens at the beginning.
- A list of points shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures (for example) are not just there; they are supporting some important point, which should be mentioned as the reason for their use.
- Unless otherwise specified, answers should make reference to both content and style. Some passages, necessarily, will contain more of one than the other, but answers which concentrate wholly on the one to the inclusion of the other will not reach the top level. (see Marking Grids in Mark Scheme: 'Characteristics of Performance'.)
- Technical terms should be used with care. Examiners have (regrettably) come to acknowledge that alliteration and assonance are apparently indistinguishable from one another. But the wrong use of a technical may spoil an answer which is otherwise going in the right direction. If a candidate notices that several clauses begin with the same word, thinks it is significant, and quotes them and says so in straightforward English, this is better than calling it by the wrong name.
- Candidates should make sure that the literary devices they discover in passages actually work. A plural genitive absolute, for example, is quite likely to have several words ending in *-ων*, because that's the only way you can do it, so it is very unlikely to mean very much, in literary terms. A special favourite this year was 'emphatic position' which (apparently) can

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

be either (1) the beginning of the sentence, or (2) the middle of the sentence, or (3) the end of the sentence. Not everyone can be right: the fact is that a word in 'emphatic position' is a word where one wouldn't expect it to be – which may be by no means easy for the average A Level candidate to spot; so this, like all other 'rhetorical devices' has to be handled with care.

*Note that specific examples of textual points expected to be referred to in answers are in general not listed in the remarks below, but may be found in the Mark Scheme for the component.*

### Plato: 1(a)

The characterisation of Thrasymachus as impatient, forceful, and abrupt was within the capacity of all candidates to grasp, and most wrote about him well; his attempts to interrupt and hijack the conversation, the 'wild beast' simile (not *similie*, please...); the exaggerated reaction of Socrates and Polemarchus; and his scathing attack on the way the conversation is being conducted. The best answers, however, saw more, and rightly pointed out that Thrasymachus' philosophical earnestness and his criticism of Socrates' methods lift him beyond the level of a one-dimensional bully or caricature of the nasty sophist.

### Plato 1 (b)

This was a different type of question. It required that a candidate state the argument clearly, and show understanding of it, but it did *not* ask for a philosophical critique of the passage (nor will future questions on this text). Some candidates offered such a critique: of these, some found plenty of time to answer the question as well, so that they did not in the end disadvantage themselves except by using up time, but others did not, and could be given small credit, as they were not doing what they were asked to do. Some stated the argument first, at greater or lesser length, and then gave examples of how the language helps to clarify it, which was fine as long as the remarks on language were not reduced to an afterthought such as 'Plato repeats the word  $\mu\alpha\tau\rho\zeta\eta$  a lot and there are many negatives...' The most successful answers considered argument and language *pari passu*: for example, 'Plato is stating that  $\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  do not serve their own interests but that of something else; he gives the example of medicine, saying  $\omicron\hat{\iota}k \dots \mu\alpha\tau\rho\kappa\alpha \mu\alpha\tau\rho\kappa\omicron \dots \{11\sim \sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  [translation...]; he then adds another skill, horse-management, to strengthen the point, and repeats the grammatical terms exactly in the same order as before:  $\omicron\hat{\iota}\delta\tau\mu \dots \{\mu\uparrow\mu\pi\iota\kappa\alpha \mu\uparrow\mu\pi\iota\kappa\omicron \{11' \frac{1}{2}\mu\uparrow\mu\pi\iota\kappa \dots\}$ , etc.

### Thucydides 2(a)

As the Mark Scheme shows, this passage is densely packed with evocative ideas and language; we did not expect candidates to pick out every conceivable point, although some did, and more – and achieved maximum marks as a result, provided that their analysis was as effective as their knowledge was compendious. But we do expect the passages as a whole to receive a reasonable degree of overall coverage, and candidates will not receive the highest marks if they omit major points of content. In this passage, these included: the reversal of the Athenians' fortunes; the effect on the soldiers of the sight and sounds of the unburied dead, and the living wounded; and the helpless sympathy for the wounded and the fear of worse to come that make the departure so hard. Some candidates, perhaps doing this passage as the first job on the paper, set off writing at inordinate length on the beginning, often finding significance where there is none ( $\{\mu\omicron\lambda\epsilon\lambda\omega\kappa\zeta\tau\epsilon\eta\}$  is indeed a long word, but it's the one that means what Thucydides needs to say), and found that they then had to rush.

Thucydides 2(b)

Nicias' speech is less one-dimensional than some candidates would have it. To receive the highest marks, candidates needed to see not only the positive points he makes in the interests of energising his men, but also the negatives that he does not hide from them. A balanced answer needed to take into account: that there is reasonable hope that the god(s) may now be on their side; wherever they go, they are still a formidable fighting force; but they must maintain discipline, and it is the responsibility of every man to ensure this; speed is imperative, and provisions are short, but safety is within reach; in conclusion, this is no place for cowards – think of your homes, or of Athens: „ndrej g}r ... kt1. There was less to say on the language front in this passage, though there were important points (for example, the structure of the second sentence from log·zesqe to +xanasftseien: see Markscheme), and the best answers included these too. A common red herring was to point out that Nicias uses imperatives a lot, and addresses his men as 'you'...

## Section B: Language

### 3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) (Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Markscheme)

- 1 o¶ m™n was often translated as 'the men', or the whole phrase as just 'the Thebans'. It was disappointing that Êrh often appeared as 'shore', presumably as if Latin *ora*.
- 2 +peidf ... +g™neto needed, and usually got, idiomatic translation. tetrwm™noj was not easy, and frequently done as 'turned'; proshn™cqh, though not universally known, usually made sense if kept as some kind of passive, though not all did this.
- 3 proslaÐnw, although common in Xenophon with the meaning 'ride', was allowed as 'drive'.
- 4 Ågdoƒkonta produced the usual number uncertainty, though not as bad as usual. Îploij was quite often 'hoplites'.
- 5 p}ntose and panto·oij, though probably not specifically known by most, were well done, especially the latter. +pel}qeto was not always known, but those who saw that qe·ou is not qeoð (the majority) had good suggestions for it.
- 6 ÷,n was very often confused with ÷}n, with disastrous effects on the syntax. Candidates are not expected to know the principles of accentuation, but it is expected that they are aware of different words that are accented in the same way, and think about which one they are dealing with. e»a caused less trouble than ÷,n.
- 7 prop™myai was surprisingly often not recognised as an infinitive, perhaps because of the word order. In this section, as in section 3, there were some 'horses' rather than 'horsemen'. Some thought that Ýwj can only mean 'while'.

Overall, though, the translation was well done, with a good number of correct versions, and generally good use of English.

(b) There was plenty to say on these lines, and most did not find it hard to make worthwhile points. Some, however, did not specify the Greek words their answers referred to, or did not translate them, which, as on set text passages, is essential for full credit.

- (c) (i) 'with' for sun- was not accepted.  
(ii) Some took İpo- as if it had been İper-.

(d) Numbers (ii) and (iv) caused most trouble: p·ptw was not enough, and many wrote sunp·ptw.

(e) (i) was correctly answered by almost all candidates.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

(ii) was not: it needed to be specified that Agesilaos could have been top man *in Asia*, and that if he went home he would not only rule, but be ruled. Many conflated and confused the two clauses.

(iii) 'He uses  $\mu\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\delta\epsilon$ ' is not sufficient answer to such a question: it is simple enough to state that these words contrast the two instances of  $\nu\sigma\mu\iota\mu\alpha$ , but many did not. Some said that  $\nu\sigma\mu\iota\mu\alpha$  is middle, but if the contrast with  $\nu\sigma\mu\iota\mu\alpha$  was brought out, credit was given.

### 3 Prose Composition

*(Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Markscheme)*

- 1 Usually good, but not all used the dative after  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$ .  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$  was common instead of  $\epsilon\kappa$ , and was considered as a minor error only.
- 2 The opportunity for subordination in 'she led' was frequently taken, and duly rewarded. The dative, again, was not always used after 'showed', but most people knew a word for 'show' and got a correct aorist. Some, here and later, made the participle agreeing with Timokleia masculine: this was of course only penalised once.
- 3 'When' was often done successfully as a genitive absolute, and  $\text{πολιορκ}\omega$  well used, though sometimes put in the active.
- 4 The first clause was better done as accusative, as the Thracian is in fact the object (or may be made the object) of the verb 'push', but since Greek authors not infrequently do use the genitive absolute in these circumstances, this was allowed. Some good compound verbs were used in this section. Those who used  $\text{ἐ}\nu\epsilon\lambda\theta\omega$  for 'get out' sometimes got its parts muddled;  $\text{ἐ}\nu\epsilon\lambda\theta\omega$  was an effective word, and easier to use.
- 5 There was more opportunity for subordination here. 'Realised' caused some problems, not least in the formation of the correct part of  $\text{ἀ}\nu\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ .
- 6  $\text{ὅ}\tau\iota$  ...  $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  was excellent here, as was  $\text{ὅ}\tau\iota$  ...  $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ . A relative clause was, of course, fine for 'Theagenes who', but the examiners liked  $\text{τ}\omega\delta\ \text{ὅ}\tau\iota$   $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\text{τ}\omega\delta\ \dots$   $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ . The aorist of  $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  caused some problems in formation, as did how to say 'against', and 'for'. Some, unfortunately, got the word for 'Greece' wrong.
- 7 Two parallel participles, or  $\text{ὅ}\tau\iota$  ...  $\text{ἐ}\nu\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  were looked on with approval here for 'words and what she had done'.
- 8 One or two candidates nicely used an active infinitive for 'to be set free'.

The glossed words were not always used well: there were a number of 'Orakoi' and 'τῆν φρεατῆα' (accusative singular) was quite common. Breathings were generally good, but there seems no reason why checking a composition through afterwards should not eliminate all, or almost all, errors in them. We did not insist on a connecting word at the beginning of the first sentence, but thereafter the omission of more than one was penalised. Candidates should be aware that  $\mu\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is not a connecting particle.

We do not expect candidates, with limited experience of Greek, to be able to write like Thucydides or Plato. 'Style' marks, therefore, are awarded for any reasonable and intelligent improvement on basic word order – or, indeed, on English word order. Subordination, appropriate connecting words when the English does not specify them, and usages such as some of those referred to above, will all earn marks for good style, and the passages are designed to encourage and elicit such improvements. Even less strong candidates generally gained some of the 'style' marks, and many easily got the maximum. It was encouraging to see that a good number of candidates opted for the composition as opposed to what is generally seen as the easier alternative, and mostly did very well, and it is to be hoped that this will encourage others to see that this option is by no means beyond their reach.

# Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H041)

## Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H441)

### Chief Examiner's Report

#### General Comments

The introduction of a new specification always presents a number of different challenges to setters, Examiners, teachers and candidates: new topics, new styles of questions, longer papers, new Assessment Objectives and new assessment grids. Now that the new specification has completed its first full cycle, it is satisfying to report that everyone rose to the challenge admirably! At both AS and A2 candidates continue to show their enjoyment of the topics they study in Classical Civilisation. They write with interest and enthusiasm, displaying strong personal response, even if the quality of English is not always as fluent or sophisticated as one might hope.

Examiners were concerned that the quality of written communication and legibility was significantly worse than in previous years. Poor spelling, punctuation and expression can impair the quality of even a well-structured response. Classical names and technical terms which were printed on the examination papers were frequently misspelt. The reports for the individual units explore these issues in greater depth.

In general, there were fewer rubric errors involving answering too many questions or attempting the mix and match approach, but only a small minority obeyed the rubric about starting the essay question on a new page of the answer book. In future, we should like to encourage candidates to start **each new part** of an answer on a new page in order to give Examiners sufficient space to write comments and the marks achieved.

#### AS Units

At AS the overall aggregation was much the same as last year, with candidates producing work broadly similar in standard to last year, but in individual units there was an improvement in standards. Moreover, some units, especially Roman Society and Thought, Greek Tragedy in its Context and City Life in Roman Italy, showed a pleasing increase in the number of candidates sitting the exams.

Examiners felt that some candidates under-performed because they indulged in generalised argument without supporting evidence or detailed reference to specific incidents in the texts. This was especially true of the Odyssey, Roman Society and the Greek Tragedy units. Candidates need to show Examiners that they have read the texts and not just a book of mythology or a book of notes. In the material culture units it is equally important for candidates to give precise evidence and make deductions from it. In addition, the team of Senior Examiners should like to reiterate a point from last year's report: the bullet points in the essay questions are there to give some general guidance but are not designed to limit the scope of a candidate's argument.

## **A2 Units**

At A2 the overall standard seemed to be much higher when compared to the legacy specification. This was especially true of Art and Architecture in the Greek World and Virgil and the World of the Hero units. The vast majority of candidates were well prepared and had a good deal of relevant information at their fingertips. The factors which differentiated between candidates tended to be the maturity with which some engaged with the material, both primary and secondary sources, and the focus on the questions posed. The ability to draw links between the different aspects of a topic, however, varied across the units. At best there were some superb synoptic responses in the Virgil and the World of the Hero unit, some perceptive arguments on the continuity of different forms of comedy into the modern world and some lively and vigorous discussions, with insightful observations, of the different art forms studied by the candidates.

Many candidates had studied material beyond that prescribed for individual units and were able to interweave it skilfully into their responses. Reference to a wider range of material or further reading is to be encouraged and is always credited **if it is relevant to the question**. A note of caution, however: such material should not be used to the exclusion of the prescribed material or material specified by a particular question. Of course, not everything that Examiners read was praiseworthy and there are areas which can be improved upon next year. Now that the A2 papers are longer, this gives candidates an hour to **plan and write** each of the two questions they are required to answer. Advice given at INSET in the Autumn was that candidates should spend five minutes of each hour reading the question/passage and planning their response. Examiners were disappointed, therefore, by the large number of very short answers, sometimes less than a side in several cases, and the lack of evidence of planning. Those candidates who did spend some time organising their thoughts, planning their answers and marshalling their material were, on the whole, much more focussed and thoughtful. Some candidates, however, produced lengthy, meandering answers which seemed to touch on the question almost by accident.

Another point to make is that candidates need to read the questions and take careful note of what is being asked of them. Failure to note precisely the angle of the question led to a frustrating lack of focus, and underdeveloped or poorly structured answers. Whilst there were no obvious rubric errors, some candidates had clearly spent a disproportionate amount of time on one part of the commentary question and this either led to cursory attempts at the essay question or, in a number of cases, led to candidates omitting the second part of the commentary question and/or the essay question.

# F381 Archaeology: Mycenae and the classical world

## General Comments

Examiners felt that there was a general improvement in the quality of responses this year. Although there were a few very weak scripts with very little applied knowledge of the subject most were either solid or very good indeed. Interestingly, in weaker scripts the performance in Section B seemed to be stronger than in Section A, possibly indicating that they had a better knowledge of archaeological techniques than Mycenaean archaeology. As in the previous session, a common area for improvement is the use of specific and relevant examples from archaeological sites. Many candidates failed to capitalise on solid argument through the lack of examples to illustrate the point or by concentrating on individual sites which were inappropriate for the technique under discussion.

