

GCSE (9–1)

Candidate style answers

CLASSICAL CIVILISATION

J199

For first teaching in 2017

J199/12 Women in the Ancient World

Version 1

Contents

Introduction	3
Question 12	4
Question 25	8
Question 26	12
Question 27	14
Question 28	16
Comparative essay questions	18

Introduction

OCR has produced this resource to support teachers in interpreting the assessment criteria for the new GCSE (9–1) Classical Civilisation specification and to bridge the gap between new specification's release and the availability of exemplar candidate work following first examination in summer 2019.

The questions in this resource have been taken from the J199/12 Women in the Ancient World specimen question paper, which is available on the OCR website. The answers in this resource have been written by an senior examiner. They are supported by an examiner commentary.

Please note that this resource is provided for advice and guidance only and does not in any way constitute an indication of grade boundaries or endorsed answers. Whilst a senior examiner has provided a possible level for each response, when marking these answers in a live series the mark a response would get depends on the whole process of standardisation, which considers the big picture of the year's scripts. Therefore the levels awarded here should be considered to be only an estimation of what would be awarded. How levels and marks correspond to grade boundaries depends on the Awarding process that happens after all/most of the scripts are marked and depends on a number of factors, including candidate performance across the board. Details of this process can be found here:

<http://ocr.org.uk/Images/142042-marking-and-grading-assuring-ocr-s-accuracy.pdf>.

Question 12

Source D: Phoclydes, fragment

The tribes of women originated from these four: one from a she-dog, one from a bee, one from a bristly sow, one from a long-maned mare. The last bears herself well, is swift, a pleasure seeker, and of the finest form. The one from a bristly sow is neither bad nor good. The one from a she-dog is difficult and wild. The one from a bee is a good housekeeper and knows how to work. Pray, dear friend, to obtain delightful marriage with her as your lot.

'The *kyria* was a valuable and respected member of an Athenian household.' How far do you agree with this statement?

Use Source D as a starting point, and your own knowledge in your answer.

[8]

Example 1

The *kyria* was a very valuable member of the Athenian household because she performed a range of tasks that were vital to the household's success. Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* states that she was responsible for managing the resources that the *kyrios* brought into the household. If she did this well then all members of the house would be clothed, fed, happy and healthy. If she failed in this task, however, the household might run out of a vital resource like food, which could result in the ruin of the household. She was also responsible for managing the domestic slaves in tasks like weaving. This was important because weaving cloth would keep the family clothed, and could even bring money into the household if spare textiles were sold in the Agora. Her value to the household was limited, however, since she could not go outside without a male escort, so she would sometimes cause a drain on the time and energy of her male relatives or slaves.

Despite how valuable she was, I do not believe that the Athenian *kyria* was very respected in her household. Source D suggests that women were seen as sub-human, being descended from animals. This implies that the male members of the household thought they were better than the women (including the *kyria*) and so suggests that the women were not respected. This idea is reinforced by the fact that any decision the *kyria* made could be overturned by the *kyrios* – a fact that shows the *kyrios* did not respect her judgment or wishes.

Examiner Commentary

Level 4

There is excellent, precise knowledge of sources in this passage; citing Xenophon is very impressive wider knowledge. The answer describes what the *kyria* did in line 2, and then analyses the value of this duty, and what the repercussions of failure to perform this would be. There is also excellent analysis of spinning and weaving, and the mention the *agora* shows a good knowledge of wider cultural context. There is a lot of very fine knowledge and understanding in the first paragraph, although there is the omission of her role within the family to look after children. The source is fairly well analysed in the second paragraph, although the answer could analyse individual points of the passage, rather than look at it as a whole.

It would achieve a Level 4 mark; its best feature is the very good knowledge and understanding of cultural context; it almost gets full marks (remember candidates will probably spend no more than 10 minutes on this, so are not expected to say everything), but it needs more precise referencing and analysis of individual points from the stimulus source to gain full marks.