Candidates seemed to cope well with the requirements of all the questions and, although some questions were more popular than others, the performance in each question seemed to be similar. Examiners noted that there was a pleasing range of examples being used, including not only the obvious, big sites, but also some more unusual or local ones. However, a small but noticeable minority wasted their effort by trying to bring in examples from outside the Classical world, including, Angkor Wat, Pharaonic Egyptian sites and prehistoric British sites. These examples were counted as irrelevant and failed to earn any credit.

Sadly, it was still a minority who could actually spell both Mycenaean and archaeology, despite both being on the question paper.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Commentary Questions

- 1 This was the more popular of the two commentary questions. However, performance in this question appeared to be similar to that in question 2.
  - (a) The photograph was known by almost everyone – only a few candidates failed to give it its proper name, but they still mentioned lions so seemed to know more or less what it was and its location. The greatest stumbling block seemed to be Mycenae's location within Greece. Only a handful of candidates attempted to describe its location and even fewer managed to do so accurately. Examiners were pleased by the number and variety of well-remembered details given, such as the correct material of the Lion Gate, its design as a funnel for the enemy to be trapped in, and the link that scholars have made with Agamemnon and lions in Homer.



- (b)** A few candidates were distracted by writing about art in general and forgetting the 'religion' aspect of the question, but the majority managed to stay on track and refer to relevant artefacts. This question saw the whole spectrum of answers, from the very weak ('they had an idol of a god so we know they had gods' type answers) to the very detailed and thoughtful. This question more than any other on the paper attracted the most 'stating the obvious' type responses. This was a shame as almost everyone knew at least one or two works of art that were relevant, but failed to draw solid conclusions from them and failed to capitalise on the knowledge.
- (c)** The most common mistakes with this question were a) not noticing the word 'building' in the question and talking about sites in general, b) trying to discuss as many buildings as possible in the time allowed and c) focusing solely on the building's contents to the exclusion of the building itself. Those who managed to avoid all these pitfalls generally had a lot to say and managed to draw interesting conclusions. Factual knowledge of Pylos in particular tended to be strong when the palace was used as an example.

**2** This proved to be the less popular of the two commentary questions.

- (a)** Everyone knew that the artefacts were masks and, excepting one misattribution to Troy, everyone knew they were from Mycenae. The material and the finder were also well known, and a good number came up with other interesting facts, such as Schliemann's statement upon finding object B. Very few attempted to place the objects in the correct graves. It should also be noted that for both this question and for 1(a) the dates were wildly placed, anywhere between 2000 – 1<sup>st</sup> century BC.
- (b)** This question tended to be well answered. There was a good range of facts, including not only bodies and wood but also other material such as seeds and leather. In general, the answers to this question were the most perceptive of any in Section A. Candidates regularly drew several sensible conclusions, such as dates, gender and lifestyle from human bones, and several went beyond this to consider such things as isotopic analysis or the glimpses of everyday life seen in the Vindolanda tablets.
- (c)** This was such a broad question that it did not create any significant difficulties. The prescription to discuss Mycenae led a few candidates to label what was obviously Pylos as Mycenae, whether inadvertently or not. It must be said that there were certainly some odd selections as the second site – a sizeable minority eschewed a proper site to talk about one building, such as the Chester amphitheatre or one particular house in Pompeii – which led to a somewhat skewed evaluation. Those who selected a more sensible comparison generally did try to evaluate the two sites and had thought about the issues involved – answers were often quite personal to the candidate.

## **Essay Questions**

- 3** This was the middle question in terms of popularity, but still received a good number of answers. It was also midway in terms of the standard of answer.

Knowledge in general was very strong and most candidates managed to provide accurate factual detail when answering this question. This year there was hardly any confusion between the different types of geophysical surveys, as compared to the equivalent question last year. Almost everyone came up with at least two different methods of surveying, and a good proportion of candidates poured a huge amount of detail into their answers. Linking the methods to examples was a very decisive discriminator between the weak/average responses and the good ones. There were very few erroneous examples – generally they were simply omitted instead, or one site was used for every single prospective/surveying method mentioned.

All but a few candidates struggled with the evaluative element of this question and there were very few that really satisfactorily grappled with the range of issues that could have been given. The majority were content to list the methods (sometimes with sites), but only to draw a very vague conclusion in a sentence at the end that 'survey is useful because we know where to excavate'. Often candidates knew why archaeologists surveyed (save time, save money, greater accuracy, prevent destruction, etc) but failed to link it to the body of their essay.

- 4** This was noticeably the most popular essay question and also produced the best responses. The weaker answers managed to find something to say on the topic, and the best dealt with it very skilfully.

Again, knowledge tended to be strong, although perhaps not quite as impressively detailed as in question 3. Factual accuracy on dating methods continued to trip up a few candidates. Examiners were pleased to see that some candidates went beyond the obvious dating and surveying developments and looked at such matters as underwater archaeology, the use of computers and databases, GIS and facial reconstruction. Those who engaged with the question had a lot to say. However, as for question 3, the ability to link the technique with an example proved a clear discriminator.

Also as for question 3, there was a sizeable proportion who continued to produce a 'shopping list' of techniques (and sometimes examples), but who did not do much with it. However, this question did afford the opportunity for all candidates to find something useful to say (such as improved accuracy of dating). It should also be noted that a few candidates decided to repeat the questions from last year's paper and did not engage with the specific wording of this year's question.

- 5** There were not many answers to this question and few that were very strong. Its apparent lack of requirement to know specific facts (as opposed to the other two questions) seemed to attract weaker responses.

The wording of the question seemed to be ignored by almost every candidate who answered this question ('choose **two** sites and compare'), as the majority simply wrote about about how sites could be presented, without linking them to specific examples, and certainly without creating a consistent analysis between two sites. Sometimes it was clear that a candidate had been to one site they selected, and here the personal insight was valuable and interesting, but it was rarely upheld for the rest of the essay. This was a shame as several candidates' views were both personal and well thought-out, but hardly ever turned into a proper comparison.

One rather baffling answer wrote about the film 'Troy' for the entire essay, as a way of presenting the site to the public in an 'extremely accurate' way!

## F382 Homer's *Odyssey* and Society

### General Comments

Candidates seem to have engaged well with the *Odyssey* as literature. This year they showed a particularly good grasp of its context, with strong awareness of the original audience with few anachronistic comments. The register used for written work was generally appropriate, showing improvement from last year: some candidates used bullet points for the part (a) question in Section A, which is perfectly acceptable; in other questions candidates used full sentences and avoided the note form which was sometimes a problem last year. Spelling of classical names was reasonable, with the notable exception of 'Polyphemus' (frequently 'Polythemus'), which suggests that some candidates were spelling it phonetically. The best essays were divided clearly into paragraphs; some candidates had plenty of interesting ideas but were not able to access the highest marks because they did not organise them into a coherent argument. Technical terms such as 'simile', 'xenia' and 'kleos' were used effectively by a large majority of candidates.

Although many candidates showed a wide knowledge of the *Odyssey*, there were a disappointing number who could use only the most obvious scenes to support their arguments. Candidates should aim to include a wide range of details, rather than relying on a handful of episodes. The problem of making up false quotations was far less prevalent than last year, but still occurred occasionally.

The best answers to part (c) and essay questions were from candidates who appeared to be engaging with the task directly and thinking on the spot. Some answers appeared to be minimally adapted from prepared essays and therefore, although they could often gain credit for a good range of factual knowledge, were not fully relevant to the question and did not show a thoughtful engagement with the task. Thus superficially good essays could not be awarded high marks because they did not answer the question set. Candidates seemed familiar with the format of the paper: there were very few rubric errors or obvious problems with timing.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Commentary Questions

- 1 (a) Most candidates were able to give a clear account of what happened on the island of Aeolia, though some insisted on continuing their accounts to include the Laestrygonians and Circe. The main confusion lay in the contents of the bag: some thought that Aeolus put all the winds inside, and others that he put only useful winds in it. Some candidates who gave otherwise sound answers added fabrications such as that Aeolus instructed Odysseus not to let his men open the bag.

- (b) Candidates analysed the thoughts and feelings of Odysseus and his men well. Most covered Odysseus and his men effectively, though some did not mention the men's change of feelings in the last paragraph, where they were 'in tears'. Some understood 'tempest' purely metaphorically as 'rage', leading to less effective analysis here. The final sentence ('Covering my head with my cloak, I lay where I was in the ship.') caused some difficulties among those candidates who sensibly chose to discuss it. Answers that focused on embarrassment or shame were less convincing than those that suggested despair or isolation, as were those who asserted that Odysseus 'probably' or 'must have' felt a certain way without supporting their claims with reference to the text.

There were some excellent comments that showed an understanding of the difference between Odysseus' feelings at the time of the incident and those when he retold it to the Phaeacians.

A few candidates did not direct their answers at this question, discussing instead how Homer made the passage vivid (question 2(b)).

- (c) Candidates who focused on communication, rather than being drawn into prepared essays about leadership, often gave very good answers. They discussed communication as a two-way affair, requiring listening as well as speaking, and allowed the possibility that Odysseus' men might have made the wrong decisions even if Odysseus' communication skills were good. Only a few candidates could give details of such things as Odysseus' speech to his men on arrival at Aea or his interactions with Eurylochus. Weaker answers simply listed a few occasions when Odysseus spoke to his men, without analysing the effectiveness of the communication. A few ignored the passage about the bag of winds, or focused on this episode alone.

- 2 (a) There were a few exceptionally good answers to this question, including a large number of the incidents referred to in the mark scheme, such as Penelope asking Phemius not to sing about the Trojan War and then being sent to her room by Telemachus. A rather large number of answers, however, failed to get beyond the fact that Penelope cried a lot and set up some kind of trick involving unpicking her work. Candidates frequently thought she was sewing, knitting or spinning rather than weaving, and that the product was a cloak or tapestry, or a shroud for Odysseus rather than Laertes. Many did not explain the context of the passage, that Penelope had arranged the meeting in order to question the 'beggar' about her husband.
- (b) There were many good answers to this question, with candidates quoting individual words and short phrases rather than making general points or quoting a passage several lines long. Most candidates attempted to explain why descriptions were vivid, for example discussing Homer's use of colour (purple, golden) and explaining how the comparison with an onion skin conveyed the brilliance, the colour and the texture of the tunic. Weaker answers simply noted the similes, or explained them in a way that would apply to any simile in the *Odyssey*.

- (c) Most candidates could give some examples of Penelope and Odysseus testing, though many were surprisingly vague on facts about Odysseus, and the episode of the bed test was not well understood, with many candidates claiming that Penelope asked Odysseus a series of questions about the bed.

The passage itself was often analysed well, with perceptive comments about the way in which Odysseus and Penelope were each testing the other. This led to some interesting discussion of why the testing happened, including testing identity, loyalty and willingness to fight. Some candidates extended their analyses to make convincing distinctions between Odysseus and Penelope, for example claiming that Odysseus' tests were based on deception whereas Penelope's were more straightforward, and that Odysseus wanted to test character, or were perhaps just for fun or from habit (Laertes), whereas Penelope wanted to test the more basic issue of identity.

### Essay Questions

- 3 This was a very popular question (about Odysseus' motivation for returning home), and elicited some top quality answers. There was a pleasing awareness of other motivations, such as the desire for *kleos* (glory/reputation) and the role of booty acquisition in this. Many of the best answers discussed what was expected of a Homeric hero. Most candidates knew the Calypso episode well, and used it effectively to support their arguments. Fewer, but still a good number, discussed the year on Aea and the need for his men to remind Odysseus to continue his voyage. Some made good use of the conversation between Odysseus and Anticleia in the underworld and a wide range of other details. Some candidates took *nostos* to be completed with the arrival back in Ithaca, others with the reclamation of the palace from the suitors: either approach is valid, especially if the candidate explains his/her decision.
- 4 There were some weak answers here which discussed gods and goddesses vaguely without reference to the *Odyssey*, or limiting their answer to an account of how Athene helps Odysseus. However, the majority of candidates engaged successfully with the task, giving at least some basic examples, often referring to Athene, Zeus, Hermes and Poseidon in the *Odyssey* and using the story of the adultery of Ares and Aphrodite very effectively.
- Better answers did more than list 'good' and 'bad' actions of the gods; they engaged with the concept of a role model, identifying what was expected of a Homeric mortal. Many commented that Poseidon's insistence on avenging his son was appropriate in the Homeric world and equivalent to Odysseus' punishment of the suitors. Some explained that Greek gods were not thought of as role models, including interesting discussions of gods and morality.
- 5 There were very few answers to this question. As this is primarily a literary unit based on the *Odyssey*, to score high marks, candidates needed to give illustrations from the *Odyssey* and to show understanding of the complex composition of the poem.

## F383 Roman Society and Thought

### General Comments

This year there was a rise in the entry for this unit which is encouraging. Questions elicited a wide variety of answers which made the marking process very rewarding and interesting. The mark scheme can only be indicative of the wide range of approaches to answering any particular question.

Answers showed a sound knowledge of literature with detailed references made to the texts. However, as a general guidance for improvement, answers could include more detail from Roman society.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Commentary Questions

- 1
- (a) There was a general knowledge of the privy council with some answers making reference to the 'friendship' (the term *amici* was used by many), and some ideas over 'possible' purposes of meetings. Many referred to the subject matter of Satire 4 and better answers made reference to Pliny and Augustus.
  - (b) This was answered well for the most part, with 'drawn white faces' and 'quailed' being favourite references. There was some confusion between 'Crispus' and 'Crispinus' and reference to the inverted commas around 'friendship'. Better answers referred to the simile of Crispus and analysed the depiction of Domitian as the cause of this fear (scourge, plague) with one reference to him as the 'elephant in the room'.
  - (c) Better answers made clear distinctions between 'mocking' and 'angry', most using Satire 4 as 'mocking' and Satire 3 as 'angry'. Some made even greater differentiation and the best answers discussed the nature of mock epic and Juvenal's vitriol. Some answers made no real distinction but rather listed satirical or funny comments or lacked a range of examples.
- 2
- (a) Many answers offered the basic information, but the best mentioned Trimalchio's status as an Augustalis and his money making schemes (particularly impressive was the knowledge that Fortunata sold her jewellery and clothes to help fund his second venture). Some answers focussed on the bath incident which is on the same day as the dinner party.
  - (b) Again, this was a well-answered question, though better answers showed more thoughtful consideration of the different effects which different literary techniques had, (ie the exotic dates, multi-sensory effects of size and sound, texture of woven/embroidered). Many candidates seemed to use a list of literary techniques without giving examples from the passage or considering how they made the passage 'vivid'. It is appreciated that the text is in translation and, although discussion of almost all literary devices is credited, focus on punctuation should be avoided.

- (c) On the whole this question was well-answered. Candidates clearly enjoy the *Dinner*, though less successful answers made no mention of events outside of the given passage. Many answers stated that '*Dinner with Trimalchio*' is a satire, but few developed this to say what it was satirising. Better answers made reference to Petronius' contemporaneous society and/or analysed the different kinds of humour. Some answers considered other elements as being more important, besides humour, such as Trimalchio's character and the food or entertainment which was credited.
- 3 This was a popular question but in too many cases was misinterpreted as a question on 'city versus country' and a few answers made no mention of the countryside whatsoever.