Example 2

The *kyria* was a valuable member of the Athenian household because she could bear children for her husband. This was the most important role of the *kyria* and she was valuable because of it. A source shows that some women tried to buy babies on the black market if they were infertile – this reinforces how important having babies was in Athenian culture.

The *kyria* was also valuable to the household because of all the chores she did. A good *kyria* would cook, clean, weave, decorate the *andron* and train domestic slaves. The bee wife mentioned in Source D is probably the kind of wife who would do all of these chores well.

All of these valuable contributions to the household would surely mean that the Athenian *kyria* was a highly respected member of the family.

Examiner Commentary

Level 2

The answer makes an excellent first point, and there is a good idea about buying babies to back this idea up; quoting a source for this would be even better. The second idea is rather generalised and typical of average answers; there is no attempt to provide evidence and no attempt to differentiate different types of women – even just mentioning scenes on vase paintings would be an improvement. However the range of duties mentioned is good, and the mention of the term “*andron*” shows good knowledge. There is then a brief reference to one part of the source. It is good that the answer discusses one particular part of the source, but there are clearly unexplored ideas. The final line is rather meaningless.

Overall it would achieve a Level 2 mark as it is one sided, and does not show any knowledge of how women were regarded as inferior. There is clearly some good knowledge of her duties within the household, but no mention of her rights. It does engage with the topic, but has a limited range of evidence. Knowledge is sound, despite omissions.

Example 3

Source D mentions that women can be divided into four categories: those who are like she-dogs, sows, mares and bees. All of these animals are below humans and so I don't think that the *kyria* was very valuable or respected in the Athenian household.

The *kyrios* was able to go to the Assembly and host symposia with his friends whenever he wanted. I don't think this is very fair because the *kyria* was not able to do these things and women should be equal with men.

Examiner Commentary

Level 1

The first statement is accurate, if rather basically expressed. There is no real analysis of this. There is a good point about the rights of the *kyrios* and an attempt to compare him to his wife, although whether this was fair is not really part of the question.

Clearly, for an 8 mark question, there isn't much to credit; there is no reference to any other source, and no balance with there being none of the actual duties of the *kyria* mentioned. As there are no other sources, a basic evaluation and limited knowledge, it fits a Level 1 answer.

Question 25

Source H: Laudatio Turiae

Why need I mention your domestic good qualities, your loyalty, your companionship, your good nature, your wool-working, [your religiosity] without superstitiousness, your admirable dress-sense, your devotion to moderation? Why mention your kindness, your duty to your family, since you cared for my mother just as much as your parents, that you have taken [equal care] for her as for your own family, and you have countless other virtues in common with [all other] mothers committed to a worthy reputation?

Using Source H as a starting point and your own knowledge, discuss whether or not Turia was the ideal Roman *matrona*. [8]

Example 1

Turia was a wonderful wife, but I don't think she was the ideal *matrona*.

Source H uses rhetorical questions and listing to convey the broad range of Turia's admirable qualities. By phrasing it in this way it gives the impression that Turia's accomplishments and positive characteristics are many, and the rhetorical questions make it seem like everybody knows about them already. To be so famous for being so good must have improved the reputation of her husband and her household, and thus means that she was an ideal *matrona*.

Ideal Roman women were supposed to work with wool. It showed their industriousness and their obedience. For example, one of the ways that Livy conveys Lucretia's virtue is by showing her weaving. Because Turia's husband mentions her "wool-working" I think it is fair to say that Turia is ideal in this regard.

Turia was not the ideal Roman *matrona* because she was unable to conceive a child with her husband. One of the main roles of the *matrona* was to produce (preferably male) heirs to continue the family line. Despite their long marriage, Turia remained childless and so it is impossible to say that she was absolutely ideal. That said, she did offer her husband a divorce and she even offered to help him to find a new, more fertile wife. This shows the depth of her devotion to her husband and leads me to believe that although Turia did not fulfil this particular aspect of the *matrona's* role, she was a remarkably selfless person who loved her husband very much. Her husband rejected her offer, and so this shows that he cared for her more than he wanted children. Therefore, I think it is fair to say that Turia was the ideal *matrona* for him.