A suitable introduction to this answer would have been a general overview of what life was like in the countryside. Many answers focussed on the disastrous state of Rome in Juvenal Satire 3. Some credit was given for discussion of the city when used in an argument to compare with the countryside. The tale of the town mouse was frequently cited though often with no mention of the country mouse. Better answers considered Horace's Satires and evaluated the possible weaknesses of the country – thieves, hard labour and even mention of the confiscation of farms by Octavian. The best answers could draw on detailed knowledge of the text with reference to Juvenal's claim of being the owner of a single lizard, or Horace 1.1 where the lawyer and farmer want to swap roles. The question differentiated by giving the opportunity to discuss Horace and the countryside with readily available information but requiring deeper thought for examples from Juvenal and/or Pliny.

- 4 A very well answered question with many able to show a range of contextual as well as textual knowledge. Many answers made reference to Fortunata and even made some distinction between her and well-bred women such as Arria and Ummidia. Many criticised Pliny's reaction to his wife's miscarriage but also felt he had a genuinely loving relationship with Calpurnia. The best answers referred to Regulus preying on defenceless old ladies and Juvenal's references for example to Locusta. Less successful answers listed instances of women being mentioned in the authors without evaluation, many choosing to evaluate at the end rather than during the course of the answer.
- 5 Many answers revealed a good understanding of ancient society, but some were less successful in comparing it with the modern world. The better answers considered a range of writers and attitudes and the best structured their answers by argument, not author. Some answers considered modern comedians and media with appropriate links to ancient authors. However, others made little reference to the ancient texts and gave no clear answer to the question.



## F384 Greek Tragedy in its context

### General Comments

This year, Greek Tragedy has not only maintained its popularity amongst students of Classical Civilisation, but seems to have increased its candidature. The candidates have continued to show how much they enjoy and appreciate all of the plays they have studied. There was a clear empathy with the characters and their situations seen in the personal responses of the candidates, who also showed an awareness of the dynamics at work in the plays. Although most of the candidates dealt with the plays, with better textual knowledge than previous years evident, some still concentrated on the myth. The historical context was sometimes overused at the expense of material from the texts. A pleasing improvement was seen in the use of the passages to answer the (b) parts of the Commentary Questions.

There were still ongoing problems in a number of areas, such as the misspelling of names, with the usual suspects (Euripides, Laius, Dionysus, Aegisthus). A very common error was the inability to spell 'villain' despite it being in the question. Misspelling and misuse of technical terms (*anagnoresis*, *peripeteia*, and this year, *kleos*), and using sympathy and empathy without distinction showed no improvement from last year.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Commentary Questions

Question 1 from *Agamemnon* was more popular than Question 2 from *Bacchae*.

- 1      (a)      Candidates were generally secure on the details of events leading up to the passage, although some did go back to the beginning of the play. Many otherwise good answers neglected to mention the interaction between Agamemnon and the Chorus before Clytemnestra's speech to Agamemnon.
- (b)      Most candidates were able to make valid comments on the language and on the confrontation between Clytemnestra and the Chorus. However, a surprisingly large number did not discuss the situation on stage, despite the prompt in the question.
- (c)      Candidates were able to discuss Clytemnestra's masculine qualities in the passage, and compare her behaviour here to the rest of the play. References were made to her dominance over the other characters (although very few could spell 'manoeuvres') and her skill in speaking. Many candidates contrasted her masculine behaviour, such as killing Agamemnon, with her feminine side, giving this as the reason for her actions (maternal bond with Iphigenia and jealousy of Cassandra). These answers were balanced and produced some very interesting discussions.
  
- 2      (a)      Candidates generally knew the main details of the play leading up to the passage. However, a significant number spent too much time giving the story of Dionysus' conception and birth, at the expense of details about events in the play. Many omitted any mention of the entry of the Chorus.

- (b) Candidates were able to use the passage to discuss Pentheus' feelings about Teiresias and Cadmus. There was some confusion about the orders to destroy Teiresias' 'oracular seat' with many candidates thinking that this referred to Dionysus. Justification was tackled less well. Many answers ignored the situation in Thebes, and stated that Pentheus should not be rude to his elders, and that they should be allowed to worship whichever god they liked.
- (c) This question produced a full range of answers. Better answers were able to deal with Cadmus' advice in the passage, and his warning to Pentheus, as well as his appearance at the end to bring Agaue back to reality, and his punishment at the hands of Dionysus, despite actually worshipping him. Some candidates did not discuss the latter sections of the play. Weaker answers concluded that he was not important because he did not appear much in the play, but better answers analysed his contribution to the plot and the development of Pentheus' character.

### Essay Questions

Of the three essay questions, Question 4 was by far the most popular. Question 3 was attempted by a number of candidates, while Question 5 proved to be the least popular. Candidates were able to produce a good range of detail, and some sound arguments based on a good knowledge of the text. However, like last year, many candidates failed to realise that the bullet points are there as a guide and a help to answering the question, rather than a strict essay plan. Also, an increased number of candidates answered the essay question mainly by summarising the plot of the relevant play(s) with little by way of analysis, or seemed to write essays on a similar theme without taking account of the question set.

- 3 Candidates who tackled this question showed a good textual knowledge. There were some thoughtful answers, dealing both with the 'detective story' aspect of the play (many compared it to modern books/films/TV programmes) and those features of the play which took it beyond the genre. Weaker answers discussed features such as Fate, Dramatic Irony and knowledge, but with little reference to the proposition in the question. There were also a number of answers which seemed more concerned with *Oedipus the King* as the perfect Greek Tragedy rather than as a 'detective story'.
- 4 This was overwhelmingly the most popular essay question. Candidates were fully engaged with the question, with good discussion of both characters, and plenty of appreciation of their respective positions. They were able to consider both Medea and Jason, looking at the factors which made them either a victim or a villain. They were also able to analyse the differing reactions of a contemporary audience, and a modern one. Many answers were not balanced, dealing mainly or solely with Medea, with Jason being under-represented or simply being treated as a typical male of his time. A surprisingly large number of candidates concluded that Medea was more of a victim than a villain, despite the murders of Creon and Glauce, because she **had** to kill her children. There were a substantial number of candidates who discussed sympathy/pity for the characters with little reference to which was a victim or villain.

- 5** There were only a few answers to this question but candidates had plenty of material with which to answer it. As last year, a large number of candidates tried to deal with all four plays, which limited the detail they could use. In most cases, only writing about two plays may have benefited the candidates. Some candidates produced thoughtful and well-considered answers dealing with the limitations and advantages of the plots being known. However, there were a large number of answers which simply summarised the plots of the plays, without considering the ramifications of the question.

## F385 Greek Historians

### General Comments

There was a general feeling that the answers were stronger this year, perhaps reflecting more confident teaching. Plutarch was much more popular this year which may also reflect the fact that this new specification has had a year to bed in.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Commentary Questions

There was no discernible preference for either option.

- 1
- (a) This was answered well by the majority of candidates, who knew the context for the speech. The number of candidates achieving high marks for this type of question was substantially higher than in the previous session, indicating that candidates are more confident with the level of knowledge and understanding required by these questions.
  - (b) Although some answers tried to recycle prepared material on Thucydides and his style of writing, the stronger responses were those that focussed on the passage and used it intensively. Some were distracted into describing speeches in more general terms, but they did not focus on this particular speech.
  - (c) Some candidates were clearly hoping for a question on bias and really made something of this. Although several used broad brush strokes to answer this, the stronger answers were those that managed to focus on the aspects required by the question – the treatment of the Athenians and the non-Athenians. Stronger answers tended to be the ones that were able to cite specific examples and incidents.
- 2
- (a) This was something of a Marmite question, with candidates either loving it and being able to answer with a comprehensive account of the battle of Salamis, or hating it and being unable to answer with sufficient detail. Some, unfortunately, tried to tell the Examiners about completely different battles.
  - (b) This tended to be well-answered by candidates. Most were able to make use of the passage and use specific examples from the text to show how the passage was exciting. The Examiners were particularly pleased by some very perceptive reading between the lines.
  - (c) Most responses to this were strong, showing a sound understanding of the nature of historiography and the usefulness, or otherwise, of Plutarch as an historical source. Some relied on generalisations without using the passage or other parts of the text as evidence, but these were not the stronger responses.

## **Essay Questions**

Question 3 was the most popular option, followed by 5, with 4 being the least popular.

- 3** This was generally well-answered, with candidates being able to produce several useful examples and references to specific individuals. Xerxes was used by the vast majority of candidates. There were some rather weak responses that relied on vague generalisations about the question. Higher marks were awarded to those that could use actual examples and evaluate their value in a work of historiography.
- 4** Few answered this question and several of those who did attempt it did not manage to understand what was being asked of them and tended to discuss Thucydides' skill as a historian, which was not totally relevant to the question. However, there were some strong responses that took examples from Thucydides and assessed their worthiness for posterity.
- 5** Although not as popular as question 3, Plutarch has clearly become a popular author. Several answers impressed the Examiners with their detailed knowledge of his work. There were some very strong answers, and these were the ones that tended to compare two authors directly, rather than listing examples from Plutarch before moving onto the other author. Some read the question and answered it without reading the prompts which did not help to create a strong answer.

## F386 City Life in Roman Italy

### General Comments

There was a rise in the entry for this unit which is pleasing. Many clearly have enjoyed their study of the cities in this unit and it was felt that the quality of answers had also improved.

### Comments on Individual Questions

All the questions allowed for a variety of answers and interpretations and so the mark scheme can only be indicative of the wide range of approaches to answering any particular question.

### Commentary Questions

- 1 (a) Most were able to describe *opus craticium* with varying detail, from the basic frame to mention of Vitruvius. Possible reasons for its use which were suggested were: cheap; space saving with thin walls; speed of building after the earthquake of AD 62.
- (b) There are many versions of the internal arrangements of the House in Opus Craticium so answers referring to 'room 2b' or 'entrance 13' needed to offer some description to gain credit. Credit was given for a range of possible internal arrangements. In general there had to be some appreciation of the change by the creation of flats: the separate staircases/access. There should also have been some assessment of the success of these changes such as the ability to have private access. Surprisingly, very few discussed the balcony.
- (c) Evidence here could have been drawn from: the House in Opus Craticium and the Samnite House, Herculaneum; the Garden Houses and the Insula of Diana in Ostia. Candidates were at liberty to come to any reasoned conclusion about what life was like but as ever answers supported with specific detail were the most successful.
- 2 (a) All but a very few identified the amphitheatre as the building for holding gladiatorial shows. On the whole knowledge of the amphitheatre was good but the best answers focussed on describing the building itself. Only a few, however, actually described the shape. A range of detail is expected, so focus only on the seating tended to limit an answer.
- (b) This question had a wide scope for interpretation. Some credit was allowed for discussion of the passage and for the contextual knowledge of gladiatorial fights. Such answers tended to be general and lacked specific detail. Better answers discussed the riot described by Tacitus in detail by naming Regulus and the Nucerni and remembering that children also died.

Also discussed was the wall painting with impressive knowledge of details such as the number of fighters shown in the arena. Some better answers referred to what Petronius goes on to say after the printed passage about 'half pint gladiators'. Some felt that these were only minor set backs and that on the whole gladiatorial shows were successful.

- (c) Most answers appreciated that the games would provide a boost in Pompeii's tourism and trade – in some cases citing the wall painting as showing stalls outside the amphitheatre. Credit was given for the mention of the same material as in a previous question (ie wall painting) when used in a different way. It was similarly felt that the riot tarnished Pompeii's reputation. Evidence here could also have been drawn from knowledge of inscriptions as this is how wealthy citizens of Pompeii could enhance their reputation. Here details were offered of: those who built the amphitheatre; those who refurbished it and those who donated lighting or put on shows. Discussion of the Colosseum and the emperors was not appropriate for this question which was focussed specifically on Pompeii.

## Essay Questions

- 3 This was a popular question but in a few cases was misinterpreted as a question on 'life of luxury in Pompeii and Herculaneum' and a very few answers made no mention of the *domus* whatsoever, describing the baths and theatre instead. Neither was the question a comparison between the housing of the rich and poor, although some credit was afforded those who felt that some owners fell on hard times and had to sell off their garden – as in the case of the Samnite House in Herculaneum. Life for these would not have been so luxurious.

Answers which were the most successful were those which discussed the houses of Menander and the Stags, as well as other houses such as the houses of Octavius Quartio and Umbricius Scaurus. Full marks were available to answers which used detail from houses in the specification. However, there was an opportunity to offer detail from other houses and those mentioned included: the House of the Faun; the House of the Wooden Partition; the House of the Mosaic Atrium. The principal focus was on the layout of houses, decoration and use of space as well as an assessment of lifestyle. Decoration could cover named mosaics, wall paintings and statues. However, too many answers made reference to styles of painting such as 'Fourth style' without explanation or examples. Similarly reference to the 'paintings in room 23' with no further detail gained little credit.

- 4 A well answered question with many able to show a range of contextual as well as archaeological knowledge. Many answers made reference the temple of Isis in Pompeii and the various Mithraea in Ostia but without widening the scope to other temples, tombs and shrines. These answers were limited by the range of examples offered. The best answers referred to named examples of a wide range of religious buildings and artefacts including state religion, cults, Judaism and Christianity. Less successful answers listed buildings without evaluation of what the evidence tells us.
- 5 Many answers revealed a good understanding of the degree of danger of living in a Roman society, with Ostia being deemed the most dangerous. More general answers considered theft from the rich in Herculaneum and the risk of living in a port. Some answers referred to the specific damage caused by the earthquake in Pompeii and, of course, the eruption of Vesuvius. Better answers considered a range of dangers such as fires in Ostia and the resulting Fire fighters' barracks to protect the grain in the warehouses; piracy was considered; the account of the killer whale was also remembered.

# F387 Roman Britain: life in the outpost of the Empire

## General Comments

The Examiners are pleased to report that the structure and composition of the new examination paper set on Roman Britain, appears to have been tackled without too many problems. This new course includes the study of inscriptional evidence, which, while familiar in the legacy Ancient History specification, had not been required by the legacy Classical Civilisation Roman Britain units. While it was anticipated that questions using epigraphic evidence would take a little while to bed in, those who attempted Question 2 did not seem to struggle and performance was similar across both the Commentary Questions.

In terms of performance and quality, the range seen by the team of Examiners was extremely wide. The most thorough and carefully-crafted responses paid close attention to detail in all parts, referring to relevant points concerning the sources provided in the Commentary Questions and deploying detailed factual knowledge relevant to the question. Responses to all four questions were seen at this level. At the other end of the scale, there were significant numbers of answers in which there was very little evidence of any detailed factual knowledge or contextual understanding. A substantial number of responses seemed to regard towns or roads in Roman Britain as some kind of permanent entities, and there was little awareness of change over time or development during the occupation period. This need for candidates to be aware of the context of examples discussed may require additional emphasis during teaching, particularly if a thematic approach is taken to the introduction of topics.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Commentary Questions

The anticipated division in popularity between Questions 1 and 2 was borne out by candidates' responses, with about 80% opting for the Rudston Venus question, and about 20% choosing to answer the question on inscriptions.

- 1 (a) This question was mostly done quite well. The question specified a discussion of 'artistic representations'. Examples needed to be of 'Roman gods and goddesses', and while the Examiners were prepared to stretch a point and include characters such as Orpheus and/or the Roman emperors Claudius and Hadrian, choices such as the *genii cucullati* were not relevant. Useful examples regularly cited included Mercury from Uley and Minerva from Bath and the best responses focused on detail here and saved wider discussion for part (b). There were some good, delicately-worded comments on the finer points of the Rudston Venus (if 'finer' is an appropriate epithet here) with some sensible comparisons. There were also some responses with good awareness of the rest of Rudston panel, in terms of artistic quality and content. However, some of the strikingly obvious detail in the printed source was passed over in silence, be it detailed description and comment about the hair, proportions of the limbs, exaggerated hips and obvious genitalia. Some responses showed evidence of either not looking closely at the images of these artefacts or mindlessly repeating criticisms from secondary sources. Other weaker responses simply described the images printed on the question paper.



- (b) This question opened up the possibilities for a wider discussion making use of any art form. The key word we hoped would prompt some discussion of change over time was 'emerged'; but this was quite rarely dealt with. A number of solid answers were seen which began with well-known Pre Roman Iron Age examples, then discussed classic Roman art, and concluded with equally solid examples to illustrate 'fusion', such as the Bath Gorgon, Rudston's Venus or the Hoxne 'pepper pot'.
- 2 (a) This question differed from 1(a) in that full marks were theoretically possible in an answer which concentrated solely on the *usefulness* of the inscriptions and the contextual material subscribed to each. This question was done extremely well by a few, and less well by many although most were on the right lines. Some candidates did not seem to realise that they had to *evaluate* the inscriptions on the paper – and a few others did not even refer to them, apparently answering a general 'what do we learn from inscriptions ...?' question.
- Inscription (i) caused confusion for a few candidates who assumed that the altar was found on a *Roman* old market site; and some had very limited knowledge of the cult of Asklepios, 'Hygeia' and 'Panakeia'. The best responses noted that this cult is without parallel in Britain, noted the name Antiochus (possibly of Eastern origins, certainly not Roman or Celtic) and the military location.
- Inscription (ii) was evaluated better, with a good number of candidates picking up details about the rank of the benefactor and the pre-existence of Isis' cult ('had collapsed through old age').
- Inscription (iii) elicited some good contextual knowledge but having described Mithraism in a fairly solid way they did not note the location either of this or of other Mithraea in military contexts, which has a bearing on 'useful'.
- (b) This question was intended to open up the discussion. Candidates whose focus had been poor in (a) often repeated material in this answer. There was a good spread of knowledge about 'foreign cults'; the term is used in the specification with the normal fairly narrow sense of 'foreign to Rome' – thus embracing Isis, Mithras, Cybele, at a pinch Dionysus, and definitely Christianity. The Examiners were prepared to allow the sense of 'foreign to Britain' if this was made clear by the candidate – though inclusion of the imperial cult and the Capitoline triad tended to weaken the discussion of 'how far' and 'widely practised', the latter element rarely being addressed in any depth. Discussion of town v. country, military v. civilian, and chronological issues – let alone the dearth of material on most of these, including Christianity – was all grist to the mill.

## **Essay Questions**

In the case of the essays, about a third of candidates chose to tackle the importance of roads in the economic development of Roman Britain, and two-thirds tried to explore the extent of the contribution made by the development of towns to the Romanisation of Britain. There was of course some opportunity for candidates to incorporate some knowledge of roads in the essay on towns and vice-versa! In developing an evaluated response to either question, such crossover is inevitable. There were also some responses in which a very general attempt at tackling the question set (or ignoring it all together and simply discoursing on Romanisation) made it hard from reading the essay to work out exactly which topic was being attempted, despite the number placed in the margin.

Problems with very short answers, lack of plans and limited use of specific examples or awareness of context were particularly evident in the essay questions.

- 3** The better responses were marked out by an awareness of the development of roads during the Roman occupation, their primary purposes, and then their secondary but still important role as catalysts for economic growth. The use of the term 'economic development' in the question served to differentiate between those answers which simply discussed the 'economy of Britain' as though it were an undifferentiated reality with no geographical or temporal variations, from those with a more measured and perceptive approach.

The better responses also made use of specific examples of villas in close proximity to roads (and therefore towns) and some answers linked the provision of roads to international traffic at ports, either directly or via rivers. There were also some good detailed examples of pottery industries and mineral extraction being dependent to an extent on roads, and the Vindolanda letter about the bad state of roads was often noted and well evaluated. Other causes of economic growth were frequently mentioned and these were used to lead to a supported and evaluated conclusion which addressed 'how important' very clearly. Less focused and supported answers adopted a 'kitchen sink' approach almost from the outset, with little or no actual evidence included.

Some candidates asserted that 'there was no means of communication before the Romans came'; Centres need to give a realistic picture of Pre-Roman Iron Age Britain to dispel some of these myths.

- 4 This question also included a number of aspects which differentiated between candidates. First, there was the obvious need to address 'to what extent'; but also to explore 'development of towns' (ie not just their existence) and 'contributing to the Romanisation of Britain'. This needed a bit of unpicking and exploring, and was carefully evaluated in answers gaining marks in the top bands of the marking grids. Sadly, most answers were not so perceptive.

Often candidates tried to cite a range of evidence starting with *oppida*, sometimes with named examples, followed by outlines of the various different kinds of towns found in Britain, with or without a few named examples but with no sense of chronological development. There was some attempt at engaging with 'to what extent' but without context these arguments tended towards the superficial. As an example of this kind of muddle, one answer noted (a) the implantation of *civitas* capitals such as Wroxeter and Cirencester, and then (b) discussed the role and purpose of *coloniae* such as Colchester, Lincoln and York, and then (c) brought in Boudicca and her rebellion as an instance of resistance to this policy imposed by the Romans. Given that most of the towns cited post-date Boudicca, it is hard to regard such discussion as well-founded. In terms of evidence Examiners found that middling responses were improved if candidates had a firm grasp of a set number of examples to which they could refer, rather than a general awareness of what sorts of buildings were in towns. Common generalisations were that all towns had amphitheatres, theatres or substantial bath-houses and the distribution of towns across Britain was rarely discussed.

## **F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World**

### **General Comments**

Examiners were pleased by the overall standard of the answers in this first year of the new Art and Architecture specification, and delighted by some individual responses. Many candidates had a good knowledge of the prescribed material and some showed knowledge of examples beyond those required by the specification. The level of engagement and personal response shown by candidates of all abilities was impressive. This was particularly shown in the questions on the Amasis Painter and the metopes.

There were some common errors which appeared in a large number of answers:

- confusion between a painted line and an incised line;
- the belief that the background in the black-figure technique was white;
- use of the word carving to mean incision;
- the use of the verb built in connection with statues and vases;
- the use of the term vocal point instead of focal point;
- the confusion of Polykleitos and Praxiteles.

There were no rubric errors but there were several papers where candidates did not answer the (b) part of the commentary question or the essay because they failed to allocate their time effectively. As with other units this year, the level of legibility, spelling and general quality of written communication gave examiners cause for concern. As well as the usual problems with symmetry, repetition, anatomy and confusion between sculptor and sculpture there were several new misspellings this year: Meanads, Kirace Warriors, Catriyatids, complexed (for complex), exadurated (for exaggerated), intent (for intense), kneck (for neck), verital (for vertical). There was some useful new vocabulary employed – words such as inovention and crudimentary.

### **Comments on Individual Questions**

#### **Commentary Questions**

The vase-painting question was by far the most popular with around 90% of the candidates tackling this question. The relatively small number of candidates who answered the question on temple architecture often showed a good deal of personal insight.

- 1 (a) This question was a pleasure to mark and most candidates wrote at length, clearly enjoying interpreting the various decorative elements of the image of Dionysus and the Maenads. A pleasing number knew the technical names for the patterns and the parts of the vase, and did a thorough description, including the central panel and the vase as a whole.

The best answers analysed the visual ideas of the painter, exploring the effects he was able to achieve with the limited artistic tools at his disposal. Others were too concerned with whether the painting was literally a 'decorative delight', and, having explored some successful aspects, they went on to a sharp recantation in 'part 2' of the answer, saying it was not a decorative delight because the image was unrealistic: the feet and hands were too big and pointed, the frontal eyes were wrong, the Maenads' arms were deformed, the Maenads were indistinguishable, you couldn't see the animals against the dress, or the kantharos against the robe, and the image was too flat. A blended argument worked much better, where the archaic features were acknowledged, but accounted for in terms of the style of the period.

There are several other points which Examiners were pleased to note:

- the equal balance between the Maenad group and the weightier Dionysus;
- the contrast of skin colour – black/clay colour with outline (though many said the Maenads were painted white);
- the interesting positions of all 6 arms – the pattern made by the two Maenads together and Dionysus' arm positions mirroring those of the two Maenads;
- exploration of the clothing patterns, which distinguishes between the characters whilst adding richness;
- the incision is very fine and added colour enriches the design;
- the ivy branches enhance the movement of the Maenads, and are created with a mix of painting on the background and incision against the black dresses.

- (b) There was a range of pots from the specification which could be used to answer this question, from the François Vase to the lekythoi depicting the Wedding Procession and the Women Weaving and Exekias' pots depicting Achilles and Ajax and Dionysus sailing. Some candidates went beyond the prescribed material to mention the pots depicting Achilles and Penthesilea and Ajax. Not everyone could remember detail of the François vase, with many candidates wrongly assuming that there is a profusion of filling ornaments on the volute krater, or even confusing Kleitias with Sophilos and his animal processions. Of course, there were many who were keen to list all the myths included on the different narrative friezes on the François vase. There was often detailed comment and discussion of the Troilos frieze. A few candidates were able to compare the frieze depicting the wedding of Peleus and Thetis with the Wedding Procession lekythos but seemed unaware of how small the latter pot is – leading to some insecure comparisons and conclusions.

Detail of Exekias' Achilles and Ajax amphora and his Dionysus Sailing kylix was well known and candidates of all abilities could recall specific features and elements of these designs and compare them with the work of the Amasis Painter. A pleasing number could analyse the compositions of the two amphorae and compare them in a relevant manner, eg: the large scale, the focal point, the symmetry, the creative content, the adaptation to the vase-shape.

The very best answers offered a balanced argument leading to a nuanced conclusion showing ways in which Kleitias and Exekias were both comparable to and different from the Amasis Painter.

- 2 (a) There were very few answers to this question. It was answered at every level from the very detailed and accurate, to the quite random and inaccurate. Some candidates could describe the Doric format in some detail, and could point out several ways in which this temple differed, and could relate these differences to Ionic style and to the Parthenon. Most candidates, however, only selected and described one element of the Doric order, usually the columns. Examiners felt that many candidates were simply working from the photograph: they claimed that there were no carved metopes and seemed to have little or no knowledge of the Ionic frieze.
- (b) Most candidates could compare the local Athenian setting with the pan-Hellenic sanctuary but some were tempted into long comparisons of mythology as well as of the subject matter of the sculpture. There was less awareness of topography, with some thinking that Olympia must be near Mount Olympus or that it was on the top of a mountain. Some candidates had obviously been to the sites and could compare the expansive flat site of Olympia with the small hill next to the Athenian Agora. Comparisons of the temples' architecture were infrequent, although a few contrasted the massive columns and low entablature of Zeus with the slender columns and high entablature of Hephaestus. The context of the metal workers' zone was rarely mentioned.

Common errors included: the Doric order having three stylobates, Doric columns having sharp plates (flutes), confusion over what constitutes a frieze and the idea of a continuous metope rather than a frieze.

## **Essay Questions**

- 3** This question was surprisingly popular in comparison to similar questions on architectural sculpture from the legacy specification, with about 30% of the candidature attempting the question. A sizeable minority was unable to distinguish between metopes, friezes and pediments and so offered examples which were not relevant to the question posed.

Successful responses provided detail of the content **and** composition of a range of metopes from both temples. In addition, the terms revolutionary and conventional were defined and applied to the selected metopes to support a range of different opinions. There was no consensus about the definition of terms in the title, but there were plenty of creative interpretations. Moreover, there was no agreement about the success of individual metopes either. The best answers were from those who looked and responded for themselves, trying to say something fresh about the metopes. There were some particularly sensitive descriptions of the Nemean Lion metope (Heracles' pose was described as partly triumphant and partly despairing) and the Dead Lapith metope [XXVIII] (seen as a successful composition because it showed a graphic confrontation of civilisation and bestiality, and pathos in the pose of the Lapith). The Cretan Bull was popular, even though some found it 'conventional' because it showed a fight in progress. Very often, a static metope, such as the Augean Stables or the Golden Apples, was seen as conventional. The best answers showed appreciation of the unusual humanity in the Heracles metopes, and there were some nice appreciations of the figure style and anatomy in the Parthenon metopes.

Sometimes candidates were unable to offer full explanations of their ideas about revolutionary and conventional, eg the Parthenon was revolutionary because of the amount of sculpture or the temple of Zeus was revolutionary because of the unified theme for the metopes. Such views often resulted in very generalised responses with little reference to detail from individual metopes.

- 4 This was by far the most popular essay (answered by about 70% of the candidates), and it produced the widest range of marks on the paper. Almost all candidates were able to offer quite a wide range of examples of free-standing sculpture from both the fifth century and fourth century, but it was also pleasing to read answers which interwove examples of architectural sculpture into a well-structured argument. Most candidates gave a blanket approval to the 4<sup>th</sup> century, although some showed that its success depended on the achievements of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, or even that the 5<sup>th</sup> century held its own.

A fair percentage of candidates got into difficulties by muddling the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries and by concentrating on examples from the Archaic period. Some also confused the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries; this was not always disastrous if done consistently and if individual works were not misplaced. A small minority of candidates wrote about vase painting. The best answers were those that looked for the merits of each period rather than favouring just one: comparisons were successfully made either thematically, or by comparative pairing of works, not just by working through each century chronologically. Those candidates who could take on the question and offer ideas on what 'better' and 'more successful' might mean in terms of sculpture scored well, with some producing quite stunning responses in terms of the range of examples and the quality of the evaluation offered. Essays worked better when there was some specific structure, rather than a general characterisation of each century as a whole, or random pulling out of examples. Too often, however, the responses turned into reasonably competent development of sculpture essays.

The Art units have always produced lively and interesting interpretation of the works under consideration, and this year was no exception. A candidate who offers his/her own analysis and sends the Examiner back to the books to observe it with fresh eyes is doing very well. Attempts to discover the Greek sculptor's purpose yielded good fruit: for example, the extravagant Aphrodite of the Agora was seen by some as expressing emotion through its use of drapery, though many found it ridiculous and excessive; the grandeur of the Riace Warriors was praised by some, though others found them exaggerated; some praised the subtle drapery and spiral pose of the Delphic Charioteer, though many found him dull. Examiners look forward to reading many more individual interpretations next year.