Examiner Commentary

Level 4

The opening paragraph is well made, thanks to the final comment; it is very perceptive, but not something that candidates would perhaps generally say. However, the candidate is a little general in the reference, only really referring to the wool working, rather than the other good qualities. However, the discussion of wool working is good and the point is well backed up with a further reference to a different source.

It is pleasing then that the candidate goes on to mention the lack of children and give an alternative view that she was not an ideal *matrona*. There is pleasing further knowledge of the source in her offer of a divorce, and the candidate does well to make a good AO2 point about the depth of her devotion and selflessness. The reaction of her husband to this is also well discussed.

The answer shows very good analysis and balance. There could be a little more factual knowledge of the text beyond the printed passage, but it is worthy of a Level 4 mark.

Example 2

Source H shows that Turia was the ideal matron because it mentions her “loyalty”. Married women in Rome were expected to be absolutely faithful to their husbands. This is because their culture valued *pudicitia* and also because there was no such thing as a paternity test in ancient Rome.

Source H also mentions that Turia was good at weaving. This was important because Roman women were expected to weave cloth to contribute to their households.

Another thing that Source H says is that Turia had “admirable dress sense”. This makes her ideal because it is clear that her husband approved of the way she dressed. This would make him happy, and so she was doing her job.

Finally, Source H mentions that Turia was “dutiful”. This is nice because it shows that she looked after her parents and her parents-in-law.

Examiner Commentary

Level 2

The point about loyalty is a good one, and the reference to *pudicitia* backs this up quite well. It is a pity, however, that there is no mention of a source on *pudicitia*. The paternity test point adds little. The second reference about weaving is again well picked out, but is not really backed up with any other evidence; the same is true about the points about dress sense. The candidate is referring well to the passage, but not really doing much more at this point. The idea of dutiful is again creditable, but there is little more than a paraphrase.

Overall there is no real attempt, beyond the word *pudicitia* to use other evidence or to give opinions beyond the idea that the qualities in the passage were good ones for a *matrona*. There is no knowledge of the rest of the source, nor any attempt to provide a balanced judgement. The answer focuses almost predominately on the passage however the knowledge, albeit brief, of Roman culture is able to push the answer into Level 2.

Example 3

The *Laudatio Turiae* is a funerary inscription that says lots of complimentary things about a woman called Turia. I think that she was an ideal Roman *matrona* based on this source. Source H is an excerpt from the *Laudatio Turiae*. Some of the complementary things it says about Turia are: "loyalty", "companionship", "moderation" and "duty to family". All of these things are positive, and they make her seem like an ideal *matrona*. It is possible that her husband was lying though, so maybe she wasn't.

Examiner Commentary

Level 1

This is a very weak answer indeed. It is little more than 4 words/phrases picked out and a general statement that this extract is a summary. There is no real discussion as to why these aspects are complimentary, nor any knowledge of the source beyond a statement that it is a funerary inscription. The final statement seems to be clutching at straws; it shows a lack of appreciation that outright lies would be unlikely to be put on a tombstone, especially the comment about caring for her mother-in-law. It would be a Level 1 mark for the basic references to the passages, but there is no visible AO2, and so this would be all it would score.

Question 26

Source I: Virgil's Aeneid Book 11

No city would accept him within their houses or their walls,
(nor would he in his savagery have given himself up to them)
he passed his life among shepherds on the lonely mountains.
Here, among the thickets of savage lairs, he nourished
his child at the udders of a mare from the herd, and milk
from wild creatures, squeezing the teats into her delicate mouth.
As soon as the infant had taken her first steps,
he placed a sharp lance in her hands, and hung
bow and quiver from the little one's shoulder.
A tiger's pelt hung over head and down her back
instead of a gold clasp for her hair, and a long trailing robe.
Even then she was hurling childish spears with tender hand,
whirling a smooth-thonged sling round her head,
bringing down Strymonian cranes and snowy swans.
Many a mother in Etruscan fortresses wished for her
as a daughter-in-law in vain: she, pure, content with Diana
alone, cherished her love of her weapons and maidenhood.