## F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World

### General Comments

This was the first year of the new Specification and the first year in which Roman Comedy has been examined. As in previous years, most candidates displayed signs of enthusiasm for the material and answers often indicated personal engagement with the texts, making it very clear which plays they had enjoyed. With the greater emphasis on context, Examiners were pleased that candidates showed a good general awareness of the general historical background, the differences between Old and New Comedy, and most knew the basics of ancient performance conventions.

Some candidates had obviously been well prepared for this exam and were able to cope with the synoptic/comparative questions very ably. Some seemed to twist the questions on the paper into the questions they wanted to answer (Why is this funny? Compare old and new comedy?). Examiners would advise teachers and candidates to check that they are working from the correct version of the Specification, a number of candidates had obviously studied six plays instead of the four specified for examination in 2010. The plays prescribed for this Unit up to and including the June 2012 examination are *Wasps*, *Frogs*, *Dyskolos* (*Old Cantankerous/The Bad-Tempered Man*) and *Pseudolus*. From the June 2013 examination the plays are *Frogs*, *Lysistrata*, *Pseudolus* and *The Swaggering Soldier* (*Miles Gloriosus*).

References to works not on the specification can in some circumstances contribute to 'understanding/awareness of context' in AO1 or 'evaluation' or 'argument' in AO2, but they are not necessary for a good mark, and candidates should beware of including such references instead of other material more obviously relevant to the question. In answer to question 1(a), for example, pertinent references were made by a few candidates to the contrast between the Dionysus of *Bacchae* and the Dionysus of *Frogs* as a way into an examination of the portrayal of the two gods in the passage printed on the paper. Some useful comments were also made about Homer's portrayal of the gods, often in the context of arguing that Aristophanes was doing nothing new in portraying the gods as humans. Likewise references to *Lysistrata* or *The Swaggering Soldier* were credited in answers to questions 3 and 4 where the questions did not specify which plays candidates should use.

Finally, although all these plays are read as texts, candidates are reminded not to lose sight of the fact that all were – and sometimes still are - performed. Candidates who made use of their own experiences of watching or participating in stage performances of any kind were able to make good comments on the works as plays in performance rather than just as literary texts with a lot of complicated cultural references.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Commentary Questions

- 1 (a) It is important that candidates think carefully about what the question is actually asking. Good answers to question 1(a) came from candidates who had not allowed themselves to be distracted by thinking that all questions were just disguised versions of 'Why is this funny?'. This sub-question was quite wide-ranging, requiring discussion of the portrayals of both Dionysus and Heracles in the passage and also elsewhere in Act 1 and there were some very good answers which did exactly that. Several made good use of the reference to the stock comic portrayal of Heracles made in the Parabasis of *Wasps*. In many cases, however, candidates said little or nothing about Heracles or thought that the question required just evidence from the passage printed on the paper.
- (b) Similarly, there were some very good answers to question 1(b) which did exactly what was asked. They gave examples covering both the passage and other areas of *Frogs*, as well as *Wasps*, and pointed out (with examples) categories of humour which were not seen in the passage. Too many, however, simply repeated the points they had made in answers to 1 (a) or thought that this was a 'Why is this funny?' question.
- 2 (a) Question 2 was much less popular than Question 1. In general too there were fewer good answers, the most common problem in part (a) being a failure to discuss Sikon, even though it was made clear in the question that this was necessary.
- (b) Some candidates seemed unsure of the convention of giving a title in italics. This caused problems in part (b), when there was confusion between *Pseudolus* (the play) and Pseudolus (the eponymous hero of the play) with consequent difficulties for the candidates in fully addressing the question.

### Essay Questions

- 3 While providing many thoughtful definitions of 'timeless' and 'of its own time', this question also produced a number of answers which boiled down to an analysis of the differences between Old and New Comedy. Parallels between ancient and modern comedy can be helpful – for example, to show the continuation of some stock situations or characters – but candidates should beware of enthusing so much about this that they forget to include any content covering the plays on the specification. Some candidates were confused as to the difference between 'play' and 'playwright' and did not always make it clear which play, if any, they felt most deserved the description given in the title. Others had clearly not understood the question and simply asserted that each play (or author) was 'timeless and of its own time' and then named their favourite.

- 4 This question provided a wide range of answers. The best made it clear, either overtly or implicitly, how the candidate intended to define 'success'. The framework thus provided often resulted in a well-constructed argument and produced a balanced discussion examining factors such as the conditions of performance (competition or not?), complexity – or existence – of a plot, characterisation, audience response, literary skill, or even whether they gave opportunities for actors to show off their talents. It was not necessary to recount the plot of each play in full; candidates who did this sometimes lost sight of the question. Interestingly, the main examples given of good staged visual humour in *Dyskolos* were 'Knemon falling into and being rescued from the well,' 'Knemon throwing things at Pyrrhias' and 'Sostratos working in the fields in his aristocratic clothing.' None of these are shown on stage, all being reported, though in a range of different ways. Candidates who referred to these clearly lost an opportunity to discuss the importance of good narrative technique or the comedic version of a 'messenger speech' in stimulating the audience's imagination.

## F390 Virgil and the world of the hero

### General Comments

Generally, the calibre of candidates was high. Responses displayed considerable familiarity with the text and the issues which the epics raise and candidates used the extra thirty minutes in the examination to significant effect. There also seemed to be a greater maturity of thought evident in the way candidates argued their case and especially in the way they made comparisons between the *Iliad* and *Aeneid*. Perhaps, surprisingly, the quality of the synopticity was greater than had ever been seen on the 2749 Greek and Roman Epic module. Candidates were also making a wider range of reference to the secondary sources.

Spelling was generally fine although there were significant numbers of candidates who spelt *Iliad*, Aeneas and *Aeneid* incorrectly – they were all printed on the examination paper. In many cases, however, the paragraph seems to have faded into the past.

Given the fact that this was the first paper of a new specification there were very few rubric errors, though several candidates analysed the literary merits of the passage from the *Iliad* instead of the *Aeneid* in Question 2 or explored whether Book 4 was optimistic or depressing. Timing was not a problem for the vast majority of candidates. Questions 2 and 4 proved to be the most popular, although many also tackled Questions 1 and 3.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Commentary Questions

- 1 (a) At the top end, the mark scheme was redundant as candidates set the agenda and explored the topic very well making a host of telling comparisons between the passage and Books 1 and 4. Sadly, in some cases the passage was just used as a springboard to offer a general essay on the character of Dido and only considered the 'how typical' element of the question in the concluding paragraph. The passage itself was, in general, not explored enough. It was a very rich passage and should have attracted more attention than it did. Some did focus on the wound and related it to the doe and to the emotional wounds – however, there was greater room to explore the whole of the passage along these lines.
- (b) A few candidates ignored 'Book 6' and discussed the whole of the *Aeneid*. Better answers gave a range of examples beyond the passage, although sometimes this was done at the expense of quoting from the passage. There was generally a good focus on discussing both the pessimistic and optimistic elements of the passage and the best saw how the pageant of heroes was a hugely optimistic scene for the contemporary Roman audience.
- 2 (a) There were many excellent answers and candidates seem to have improved their technique in responding to this type of question, especially in quoting from the passage. The weakest answers, again, did not unpack the images and might have offered more on the language techniques. They spotted repetition and alliteration but did not comment on effect. For instance, many quoted the 'now...now' without discussing how this made the passage more vivid.

- (b) A few responses lost focus and ignored the comparison between Turnus and Hektor, preferring to compare Turnus with Achilles. However, a significant majority of candidates used both of the passages as a springboard for their discussion before making a range of telling comparisons between the two heroes. Perhaps there was room for sharper recall from the text when discussing Turnus, but there was often a fine knowledge from the *Iliad* on display.

### Essay Questions

- 3 This Question did not prove as popular as Question 4 and there were often whole Centres which did not attempt it. There were also a not insignificant number of candidates who did not appear to have studied the concept of the hero or the heroic code. Too many saw a hero as Rambo. This was somewhat surprising given the fact that the unit is entitled 'Virgil and the world of the **hero**'. However, there were many good answers on the development of Aeneas from the Homeric hero to the Roman hero and these were well supported with detail from the two epics. Candidates who cited examples from the *Odyssey* were credited but this was not expected and responses which focused entirely on the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* could achieve full marks. Understanding of how the *Aeneid* fitted into the Augustan regime was surprisingly good and creditworthy.
- 4 A few candidates fell into the misconception that this essay was a 'role of the gods' theme. The best answers considered hindrance, help, Aeneas and his mission. Some answers became a list of hindrance and help and lacked discussion or analysis. Although such responses could score highly under AO1, there was not much to credit under AO2.

# Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)

## Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)

### Chief Examiner's Report

Yet again we have seen an increase in the number of centres entering for this subject at both AS and A2. All the topics on all Units were attempted indicating a wide range of interest in a variety of aspects of Ancient History in centres. This is obviously good news for both AS and A2 and the future of the subject. This is now supported by the successful launch of the Ancient History GCSE. This year examiners were working with revised marking grids which were designed to be more specific to Ancient History.

The majority of candidates at AS and A2 displayed a good knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics; they are more confident in dealing with the three-part first question; they are integrating the source evidence into their answers with greater emphasis on relevance; they are structuring their answers more successfully; at A2 where there is an hour for each question candidates explored the issues in greater depth. It is still an important factor that the candidates who take time to read the question carefully and identify the key issue and evidence (perhaps with a rough plan) eventually produce a more concise and focused answer. Giving some time to this rather than writing after a cursory glance at the question is time better spent, even when candidates feel they may have much to do in the time allowed.

There were fewer examples this year of candidates who did not appear to understand the instructions and answered questions from **two** sections instead of answering a question from **one section only**. There is, at AS for the most part, but also at A2, evidence of candidates who spend too much time on some parts of the paper. This then affects their ability to answer later questions. It is partly due to a misunderstanding of the extent to which the answer needs to be developed in the (b) and (c) questions at AS. Candidates do not always have a skill in answering a specific question concisely and relevantly. Many answers provided all the information on a topic rather than the specific issue in the question. The second answer in A2 papers was often much shorter than the first, damaging the overall mark.

Reading the whole question carefully before starting is essential. At A2 especially, but also at AS, some candidates answered part of the question, and failed to address the scope of the question in full. This was often the case where reference was made to the sources in the question; the reliability, accuracy, adequacy or usefulness of the sources was often addressed in a final paragraph rather than integrated into the answer as a whole.

Candidates generally understand the need to evaluate the evidence they are using (part of A02), and they often identify general points concerning reliability and/or the context of the evidence. However, there do appear to be a large numbers of errors prevalent about some of the sources – Herodotus is identified as Athenian, Tacitus is contemporary with Augustus to give two examples. Ignorance of some basic chronology and factual information can easily undermine an argument if based upon such errors.

Candidates responded well to the new topics and format of the A2 units. They now have one hour for each question, and there is even more reason to plan their answer before starting. This was by no means universal, and some answers lacked a focus on the questions as a result. The scope of the A2 units is more thematic and most candidates avoided simple narratives of events in favour of selected information which developed the issues over the period as a whole.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

Examiners found that answers which developed the issues in a concise manner displayed coherent judgements and a clear argument.

Centres should be aware that, if candidates use extra sheets, these sheets should be attached to the booklet with string or treasury tags. If this is not done, there is a danger of sheets becoming detached and lost.

Finally, as always, we continue to need **assistant examiners**: this is especially important as we go forward with the new specification. Principal examiners need the support of those who are daily in contact with the subject and the students who enter for the examination, to provide the most reliable assessment of their attainment.

## F391

### General Comments

The second session of this new specification confirmed many of the findings of last year. Across the three options, candidates showed that they had covered a good range of material and were able to draw on what they had learned under examination conditions. They were clear that they needed to refer to the sources studied, and they often showed considerable skill in interpreting the evidence they selected for particular questions. Evaluation of sources remains a greater issue for many, however, as does a lack of precision in references to details drawn from the sources. It is clear that some candidates have learned general evaluative paragraphs which are often tacked on at the end of essays, sometimes repeated almost word for word in (b), (c) and essay questions. The value of such general paragraphs, divorced from specific examples, is rather limited. There were a very few candidates who attempted the wrong section; this was more of an issue last year, but it would be helpful to make sure that all candidates are very clear which option they should be attempting.

The majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper satisfactorily, though there are still too many examples of over-lengthy answers to the (a) and (b) questions, which account for 30 marks; the (c) question and the essay carry 70 marks, and candidates must make sure they allow sufficient time, particularly for the essay. There were only a very few rubric infringements where candidates answered two questions from a single section or answered questions from more than one option. Schools have clearly taken on board the need to familiarise candidates with the layout of the examination paper.

Option 3 on Sparta was again the most popular option. Athenian Democracy was next in popularity, while Option 2 (the Athenian Empire) was taken by the smallest contingent.

The great majority of candidates attempted the document question first, though a very few went first for Section B. The paper is designed so that the (a) question allows candidates a gentle introduction to the paper, based on the selection of detail from the passage chosen. For most candidates this worked well, and they were able to select relevant examples from the passage to good effect. The (b) and (c) question build on aspects of the passage set. There were a very few candidates who used the (a) as the springboard for a wider discussion of the topic; where they used the passage, they could receive credit, but if the material they introduced was from outside the passage, examiners were unable to reward its use, even if it showed an impressive understanding of the issues. As last year, there were a small group of candidates who wrote at excessive length, which could result in problems with time later in the paper. The very best answers made excellent use of the passage and briefly placed the material in context. The (b) question was designed to focus on a different area than (a) and to draw on sources in addition to the passage in the question; most candidates managed this effectively, though not all remembered to evaluate the sources that they used. In some cases candidates extended the scope of the question set; in 9(b), for example, some candidates explained at some length why the *ephors* were more important than the kings, which made the question more demanding than was intended. There were some detailed and effective answers to the (c) questions, though candidates did not always focus on the key terms in the question. The best responses were well organised, and the interpretation and evaluation of sources formed an integral part of the argument; some weaker responses limited discussion of the sources to separate rote-learned paragraphs which were tacked on, generally at the end of an answer. In many cases, these added little to the overall mark as they made little impact on the quality of the argument.



There were some interesting and thought-provoking essays which showed a close engagement with the material studied. The best essays had a clear structure, and responded to the suggestions made in the bullet points, without trying to follow them as an essay plan. One serious limitation of the bullet point approach is that it suggests that evaluation can be left until the final part of the essay; the best responses evaluated their sources as they went along, and integrated any discussion into their essay where it was relevant. Many weaker answers did not have a coherent structure, and sources were dealt with in prepared paragraphs (as in (b) and (c) above), which did not contribute to the argument. Candidates did not always state the obvious: we have a limited range of sources for Sparta, and are mostly dependent on outsiders when we focus on particular topics; in a similar way, we have a good range of Athenian evidence for the Athenian empire, but are much less well served when we look for the views of the allies.

A number of candidates present problems for the examiners through their presentation of their answers. Examiners make every effort to record the appropriate mark for answers, but this can be challenging when a script is very difficult to read. An increasing number of candidates are producing their answers by an alternative means. Where candidates are answering on a computer, it would be helpful if they consider what they are writing and the accuracy of their typing. Several very long answers were submitted this year where the standard of typing made the interpretation of what was on the paper difficult; a little more time spent on checking over what was written would render the end result more comprehensible. Paper scripts continue to be challenging at times. Where candidates feel the need to add extra material later in the examination, asterisks (or some other mark) can be helpful, but only if it is clear to what they refer. There are a small number of candidates who need to be reminded about the value of paragraphing.