Explain a way in which Virgil emphasises Camilla's femininity in Source I.

[3]

Example 1

Virgil makes Camilla seem feminine by mentioning a "gold clasp" in her hair. Gold is linked with luxury and so it makes her seem feminine.

Examiner Commentary

0 + 0 – The candidate has not read the source carefully enough. A gold clasp is what Camilla does not have, and so the absence of it does not suggest femininity.

Example 2

Virgil makes Camilla seem feminine by stating that she “cherished her ... maidenhood”. This is a particularly feminine trait since maidenhood refers to the state of being a virgin girl. In addition the fact that she cherishes it makes her quite like a Vestal Virgin, a group of famous female priests.

Examiner Commentary

1 + 2 – There is a good quotation (AO1) mark, from which the candidate has mentioned the idea about virginity. There is then further evidence of this being a positive quality with a comparison with the Vestal Virgins. The second idea is not in the mark scheme, but this is a legitimate approach so should be credited.

Example 3

Virgil emphasises Camilla’s femininity because he mentions several things that suggest she is fragile – “delicate mouth” and “tender hand”.

Examiner Commentary

1 + 1 – There are two good references, but there is a maximum of only one mark for AO1. There is a good, if undeveloped point about her fragility with these references. Perhaps the candidate could have given some other evidence of why fragility was seen as a positive trait.

Question 27

Source I: Virgil's Aeneid Book 11

see page 12

Source J: Amazonomachy Frieze, Mausoleum at Halicarnassus



Explain how both sources show warrior women with qualities usually seen as masculine.

[6]

Example 1

Camilla is wearing a "tiger's pelt" which is masculine. The Amazon to the right is riding a horse. This is masculine.

Examiner Commentary

2 + 0 – The candidate has identified two masculine traits correctly from the sources, but there is no explanation as to why either is masculine. The candidate has assumed the answer is so obvious, that it is unnecessary to give it. It claims something is masculine because it is; no marks for a circuitous argument.

Example 2

Virgil depicts Camilla with a “sharp lance”, “spear” and “smooth-thonged sling”. In the ancient world warfare and hunting were almost exclusively male activities. The fact that Camilla is able to wield these weapons and “bring down cranes and swans” makes her seem masculine.

The Amazon warrior to the bottom left of Source J is on the floor, holding an arm up to protect herself. The men are physically towering above her, which represents that they are powerful but she is weak. This depiction does not show the Amazon as masculine, since Greek men were supposed to be strong and heroic. In this image the Amazon seems to be physically weaker than the men, and therefore feminine.

Examiner Commentary

2 + 2 – There is a good reference to the weaponry for AO1, and then there is an AO2 comment about men typically using these. This is elaborated upon by the analysis of her skill in her using the weapons. These points are both credited under AO2.

The candidate has made a reasonable assumption about what one of the Amazons is doing for an AO1 mark. However the analysis, which may be correct, does not answer the question as the candidate argues that she is being feminine. Therefore the AO2 point is irrelevant.

Example 3

In ancient Greece, most women were expected to stay inside their homes. The outdoors was a masculine domain. The Amazon to the right of Source J is riding a horse, which means that she must be outside because it doesn't make sense to ride a horse inside. Because she is depicted outside, she is depicted with qualities usually seen as masculine.

In ancient Rome, most women were expected to stay inside their homes. The outdoors was a masculine domain. Virgil states that Camilla was raised on the “mountains” because people wouldn't accept her into their “houses”. Because she is depicted outside, she is depicted with qualities usually seen as masculine.