The best scripts demonstrated a good understanding of the chronology of the period studied, and made appropriate use of technical terms, such as *ekklesia* or *agoge*. However it is always acceptable to use English equivalents, and those candidates who confuse common terms might usefully be reminded of this.

The very best answers were a pleasure to read and showed an excellent engagement with the material. In very many cases, candidates presented evidence of worthwhile classroom discussion and a through grounding in the subject, indicative of some excellent teaching.

### **Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC**

- Q1 (a)** Most candidates were able to find a range of points from this passage, though not all placed the Old oligarch in context. Some were confused by the second paragraph.
- Q1 (b)** Most candidates were able to discuss jury pay, but were less certain about other elements in the system (as the evidence is much less clear). There were some good discussions of its significance for popular participation, though a number were too ready to assert that pay for attending the assembly was introduced in the mid-fifth century.
- Q1 (c)** Stronger answers covered a range of examples, and made some telling points about the importance of family background in the early part of the period, and the changes brought about by the Peloponnesian War and the rise of the demagogues. Weaker responses tended to generalise without making specific reference to examples from the sources to support their case; some failed to draw on the passage even when it would have been helpful to their case.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2010

- Q2 (a)** Most candidates were able to draw out a range of relevant details from the passage, and many also put the passage in context.
- Q2 (b)** Better responses selected a range of 'decisions' for discussion, and examiners were happy to credit a range of these, some more focused on procedure and some more on institutions. Many candidates drew on specific examples, such as the trial of the generals after Arginousai (often linked to Thucydides rather than Xenophon).
- Q2 (c)** This question offered a range of approaches, and there were some very good answers. Examiners gave some credit for informed discussion of the wider population of Athens (women, metics, slaves), but there were many well-informed answers that looked at the geography of Attica and the nature of voting in the assembly. Some candidates used the passage to good effect, noting the town/country split and the divergent views on war and peace.
- Q3** This proved a reasonably popular question. Weaker responses tended to focus on court procedure, rather than the role of the courts in the democracy. Better answers dealt with the courts' judicial role, and also discussed *eisangelia*, *graphe paranomon* and the role of the courts in safeguarding Athenian imperialism. However not all answers focused on the evidence of the sources. A number of candidates confused the *Knights* with the *Wasps*.
- Q4** The best responses showed an excellent understanding of the limitations of our knowledge of Pericles' career, and made good use both of Plutarch and Aristotle's *Constitution*. Many candidates were drawn into a narrative of Pericles' career which did not keep to the 'development of the democracy', and in some cases there was very limited discussion of the sources remaining.

### Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

This was the least popular option. Answers were evenly distributed between the two questions in each section.

- Q5 (a)** Most candidates were able to draw out a range of examples from this source, though not all gave any sort of context for the Old Oligarch.
- Q5 (b)** There were some very detailed answers, which included a good range of material from Thucydides and relevant inscriptions.
- Q5 (c)** Not all answers focused on 'the common people of Athens', though most were able to produce some examples, with links to sources.
- Q6 (a)** Some candidates appear to have found this passage more challenging, but many candidates selected appropriate examples and kept the focus on 'other Greek states outside the empire'. Some answers focused almost entirely on Athens' allies, and were unsure of the context of this passage.
- Q6 (b)** Although most candidates had some worthwhile ideas about this, they did not always link these to the sources, and examiners felt that detail was sometimes rather limited (eg where exactly were Athenian cleruchies set up?). Candidates also need to state the obvious sometimes: the importance of the Athenian navy was not always discussed.

- Q6 (c)** There were some interesting discussions of Athenian power, though many candidates did not use restrict their answer to the date range specified (431-415 BC). This was intended to help candidates restrict their answer to a manageable length, but some chose to deal primarily with the early years of the Delian League. Better answers were clearer about the time frame, and were able to discuss important events from the Archidamian War, the Peace of Nicias, Mantinea and Melos and give a balanced answer to the question.
- Q7** Many candidates were able to draw on the evidence for the tribute found in Thucydides and in inscriptions (and elsewhere), and the best were able to connect this effectively with the uses it was put to. There was some discussion of the Periclean building programme, state pay and the development of the Athenian navy, and there were some well-balanced assessments of the benefits for Athens and for her allies.
- Q8** Many candidates were able to present a narrative of allied revolts, though not all were able to show a good understanding of the sources. Relatively few candidates made the obvious point about the imbalance in the surviving evidence, so we are often forced to rely on Athenian sources for our understanding of allied attitudes. Better responses included positive as well as negative reactions (eg states who remained loyal during times of crisis, inscriptions such as the Methone decree).

### Option 3: Politics and society of Ancient Sparta

This was by far the most popular section. Question 9 was answered by many more candidates than Question 10, and Question 11 was more popular than Question 12. Many candidates failed to emphasise the problems posed for anyone studying Sparta by the lack of reliable evidence from within Sparta itself, and, as last year, some candidates seemed to add Plutarch or Xenophon to any assertion. Evaluation was often general and unclear, rather than related to the specific examples used to support the discussion.

- Q9 (a)** This proved a very popular question. Most candidates were able to draw out a range of points from the passage, though a few wrote overly long responses by expanding each point with some further discussion.
- Q9 (b)** Although this question was in general answered effectively, a number of candidates focused on the importance of others in Sparta, rather than on the importance of the Kings. A few would clearly have preferred a question on the role of the *ephors* or the *gerousia*, and devoted too much attention to this rather than the primary focus of the question. The wording of the question ('social structure') was intended to shift candidates away from a discussion of the kings' political role, but many concentrated almost exclusively on this.
- Q9 (c)** This question was also interpreted by some candidates as an opportunity to talk more about the *ephors* or *gerousia*. This was acceptable provided the primary focus was on the kings themselves. The best answers showed a clear grasp of chronology and were able to deal confidently with individual kings, such as Cleomenes, Archidamus or Agis, and comment on the importance of the personalities of individual kings. Weaker responses struggled to establish a chronology and often confused the identity of kings associated with particular stories. Relatively few candidates commented on our lack of Spartan sources. The debate in 432 BC was used by many candidates, and there were some good discussions of the reliability of Thucydides' account. Candidates did not always identify sources accurately, and relatively few used Tyrtaeus to establish an 'early' view of the kings against which to base their judgment; there were some good discussions of the evidence provided by Plutarch and Xenophon.

- Q10 (a)** This passage proved less popular. However those who answered this question made good use of the evidence in the passage, and many were able to place it in context appropriately.
- Q10 (b)** Weaker responses tended to be very general, in some cases discussing only the domination of the helots. Better answers were able to discuss Sparta's approach to the Peloponnesians, her relationships with other members of the Peloponnesian League (eg Corinth, Tegea) and her involvement with other significant states such as Argos and Athens.
- Q10 (c)** Better responses to this question showed a good understanding of the demands of hoplite warfare, particularly within the Peloponnesians themselves. The strongest candidates showed a good understanding of the significance of Spartan weakness at sea (because of the sheer cost of naval warfare), and were able to highlight the importance of Lysander in the closing stages of the Peloponnesian War.
- Q11** This proved a very popular question. There were excellent responses that demonstrated a confident understanding of the *agoge* as training for the *homoioi* ('equals', full Spartiates), together with the importance of the messes for adult males. Some candidates very effectively highlighted the tension between the 'equals' and the emphasis on competitive excellence. A number of candidates chose to compare Spartiates with other groups present in Sparta, such as *helots*, women and *perioikoi*; although this was not the intended focus of the question, examiners accepted a range of different approaches. The various categories of inferiors within Sparta were less clearly understood. The weaker responses became caught up in the narrative of the education system and rather lost sight of equality. Relatively few candidates explained the significance of the term *homoioi*, and it was often misspelled.
- Q12** This produced some well-judged answers. Weaker responses focused largely on the *helots*, though many candidates were able to make sound comments about this, though relatively few commented on the peculiar problems we face in studying events within Sparta. Many, but not all, recalled the declaration of war by the *ephors* each year and there were some good discussions of the *krypteia*. Most candidates were able to discuss the *perioikoi* (variously spelled), though the limited evidence was not always at the candidates' finger tips (eg Thucydides 1. 101).

## F392

### General Comments

Centres – by which I mean not only candidates, but teachers too – deserve a good solid pat on the back this year for the greatly improved quality of entries which was noted this year. There was a general consensus among the team of examiners of this paper in 2010 that, across the board, questions were addressed with more confidence and with a more careful focus on the wording of specific questions. In particular, it was heartening to see a much greater deployment of sources, in general terms at the lower end of the range of responses, but cited in detail and carefully evaluated in answers which clearly addressed the analytical aspects of questions too. There seemed to be a greater number of 'solid' answers which, in conjunction with the new grids employed this year, justified the examiners in giving a range of marks which were noticeably higher overall than was the case last year. There were also a welcome number of very good responses which tackled the questions in depth and in detail.

- (a) questions were done pretty well for the most part; however there seemed to be some confusion on the part of candidates about the need to make a good number of points and make use of the whole passage where possible, and not just half of it (or two of four examples). There is still an occasional tendency to write a general essay in these questions, rather than doing the basic work of reading the passage, citing appropriate pieces, and commenting. There are no marks for evaluation in (a) questions, but some credit can be given for knowledge of context. The weakest responses here made little use of the passages, and sometimes only wrote four or five lines making a single point. These are straightforward questions on which most candidates ought to be able to score more highly, with appropriate training.
- (b) questions, which were a hurdle for many last year, were done much better, and it was heartening to read so many scripts where candidates knew other relevant sources and could make use of them. It is perhaps in these questions that the most noticeable improvement occurred. However, the evaluative part of these questions (eg 'How far . . .') was sometimes omitted.
- (c) questions were also generally well done, though some tended to recycle material from both (a) and (b) without noting that it needs to be used to address a different issue.

Essay structure did, on the whole, show an improvement, though there is still room for improvement in some cases. Better punctuation would help examiners make more sense out of some candidates' longer answers. The top range of responses included some very well-argued essays; weaker responses tend to include a good amount of factual knowledge, but to make no use of it in addressing the issue raised in the question (leading to much use of the caret mark) and/or leave evaluation of reliability of the sources to the end, in a generic paragraph which sometimes gave simple overall evaluation of a source not actually used.

Time was generally well-managed and appropriately balanced between the questions.

The standard of written English was very variable. For some reason this is much better in Options 1 and 2 than in Option 3, where spelling was almost uniformly poor. Very few candidates seem to be able to spell 'emperor' or 'invasion' properly ('emporer' and 'invation'), and these were not by any means the only examples of words common within the sources, which candidates really should be able to spell accurately. 'Ceasar' and 'Britain/Briton' are ongoing issues. Surprisingly few candidates were able even to spell 'writing' or 'wrote' correctly, rendering them as, respectively, 'wrighting/writing/righting' or 'wrought'! Due allowance is made for errors resulting from writing at speed, but it is important that centres focus on accurate spelling of subject-specific terms.

Candidates continue to be unable to distinguish between language used in the classroom to reinforce a point, and the vocabulary appropriate for an examination paper. Another point in the same vein is that while candidates may disagree with the question asked, they should not be writing that the view therein expressed is 'stupid and pointless' or 'ridiculous'.

### **Comments on Individual Questions**

#### **Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome**

- 1 (a)** was mostly well done, with good use of the passage; few seemed to spot the irony of Cicero doing down his own exalted position as a means of criticising the opposing barrister in the first paragraph; but there was plenty in the rest of the passage to comment on, and perhaps the question directed answers more to that part anyway. In some responses there was a danger of over-interpretation!
- (b)** produced some good answers, with Pompey, Caesar, Crassus and Cicero all used as examples, and good use made of Pompey, whose military career turned out not to be so helpful in the long run. This question, one Assistant Examiner noted, was a good differentiator between the best responses and the less able. Many answers dealt with other factors – making good use of the *Commentariolum Petitionis*.
- (c)** led to some good, balanced answers, though the scope of the question led to some 'kitchen sink' responses where candidates used a very wide range of material but to less effect, instead of choosing a more appropriate range of examples and sources and using them in greater depth and detail.
- 2 (a)** used a passage which was just outside those prescribed in the specification. As a result, it was decided at the standardisation meeting that no requirement for context should be made for an otherwise good answer to gain the full 10 marks. As it happened the candidates proved well up to the task in most instances; many provided accurate context anyway (and were rewarded), and the passage was used very well. When a detailed comparison between 1(a) and 2(a) questions was made there was no apparent disadvantage to candidates at all, and for the most part those who attempted this question produced very strong answers.
- (b)** Problems arose with 'dignity' and 'honour' for some, and wrote about bribery and the use of violence in Roman politics; for some "dignity and honour" equated to morality; desire for political honour and recognition was overlooked. These however were in the minority, and some very good answers were noted.
- (c)** was generally well-answered – better responses noting 'useful' and 'sources', and the question was another good mark of differentiation of ability. The extract was invariably used (though not required, discussion of the extract was credited), along with Cicero's letters. Plutarch on Pompey, and occasional references to Cato.

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

- 3** was often done extremely well; some responses focused solely on the *optimates/populares* issue and so long as this was tackled in good detail, this did not prove a handicap; several made as much use of they could of the *Catilinarian* conspiracy. Weaker responses could only discuss concepts such as '*amici*' or personal rivalries. Cicero and Atticus were a faction for some. The question gave a clear prompt to assess reliability and most did.
- 4** Was often done very well; it was a less popular choice than (3). Most has good facts on his career from Spartacus and the consulship of 70; through to the issues in 65, the *triumvirate*, and the trial of Clodius. There were some very perceptive discussions on the paucity of evidence, and Crassus' shadowy involvement.

### **Option 2: Augustus and the Principate**

- 5 (a)** The new specification includes coins as part of the prescribed material; the responses to this question were a reassurance that material culture is both accessible and stimulating for students; there was a roughly 60-40 split in all the answers in favour of this question, and it was on the whole tackled in much better detail than the parallel qn. 6. As much use was made of the explanatory captions as the coins – a perfectly legitimate approach. Weaker responses were not able to interpret the sources accurately and there were one or two very poor replies, which still scored 4 or 5 marks because they made some reference to or citation from the sources which could be credited.
- (b)** picked up from the idea in the coins that '*Fortuna the Home-Bringer*' (*Fortuna redux*) was being thanked, and the personal roles Augustus is said/shown to play. This was a good differentiator; some found it straightforward and discussed his personal importance; some (legitimately, it was decided at standardisation) discussed his role in securing Rome as an empire against enemies such as the *Dacians*; weaker responses found it hard to get a handle on the question at all, though there was still discussion of how important Augustus was. This material was then duplicated in (c).
- (c)** was generally well done, though some candidates did not focus on 'how useful' at all, merely listing sources and detail, and discussing reliability.
- 6** was (surprisingly, in the view of the Principal examiner) not often done well at all. 6 (a) was often done in a patchy way, with much of the extract unused. Several Candidates found it hard to tackle (b) and seemed unsure what a '*constitution*' was; in similar vein to 5 (c), in 6 (c) a number of candidates were either confused by or ignored '*consistent attitude*' and simply trotted out a list of titles without noting which ones Augustus acquired when, what he had turned down, or what he thought of them.
- 7** was sometimes done well, with a good review of the ways in which Augustus gained and kept control of power at Rome, and Actium's role evaluated; at the bottom end of the range of responses were simple discussions of Actium (sometimes mis-dated) with little understanding of Augustus' role as princeps.
- 8** was on the whole less well answered than 7; though some good responses made excellent use of the limited and confusing source material '*at Rome*' and '*during his reign*' were frequently missed; the weakest responses listing sources and detail, and discussing reliability.

### **Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire**

It needs to be noted that in this option, some of the use of sources was well below standard, with no sources being used in some of the Section A responses. Candidates seem to make their own mental additions to the sources or to interpret them too literally – ‘mess and make merry’ does not mean the infantry/cavalry/marines were in the Mess, Agricola did not fear that ‘a general would uprising to lead the Caledonian troops’, and the Conquest of Gaul absolutely does not tell us anything about Boudicca! Apart from the use of inappropriate sources based on TV programmes ‘Guy from Time Team’ and ‘Bettany Hughes’, and a failure to understand that LACTOR is a sourcebook, not a source, the vast majority of candidates, including very good candidates, displayed insecurity with regard to the original sources – mixing up Dio’s and Tacitus’ accounts of the Boudiccan revolt, confusing all the sources which discuss natural resources (Caesar/Strabo/Suetonius/Diodorus Siculus), being unable to distinguish between Dio and Diodorus Siculus, and confusing Tacitus and Suetonius (though the basis for this was unclear). The chronology of the sources was also poorly understood in too many cases, as was some of the geography – Caesar could not have possibly have reached Devonshire or the Severn in his first expedition.



Only a couple of candidates were able to explain that the various rousing speeches are a literary/rhetorical device, used by the source authors to reinforce the narrative and to enable characters to speak on their own behalf.

- 9** There was an approximately equal division of candidates doing question 9 or 10.
- (a)** This question was sometimes done well, but more often yielded a generally disappointing set of responses; despite the wealth of information in the sources given, very few candidates were unable to go beyond eg 'Claudius was voted emperor 16 times/given the title Britannicus/awarded a triumph... and this shows that his victory in Britain was important to him/the Senate and the people/Rome'. Some made avoidable errors in their use of the sources right in front of them, eg arches in Britain and Gaul, despite Dio mentioning Rome and Gaul, the aureus being minted in Britain although the source says Lyons; a few candidates thought that the 2 sides of the coin were 2 separate sources. Very few mentioned that the 'Mendip Lead Pig' was evidence of the exploitation of natural resources within only a few years of the conquest; most candidates didn't mention the Lead Pig at all. This was comparable to Option 2 question 6 (a); candidates right across the ability range should be encouraged to make full use of the sources.
  - (b)** most candidates were able to manage at least some discussion of other reasons Claudius may have wanted to invade Britain, even if to a very limited extent/with limited balance, and there were some excellent answers amongst them.
  - (c)** like (b) was sometimes done well, but for many responses were very confused. The Examiners were prepared to accept any discussion up to AD 47, be it Caesar or Claudius; one candidate tried to incorporate Augustus and Gaius Caligula as well. It had been felt that the focus on Rome's *victories* ought to limit the scope of the discussion. The divergence between weak and good responses was very marked, evidenced by weaker responses based solely on the reliability of the source authors without any discussion of the *content* of the sources. It not appropriate to say, when discussing reliability, that one has already discussed it in parts a) and b).
- 10 (a)** was sometimes done well, but more often there was a limited use made of the passage. The question revealed that some candidates think the far north begins either in Wales or around York, and that Agricola was an emperor; the 'Forth' was a legion, and 'Britons' and 'the natives of Caledonia' are the same people.
- (b)** There were some excellent answers to this question, well balanced and drawing on all appropriate source material on resistance to Caesar, Caratacus and Boudicca, as well as Mons Graupius. Sometimes the question was interpreted as requiring a discussion of the existence and level of resistance, rather than an analysis of the failure or otherwise of such resistance, and while a discussion of both sides, military tactics was appropriate here, this alone was not enough for higher marks. Reference to Romanisation as a form of the failure of the resistance, albeit non-military, was also rewarded appropriately.
  - (c)** Again some excellent answers here. Some candidates remain confused between the various northern frontiers (Stanegate/Hadrian's Wall/the Antonine Wall), none of which can be described as having been built by Agricola. There is no such thing as the Agricoline Wall. Very well balanced answers referenced the post-Agricola withdrawal and subsequent attempts to conquer Caledonia; weaker ones focused solely on the passage given, without any apparent understanding that the battle following the passage was the precursor to Mons Graupius.

- 11 This was often done well, with good use of Caesar himself, well evaluated and supported by the limited other material available. They discussed motives and context, and made good use of Caesar himself to evaluate the material – why *should* he have described so many of his own blunders? A significant number of candidates stopped their narrative of Caesar’s first invasion at the end of the beachhead landing. It was clear from, for example, discussions of Caesar in 9(c) that the majority of such candidates knew the details of the whole invasion, so why they stopped at the landing in this essay question is somewhat baffling. Some accounts were rather too narrative, and some candidates were unable to switch of their mental tap, wasting valuable time on lengthy accounts of the second invasion, to the detriment of the contextual analysis and source evaluation required by the question. Some responses suggested that one reason for Caesar’s invasion was the potential for corn, to reduce reliance on Egypt – Egypt was not a province until the Principate, hence did not function as the Republic’s granary (nor entirely so even under the Principate).
- 12 There were some very good, very thorough essays here, though again, accounts could be too narrative, and spun off into detail about the final battle rather than remaining within the question parameters. Most candidates knew at least a little of the material evidence, mainly the destruction horizon. Source use was frequently fallible – ‘the most important source is Dio’ or ‘the most important source is Tacitus’ were frequent introductions to source evaluation discussions, and many candidates erred in their ascription of the various details to the two primary sources. Some responses suggested that the rebellion was initially successful in part because the Romans were unfamiliar with British fighting tactics, especially the use of chariots; given that at this point the Romans had been in country for almost 20 years, they certainly would have been familiar with British tactics, so this argument seems somewhat specious, as does the theory that Boudicca might not have existed. A common point of confusion revolved around Plautius/Paulinus, and Suetonius Paulinus was not an emperor.

## F393

### General Comments

In general, candidates seem to have responded well to the style and level of the questions set, and the new specification and changes to the examination did not seem to cause any difficulties. In fact, many candidates seemed to benefit from the opportunity to deal with topics in greater depth, and to have the chance to write two longer essays. There were only a few rubric errors, although some candidates still managed to answer on a different topic from that which they had apparently been taught, or answer essays from different sections. Such cases were rare, but teachers would be well advised to ensure that their candidates are clear about the instructions to candidates on the paper.

In general, candidates made good use of the sources to support their answers, and showed a range of accurate knowledge of the issues about which they were writing. A general weakness in the quality of argument was apparent, with candidates not really dealing with the issues raised by the questions. Many gave extensive and fairly detailed accounts of their chosen area, but failed to engage with the issues in the question. For example, in section 3, many candidates wrote about perceptions of the sophists, rather than the impact of the sophists on Athenian society. This could be remedied by more careful planning of the answers in the examination. There was a distinct lack of planning from many candidates, which led to answers which were little more than narrative accounts of the topic. There were also a number of clearly prepared essays on set topics, which again failed to gain higher marks because they did not address the issues in the question.

Some candidates included a general, prepared section on the sources within their answers. These sections gain very little by way of credit if they are not tied into the answer, and the evaluation of the sources is not relevant to the question set. For example, there were a number of candidates who wrote at length about Herodotus as 'the successor of Homer' who aimed to entertain his audience. The paragraph was of considerable length, but failed to have any effect on the rest of the answer, as the candidates then continued to recall details of what Herodotus had written without any critical comment.

Another general concern noted by examiners was the lack of detail in many answers. Candidates often seemed to lack an awareness of the sequence of events, and make general statements without tying them down to specific details. Such lack of detail not only means that candidates cannot score well in AO1, but it can easily restrict their performance in AO2, because they are not supporting their argument clearly.

## **Specific Questions**

### **Option 1: Greece and Persia 499-449 BC**

- Q1** Many candidates were able to recall the details of Herodotus' narrative, referring to Aristagoras and the Ionian revolt. Some were able to refer well to Persian inscriptions (The Behistun inscription and the Cyrus Cylinder.) The stronger answers evaluated the sources well and were able to point to other reasons for the invasion of 490BC, such as economic prosperity, following in the footsteps of other Persian kings etc. Some candidates questioned Herodotus' use of individuals to explain these motives and some missed the point of the question by referring to Xerxes' invasion (when the question specifically refers to 490BC). A considerable number of candidates did not think more widely about the causes of this campaign, and failed to gain marks as a result.
- Q2** Responses to this question were weaker, many simply arguing that because the Greeks fought the Persians, this meant that they were terrified. The better responses dealt with the idea of threat to a 'way of life', but most at least took issue with the word 'all' in the question. Some candidates made effective use of what they knew about both the battles and the Hellenic league to support their arguments. Candidates who planned their answers benefited considerably. Some candidates were able to identify and comment on the reactions of a number of states, such as Argos and Thebes.
- Q3** Most candidates could give examples of individuals and their roles (favourites being Themistocles and Leonidas), the better responses looked at other ways that Herodotus could have explained events. More thought could have been given to Persian individuals as well as Greeks, especially in the portrayal and role of Xerxes, who seemed to be forgotten by a considerable number of candidates. Some candidates also made good use of the Artemisia episode in the battle of Salamis. In general, however, the answers tended to be a narrative account of the roles of individuals, without clear focus on whether or not these roles were over-emphasised by Herodotus. Some candidates failed to notice that the focus of the question was on the campaign under Xerxes, and wrote at length about Darius.
- Q4** The main problems with responses to this question were that candidates gave a stock essay on Herodotus' strengths and weaknesses, rather than looking specifically at the idea of 'researcher' and 'historian'. Only the better answers looked at historiography and the fact that Herodotus was pretty good at looking at causation and motive. All candidates must remember to give examples from the text to back up their points. Many wrote generally about Herodotus, without referring in detail to the Histories. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of supporting their arguments with relevant evidence.

### **Option 2: Greece in conflict 460-403 BC**

- Q5** Some good answers and most candidates were able to access the question and give examples of fighting and peace treaties. The better responses tackled the sources well. Some candidates made good use of inscriptional evidence, as well as Thucydides. There were a good number of candidates who questioned the assumption in the question, and produced excellent arguments and evidence to show that the Greeks found other ways to resolve conflicts. Candidates again should be reminded of the importance of backing up their arguments with specific evidence.

- Q6** Generally a lack of knowledge on this one, with candidates concentrating on tribute money only, and surprisingly not much mention of building programme. Some candidates seemed to misunderstand the idea of exploitation, although many also made excellent use of their knowledge of the building programme and the developments from Delian League to Athenian empire to support their answers. Here in particular inscriptional evidence could have been used to good effect, and some candidates did this very well. Very few candidates looked carefully at both nature and extent. There were also a moderate number of candidates who seemed to think that there was a definite point at which the Delian League was renamed the Athenian empire. A number of candidates also gave lengthy narratives about the Athenian empire and the Peloponnesian League, without really dealing with the issues in the question.
- Q7** This question elicited a wide range of responses. Some showed excellent knowledge of Thucydides' account of the plague in Athens and the effects of the Sicilian expedition. However, very few candidates took the opportunity to evaluate Thucydides' account with reference to Aristophanes' plays, with the result that the word 'accurate' was not properly addressed.
- Q8** There were some excellent answers to this question, which showed a thorough knowledge of the differences between democracy and oligarchy, and discussed them in the context of other potential causes of conflict, such as trade and control of territory. However, many failed to deal with the central issue in the question, and talked more generally about causes of conflict without focusing on the differing ideologies in the Greek world.

### **Option 3: the culture of Athens 449-399 BC**

- Q9** A very popular question, accessible to candidates of all abilities. Weaker answers failed to deal with a range of sophists, concentrating too much on Socrates. Most answers used sources well. Some answers failed to define what a sophist was. Candidates should be encouraged to examine key words in the title – in this case *impact*. The more limited arguments concentrated on the fact that they were not popular, rather than their political significance. Sources were pretty well evaluated by a majority of candidates. Many candidates failed to look at the examples of Critias and Alcibiades, who, while not essential to an argument, would have been beneficial. This reflected the general tendency to look at attitudes towards the sophists, rather than the impact of the sophists on Athenian society.
- Q10** The best answers did not just concentrate on two plays and showed excellent knowledge of the festivals and their political, competitive and religious functions as well as their entertainment value. Weaker answers gave a general assessment of the issues in a couple of plays but at least were able to show some knowledge. There were some who simply recounted the details of two plays which they had studied, without reference to the festivals. There were also candidates who seemed to misread the question, and just talk more generally about festivals rather than the dramatic festivals required by the question.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

**Q11** Weaker answers did give an account of Athenian society and how women, metics and slaves were viewed. Many answers looked at how the Athenians viewed themselves, rather than how they viewed themselves in relation to other Greeks. Some answers went somewhat off course, and wrote at length about the concept of the barbarian, without bringing the content back to an argument relevant to the question. Better answers looked outside Athens and dealt with Pericles' funeral speech successfully as well as The Melian Dialogue and Mytilenean debate. Fewer candidates looked at drama and inscriptions, but the best answers were of a very high standard.

**Q12** Many candidates went beyond the confines of the Acropolis and looked at developments in Athens and Attica more widely. Some weak answers just described the buildings on the Acropolis, but the better ones were able to assess these buildings and point to the difficulties of interpreting the sculptures and evidence. Some answers failed to focus on the buildings, and instead wrote at length about what we can learn about Athenian religion more generally. This material was of varying quality, but candidates should again be reminded to interpret the evidence in relation to the question set.

## **F394**

The responses from candidates, in this first series of this unit, were informed, varied, generally well-organised and soundly based upon the evidence and sources. This was pleasing to the examiners on this new specification. Candidates found a number of ways to approach the issues and answer the questions so that in any one question there were many very good answers which covered the ground in a variety of interesting and intelligent ways. It was pleasing to see candidates attacking the question in very different ways, with the best producing a well-structured argument based upon interpretation of well chosen and relevant evidence. Examiners were generally pleased with the level of factual knowledge and source material deployed.

It should be noted that a number of questions were phrased to ask about the evidence and its usefulness or accuracy – some responses simply did not see this as part of the question and discussed events or actions by politicians/emperors without dealing with the issue of the sources. It was a common fault in all options and candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully.

The candidates had a slightly longer time in which to form their responses, and it was gratifying to see that a number (but by no means all) took the opportunity of some extra time to plan their responses carefully. More often this time taken to plan produced a balanced and well-argued answer rather than a narrative or disjointed one. The latter answers tended to focus on the issues in the questions only towards the end of the response, as if, having provided the facts or evidence, the candidate suddenly remembered the question and the issues.