Examiner Commentary

1 + 0 – The first two sentences are true, but are rather general statements, instead of being about the sources. There is creditable AO1 in identifying the Amazon riding a horse, but the AO2 is rather banal in stating that horses are not ridden outdoors. On that basis, every woman ever shown outdoors (e.g. mourning at a funeral/attending a wedding – very female activities) would be automatically doing something masculine.

The same statement is made at the start of the second paragraph; the problem is that it simply isn't true! I would dispute that being raised on mountains is something more fitting for men than women, so this would not be credited as showing she is male.

Question 28

Source I: Virgil's Aeneid Book 11

see page 12

Source J: Amazonomachy Frieze, Mausoleum at Halicarnassus



Explain how both sources give a positive portrayal of warrior women.

[6]

Example 1

Source J shows the Amazons as very independent, which means their portrayal is really positive.

Source J also shows that the Amazons were subservient to men, which an ancient Greek audience would have viewed as a good thing.

Examiner Commentary

0 + 0 – The first comment is not backed up with a reference to the source; in fact, it would be difficult to argue the source as showing the Amazons as independent. The source also does not show the Amazons as subservient to men (the fact they are being beaten by men does not show a positive portrayal). There is no discussion of the Virgil passage, which immediately reduces the number of marks the response could theoretically receive. There is nothing creditable at all in this answer.

Example 2

Source J presents the Amazons as strong, and so their portrayal is positive. The Amazon on the right of the sculpture is riding a horse and you can see her muscular leg. The man pulling her off the horse also looks like he is trying really hard, and so she must be strong to be putting up such a fight.

Source I shows Camilla in a positive light because Virgil states that Etruscan women wanted her as a daughter in law. Camilla must have had some positive qualities if these women wanted their sons to marry her and join their family.

Examiner Commentary

2 + 2 – The comment about riding a horse is good, but the candidate should say that riding was a male activity in Greece. It is possible that the leg is muscular, but it is hard to tell and less muscular than her opponent's, and it is debatable as to whether this might be regarded as a positive portrayal anyway. A better point is the idea about the man having to forcefully pull her off the horse. The second paragraph makes a good reference to her being sought after as a wife, and the discussion that she must have had some good qualities. Both sections would get two marks, but it needs a bit more analysis to score higher.

Example 3

Source I shows Camilla to be resilient, and I think this is a positive quality for a warrior woman to have. Despite the fact that she was living in the wilderness in exile with her father, she was able to adapt to her situation by learning to use a spear and a sling well enough to hunt with. This shows her resilience because even though she had a tough start to life, she was able to step outside of the traditional roles of women at the time in order to succeed in her unusual circumstances.

Source J shows that the Amazons were skilful horse riders. Although this would not have been the norm for most Greek women (some Spartan women probably rode horses, but this was unusual) I do think that this is a positive portrayal for a warrior woman because it suggests that she is a potent force on the battlefield. Her skill is shown by the fact that she is able to stay on her horse, despite the fact that she is being pulled from behind and despite the fact that the horse is rearing up.

Examiner Commentary

2 + 4 – “Resilient” is a good opening. This is explained by her behaviour in the wilds, and the fact that she steps out of typically female roles. Each of these three parts would score a mark. There is a further good comment about the riding ability of the Amazons in the frieze, and how this would have been unusual. This does indeed suggest she is a potent force, and there is a good idea about her ability to stay on the horse as it rears up and is pulled from behind. Both points show good detail from the sources and a full discussion.

Comparative essay questions

29. In which society did women wield the most political power, Greece or Rome? Justify your response. [15]

OR

30. 'Women played a more important role in religious worship in Greece than they did in Rome.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? [15]

Example 1

In Athens the main way of being involved in politics was the Assembly. The Assembly would meet every 10 days at a place called the Parthenon. There they would discuss all the important issues of the day, like whether or not to go to war with a rival city. Every man in Athens was allowed to go to the Assembly and they all had an equal say and an equal vote, which they did in secret by writing their opinion on a piece of pottery. Every decision was made like this, so every issue was basically a referendum. This was a good way of deciding what to do because it was fair and everybody was heard. The one group of people who weren't heard in this process was women. They couldn't go to the Assembly and they couldn't vote. This means that they were actually totally excluded from politics and so they didn't wield any political power in the city.

The Roman government was based around an institution called the Senate. The Senate was made up of senators, who were the richest men in Rome. You became a senator by being elected, and once you were one you were one for the rest of your life. The Senate debated important issues that were affecting the city and the Empire. Different people in the Senate had different jobs, but the most important job was the consulship. Like Athens, women in Rome weren't allowed to vote. What's more, they weren't allowed to run for office either. Like the women of Athens, they were excluded from politics entirely.

In conclusion, it is fair to say that no woman, in either Greece or Rome, had political power. Both societies excluded women from their political organisations and so they couldn't wield power or have influence.

Example 2

Women in Rome didn't wield very much political power. They could not vote, and so they were unable to influence who represented them in the Senate or the Assemblies. In addition they couldn't run for elected office, so they were unable to get involved with politics directly if they were unhappy with who was representing them. Very rich women could give money to their favourite candidates which might have helped them to bribe people to get more votes and eventually win. Conversely, they could try to ruin the reputation of politicians they didn't like, which is what Clodia did to Caelius by accusing him of trying to poison her. In these ways they could exert some influence over the world of politics. They could also try to overthrow the government, like Sempronia did when she joined Catiline's conspiracy. There is very little evidence that lower class Roman women or slaves had any political power at all.

Women in Greece were also not very influential in politics. Women could not attend the Assembly in Athens, so their opinions on political matters would not be heard, and they wouldn't be able to vote on any of the important issues that the Assembly were considering. Athenian women could speak to their husbands about politics and so wield indirect power through him. But based on what I know about Athenian romantic relationships from Xenophon, I do not think very many husbands would have listened to their wives. The wives spent the majority of their time indoors, in the *gynaikon*, away from political conversations and current events. They were also not given an academic education. As such I don't think many husbands would have taken the opinions of their wives very seriously and so I think it would be unusual for an Athenian woman to exert political power in this way. Spartan women on the other hand were listened-to. One of their key roles was to encourage the boys and men to train hard and behave well. If a Spartan woman criticised her husband's opinion on something political, I think it is more likely that she would be listened to.

On balance I think that women in Rome wielded more political power.

Example 3

I think that women in Rome wielded more political power than women in Greece.

Upper class women in Rome were able to get involved in politics through the dinner parties they attended. One of the key roles of the Roman *matrona* was to plan and attend dinner parties. If their husband was involved in politics, he might invite other politicians to their home for a dinner party. Because the *matrona* would be present, she would be able to chat to the guests and make her political opinions known. She might be particularly influential if she was very rich and could offer financial backing/bribes, or if she was from a very well respected family and could offer beneficial connections in return for being listened to. If the political guests were convinced by her, they might be prompted to act on her behalf in the Senate. In comparison, Athenian women were not allowed to attend the dinner parties hosted by their husbands. So they did not have this opportunity to indirectly influence politics, thus meaning that they wielded less power. To counter this argument, you could say that a *hetaira* might have had political influence like a Roman woman, since they were often invited to symposia. An example would be Aspasia, who had great influence via her lover Pericles. I do not find this argument to be too important however, since the experiences of *hetaerae* were not very typical.

Another way that women could influence politics is through protest. For example Hyginus' *Life of Agnodice* tells of how the women of Athens stormed the law courts to defend Agnodice when she was on trial. The court listened to the women's wishes, which shows they were influential. Similarly, some Roman women took to the streets to protest the Oppian Law and they were able to influence the men into repealing it. Livy tells us, however, that the Roman women were only able to inspire a debate in the Senate and it was the senators who ultimately decided to repeal the law after much debate. This implies that Roman women were less effective in their protests than Athenian women, suggesting that in this regard Greek women wielded more power.