Another pleasing aspect of the responses was the wide (and usually relevant) use of source material, ranging from literary sources to archaeological and epigraphic evidence. While some were very specific in either naming the reference or quoting the sentence, others paraphrased material. The paraphrase at times became too generalised to pin down to a particular source. Expressions such ‘Suetonius tells us...’ or ‘Plutarch says...’ followed by some fairly general piece of information such as ‘Augustus built a large number of buildings’ or ‘Pompey won many wars’ needs to be more specific to score high marks. A large number of candidates quote sources, which indicated a detailed knowledge to some extent and was credited; however, misquoting created some problems when candidates then formed an argument around the reference to the source. Some candidates simply made up quotations, without giving a reference to the source. The lack of any supporting source material or evidence was seriously damaging to the candidate’s overall level. Thankfully there were very few of these responses.

Interpretation and evaluation of the material was often very good, and sometimes excellently precise and specific. At the other end, it was at times generalised and not related to the specific source material being used. It is not helpful to the candidate to say that Suetonius is anecdotal, if that does not lead to some consideration of whether the information being drawn from the author is in some way affected by this, in terms of its reliability, accuracy, or usefulness. Evaluation should always accompany the use of the source material; at the same time the repeated set phrase is not developing the argument in meaningful way. Interpretation was often much more successfully achieved where responses drew conclusions from a reference, and avoided using it as an extra piece of factual information.

Given the length of the periods to be covered, it is never the expectation that everything relevant in the period has to be mentioned or discussed. However, the candidate should display an understanding of the issue(s) across the period as a whole. Some responses were limited to a part of the period; for example responses finished at 60 BC or 50 BC on the Republic and ignored the period to 31 BC; in Option 2, some responses dealt in detail with Augustus and had little to say on the other emperors, notably Domitian; in option 3 much information was provided on the last 40 years and very little on the first 40 years. The weight of the source material may cause some unbalance but not entirely.

One issue which arose in all three Options was the general lack of accuracy in chronology. This either produced inaccurate dating of events, or events placed in the wrong order or events occurring at the same time when in reality some years apart.

### **Option 1: The fall of the Roman Republic 81-31 BC**

Approximately one third of the entry chose this option. The candidates provided a range of responses and all questions were attempted. There was a noticeable focus on the triumvirate period to the detriment of other parts of the period where useful examples could have been explored.

**Q1** There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q1 ('It was the growth in the power of individuals at the expense of the state which eventually destroyed the Republic.' How far would you agree with this view?). This was answered by most candidates. The candidates had displayed some very clear views on the issue of individual power and presented a variety of views of the effect of their actions upon the state. Better answers offered a range of individuals, most of whom, had, in their opinion, damaged the Republic – Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Octavian – supported by suitable source material, the best of which was tied closely to the question of the effect on the state. Very good answers also discussed other factors, quoting Sallust, Cicero and Cato (via Plutarch) in support. Some very good answers focused upon the underlying problems of the Republic such as excessive competition, optimates' exclusiveness, bribery and control of the system through clientela etc. Weaker answers either focused upon a limited number of individuals in a narrative manner, or provided a generalised discussion of problems during the period. These were usually further weakened by an insecure understanding of the material.

**Q2** asked the candidates how accurately we can assess the extent to which social and economic problems affected the politics of this period. This was less popular than the other questions. There was no need for answers to cover every instance of social and economic problems. Better answers picked the more obvious and serious examples such as the debt or slave problems of the 70s and 60s; the urban problems of Rome during the period (the grains supply and piracy were useful examples); agricultural issues; the issue of violence; the class divisions and tensions between classes and so on. The question, however, was concerned with an issue about the evidence for these and weaker answers failed to focus on this aspect of the question. Better answers made use of Sallust's view of the effect of wealth coming from the empire; Cicero's evidence was included by some as were sources on the grain supply and politicians' reaction to the problem; in addition there were references in the sources to political acts which sought to deal with the problems. More often than not answers failed to define what constituted a social or economic, as opposed to a political problem.



- Q3** (How far does the evidence help us to understand the aims and intentions of politicians during this period?) was chosen by a large number of candidates. It invited the candidates to discuss the nature of the evidence and the extent to which it helps us understand the aims of politicians. In some answers it was taken to mean 'what were the aims of politicians' and the main point of the question was hardly discussed. Some answers simplified the issue into a 'desire for power'. The vast majority of the responses displayed a detailed knowledge of the facts regarding a number of politicians but a number of these failed to relate them to specific source material. There was also a lack of evaluation where source material was used. A number of answers stopped at 60 BC. Better answers developed an argument about the sources from well-selected examples – Sallust's view of Catiline, Cicero and others; Cicero's view of himself and others such as Pompey, Caesar, Octavian; Plutarch and Suetonius were used constantly, although less successfully evaluated, generally being dismissed because they were writing so many years later. Appian, Dio and Velleius (variously rendered) appeared infrequently, and rarely in a specific form.
- Q4** (concerned with the extent to which sources support the view that political success depended upon military success) suffered a little from the same problem as in Q.3 in that some responses did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. Better answers provided a balanced argument citing Cato or Cicero as an example of the lack of military success (even better ones noted that Cicero was aiming for some military glory in Cilicia!). Candidates used a variety of examples of military success, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Crassus, Octavian, Antony etc; some approached the question by considering what got most votes at elections, showing that other factors mattered with the evidence of (?) Quintus' *Commentariolum* and other sources on political activity. There was some insecure factual material concerning Caesar's military activity – claims that he had none until Gaul. However, good arguments were made about Pompey's early successes and later problems despite his military success, the need for more than military strength and the resort to force in the end by some politicians. A number of candidates had interesting and well-structured approaches to the question, other than a simple narrative of politicians' careers. Candidates who avoided a straightforward narrative of political careers tended to fare better at answering the question since they dealt with the military factor in the context of political activity during the period.

### **Option 2: The invention of Imperial Rome 31 BC – AD 96**

- Q5** ('Succession was a major issue for every emperor; no emperor found a successful solution to this problem.' How far would you agree with this view?) was a popular choice. It produced some creditable answers; most answers provided an accurate narrative of the various efforts which emperors made to ensure a smooth succession although not all went on to discuss how smoothly the arrangements worked. A surprising number missed Claudius altogether. Weaker answers confused succession with 'success'. Others focused on whether or not the successor did a good job of being emperor. Gaius and Nero were, naturally, blamed for not making any provisions, only rarely being excused because they were young and were not expecting to die. The better answers focused on the inherent problems of the position of an emperor in the new constitution, the emphasis on a family member rather than the best man for the job (for whatever reasons) and the extent to which a smooth transition was achieved. For all Augustus' difficulties, Tiberius succeeded relatively smoothly. Some intelligently suggested that the quality of the reign indicated a lack of success in overcoming the problems of succession. There were the obvious references in Suetonius and Tacitus concerning Augustus' apparently damning comments on Tiberius, although the full context of these quotations was rarely realised and developed. Less common were references to Tacitus about Tiberius' views and efforts, and some confused use of both Tacitus and Suetonius on Claudius' approach. Some introduced Galba effectively, and most mentioned the role of the Guard, only some developing their role beyond Gaius and Claudius.

- Q6** The question concerning the accuracy of our assessments of the extent to which the social and moral life of Rome was transformed (Q6) was quite popular but less successfully tackled in most cases. This was partly because of a failure in some responses to clearly define the terms of the question, and partly because of lack of detail about the actions taken by emperors. Augustus was often the focus of much of the answer; however, the sources do give some detailed information on Tiberius, Claudius and Vespasian, and even some references to Gaius and Nero and Domitian. Much of this was omitted. Even concerning Augustus, details of his legislation were rare, and sometimes insecure. Most especially, knowledge of the extent to which these laws had an effect or were welcomed was frequently generalised and unsupported by evidence. Candidates took the social aspect of the question to mean provision of games, baths, protection and food, which was acceptable to an extent. However, often assertions of how welcome this was and how far their lives were changed replaced reasoned argument. Very few used the writers of the latter half of the period to suggest what social and moral life was like. Even where Juvenal was used, the evaluation was general. Religious changes were introduced as part of the transforming of both moral and social life; yet again, few could cite specific details of the introduction of Isis worship, for example. Some candidates confused moral transformation with improving morale.
- Q7** focused on the relations of emperors with different groups in Rome and what support the sources provide for their success and/or failure. The problem here was one of range, both across the period and across the classes. Some answers failed to deal with different groups, in the sense of assessing the validity of the quotation in the question. Instead they focused on the 'people of Rome' as a single group, even translating that into the 'ordinary' people of Rome. The answers therefore focused on the supply of grain and games to the exclusion of other actions by emperors designed to maintain good relations. Emperors' dealings with equestrians, senators, the Praetorian Guard, freedmen and women, citizens or non-citizens as well as the poor or 'working class' were not addressed in some answers. Not all groups needed to be dealt with in the same detail; a selection of representative groups produced very good answers. However, the focus on one section of society was a partial answer. In the same way, some answers gave good accounts of the relations between emperors and groups, and the extent of their success but failed to deal effectively with the part concerning the sources. On the other hand, there were candidates who distinguished between not just emperors but the changing relations of emperors and people within their reigns, noting how Gaius goes rapidly downhill after good start and Claudius moves in the other direction to some extent.
- Q8** (How far would you agree that the building projects of the emperors would have made the Rome of Domitian unrecognisable to Augustus?) was a popular choice. As in other questions, there was a tendency to focus on Augustus, naturally, since he engaged in so much building and the sources provide ample information about them. In some cases too much time was spent on Augustus in setting the scene for the changes about to take place in subsequent reigns. Also all that was provided was the name of building with no details of its position and size and content as far as that was relevant. Weaker answers tended to narrate (with varying degrees of accuracy) the works of other emperors usually reaching Vespasian and the Colosseum at the end. Domitian's works were rarely mentioned (nor was there much discussion about the problems in identifying his works). Given the fire in AD 80 and his need to rebuild, it did seem that it was worth bringing him into the answer, especially since his name appeared in the question. There were some very good answers which really tried to envisage the scale of changes and differences in both content and style. Much was obviously made of The Domus Aurea, but only better answers pointed out that it was much changed during Vespasian's time. Good answers also identified the destruction by fires and tried to discuss intelligently what this would have meant for Rome's appearance by the time of Domitian. Good use was made of regulations to change the width of streets and heights of building, and attempts were made to go beyond the centre. Intelligent responses pointed out that much of the work of Augustus would still exist, but he

might be surprised by the palaces of later emperors given his austere style. Even structures of foreign cults, such as Isis, might have caused him some surprise, as some claimed. Some candidates took the opportunity of this question to display a range of knowledge and thoughtful understanding and thought which was pleasing and even unexpected.

### **Option 3: Ruling the Roman Empire AD 14-117**

- Q9** concerned an assessment of the extent to which Rome succeeded in romanising the provinces. This was a popular option producing a range of answers. Very few answers failed to cover both East and West, although not necessarily in equal detail. There was an emphasis on Roman Britain in some answers – not necessarily a problem provided there was also some discussion to set Britain the context of the entire Empire and compare the province with other examples. There were a number of answers which used inscriptions from the Lactors (8 and 18) very well in support of the argument. Tacitus Agricola 21 was used extensively, mostly with some detail. There was a general tendency to assume romanisation among all classes of provincials, although better answers identified élites as a factor. Better answers made use of Claudius' inclusion of Gauls in the Senate to show how far romanisation had advanced. Weaker answers did not sufficiently address the issue of 'how accurately can we assess...', some ignoring the opening entirely. Answers generally included some discussion of revolts (Boudicca and Judaea being popular choices) as examples of lack of success. Better answers looked closely at the causes given in our sources and considered how far they were reactions against romanisation. The destruction of Colchester, for example, was rarely developed in the argument when it would appear to be worth some evaluation as a reaction against Roman values. Good discussions resulted from those who considered that the sources are not very helpful in certain respects.
- Q10** concerned the policies of the emperors towards the frontiers during this period but also how far the sources are adequate. As in Q9 some candidates gave a detailed narrative/analysis of the policies of every emperor, without referring to the sources in any detail. Some answers detailed the policies (or at least actions) of the emperors, with sources in support but failed then to engage in evaluation and interpretation of the evidence; they simply quoted (or paraphrased) the sources as fact. Better organised answers grouped the emperors in terms of similar policies rather than approaching the answer as a chronological narrative. There was a general assumption that Nero was not interested in expansion, not was Gaius. The East was less well-covered than the West or North with some confusion over the names of kingdoms and provinces. Equally accurate geographical knowledge is clearly not universal.
- Q11** was a less popular choice (How far does the evidence help us to understand the effectiveness of the administration of the provinces during this period?). Answers showed some understanding of the roles of governors, procurators and other officials, using Pliny's Letters and Agricola as benchmarks. There were a number who were able to construct sensible discussions around these two sources, and better ones considered the limitations of both sources. However, wider knowledge of the empire and its administration was not as evident, nor was there much support from the source material in some answers. Often the focus was on Agricola ignoring the rest of Tacitus' work, and information in the Annals about Britain under earlier governors; the role of the procurator might have been explored using Catus or Classicianus; there are mentions of freedmen and procurators in Pliny's Letters. Josephus was alluded to for the situation on Judaea but again opportunities to explore the quality of administration under various governors was not taken by most. Answers rarely mentioned extortion trials of governors to support views on the lack of effective administration. Some, however, noted the role of local councils and leaders, who

sometimes effective but not always - this might indeed have included client kings and queens.

**Q12** (How helpful are the sources for our understanding of the ways emperors promoted their image in different parts of the Empire?) was a popular choice. Candidates generally made use of the imperial cult in their answers and there was a good range of information about its spread and use, especially in the East. There was good knowledge about Aphrodisias, for example, and its reliefs. Equally the temple to Claudius in Britain was included, with reference to Tacitus and/or the head of Claudius' statue. Gaius' attempt to get a statue set up in Jerusalem, while sometimes credited to Nero, and sometimes set up in every temple in the East, was further evidence. Some candidates devoted most of their answer to the cult which gave an unbalanced picture of the ways emperors promoted themselves. Good arguments were made using coins as evidence of the promotion of images and messages. Better answers had specific examples indicating the date (if possible), the legend and the particular occasion as indicated on the coin. Very astute responses noted the type of metal as indicative of who used them. Reference was made to structures in Rome which promoted their image, without making a clear argument as to how this related to the question. As in other questions, good approaches included some consideration of the limited nature of the evidence when considering the issue of 'how helpful the sources are...'. It was also important to consider 'different parts of the Empire' and the role of governors in this- another chance to use Pliny's Letters.

Across all three options many answers named the sources in the opening paragraph, name-dropped them in the essay and added a general evaluation of them at the end, often the same in both essays. Some of the name-dropping was inappropriate when Tacitus was given credit for describing the invasion of Britain by Claudius or the reign of Gaius to name but one example of mis-attribution.

Some answers displayed little understanding of the use of paragraphs, and punctuation was in some cases such that the line of thought was difficult to follow. Lengthy sentences became obscure in meaning.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2010