Women in neither society were allowed to be directly involved in the political process, since they could not vote nor run for office. In this respect it is fair to say that women in neither society had a great amount of political power, and if a woman was able to wield political power then she was highly unusual.

A final way that Roman women could influence politics was through conspiracy. Sempronia was involved in the Catilinarian Conspiracy, and although this was unsuccessful, she was clearly getting involved with politics in an attempt to make change. Similarly Clodia brought a court case against Caelius in an attempt to ruin his political career. Again she was unsuccessful, but her high-profile plotting shows that she was able to wield at least some power. We don't have any evidence of women in Athens doing this, so they seem to have been less influential through conspiracy than Roman women. Although it should be noted that the absence of evidence isn't proof that it never happened.

All in all, I think Roman women wielded more power.

Examiner Commentary

Example 1

Level 1

The opening sentence is factually correct while where the assembly met is largely irrelevant, and the location is wrong. This discussion of men's lives continues too long, with several incorrect pieces of information (such as writing on pottery); women are virtually relegated to an addendum. In effect there are two lines discussing women's political role in Greece.

It is the same story in terms of Rome. Too great a proportion is based on what the Senate was, although there is a little extra detail in that women could not stand for political office.

There is no balance, and an over-simplification of events at the end. There is no mention of the indirect influence of Aspasia, the role of Spartan women, the knowledge of Cleopatra etc. There is no source mentioned at any point. There is very limited knowledge and understanding of sources, although there is some understanding of political bodies. As there are no sources, and the conclusions are weak, it would gain a Level 1 mark.

Example 2

Level 3

This response starts well, with discussion about their direct involvement, although their indirect influence is not considered. The comment about bribery is possible and Clodia is brought in very well to the answer and there is good knowledge of Sempronia, although the analysis that she tried to overthrow the government does oversimplify things a little, but is a reasonable statement. It is very good to see the vast majority of poor women and slave women not ignored at the end. Overall this paragraph does show some good knowledge and does have balance, although the omission of Cleopatra could be seen as a significant opportunity lost.

The Greek section starts in a similar vein to the Roman one. There is a fleeting mention of Xenophon, but the reference is very allusive. There is a better mention of wives being kept inside the *gynaikon* and a lack of education, although the latter idea could be developed further. There follows some good discussion of Sparta, but the conclusion adds very little.

There is some discussion of sources, although very little on the Greek side. Overall it is probably at the top of Level 3, as some points are not developed to their full, and the discussion of sources is a bit too vague for the next level.

Example 3

Level 5

There is an excellent first statement, identifying a particular class of Roman women, and a particular circumstance. There is the right level of discussion about the occasion of a dinner party, the guests, her husband's role, and most importantly, her role. This is contrasted well with the situation in Athens, where women could not attend dinner parties. The approach here of discussing one point on women (at dinner parties), looking at both Rome and Greece in the same paragraph, makes direct comparison easier, and also prevents the repetitive feel that can easily come from having two separate, but similar looking paragraphs. Hetairai are brought in well at this point, and Aspasia is mentioned, but is no more than a name-check.

The idea of influence through protest is really good. There is very good knowledge of Agnodice and the Oppian Law, and the mention of Livy is good. The conclusion at the end of this section is tenable, although perhaps a bit simplistic as two stories are used to create a conclusion.

The third paragraph is concise and accurate, although there could be a mention of Cleopatra as a woman who did wield direct power.

Conspiracy is a well-made point, and backed up well with examples. The point at the end about lack of evidence not necessarily proving something did not happen is very good AO2.

The sources are excellent, and the ideas throughout are very good indeed. It would clearly be in the highest band. It compares Greek and Roman throughout. There are omissions (e.g. no mention of Sparta), but the candidate is not expected to get all the ideas to meet the AO1 Level 5 descriptor.



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: Source J: Amazonomachy Frieze, Mausoleum at Halicarnassus

Square down and Square up - alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk/gcsereform

OCR Customer Contact Centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2018** 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.

