**OCR**

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

# GCE

# Classics: Classical Civilisation

Advanced GCE **H441**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H041**

# OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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

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

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

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

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

**CONTENTS**

**Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H441)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H041)**

**OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

# F381 Archaeology: Mycenae and the Classical World

**General Comments:**

There was a slight increase in the number of candidates entered for this unit and examiners are delighted to report that there were more scripts which showed a detailed knowledge of the specification and that there were far fewer very poor scripts.

Of the commentary questions, Q1 was significantly more popular than Q2, though Q2 often received more detailed, more focused responses because candidates concentrated on answering the questions posed. Q4 was the most popular of the essay questions, though each essay question had a fair number of attempts. What distinguished the best answers was the use of precise references to artefacts, sites and evidence and a clear attempt to analyse and evaluate the selected evidence with reference to the question. Generalised responses do not score well on the assessment grid – there must be accurate subject knowledge and an attempt to use the evidence presented.

The quality of written communication seemed better than in previous years, but some candidates had difficulty with the spelling of technical terms such as dendrochronology, thermoluminescence, Linear B, Schliemann and even the names of Mycenae, Tiryns and Pompeii.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question No.
1(a)
The way in which this question was tackled was variable. There was often a good range of artefacts mentioned but sometimes they were not described in sufficient detail or there was not enough focus on men and women. Some candidates misread the question and used only wall-paintings as their examples.

1(b)
This question on the life of women attracted some very thoughtful responses. The best answers used the image as the starting point of their discussion and moved on to other similar images and depictions of women on artefacts such as the Great Goddess ring. It was pleasing to read answers which went on to link their discussion to evidence of women slaves and textile workers mentioned in the Linear B tablets. There were some candidates who limited the scope of their answers by failing to mention the image at all or by discussing only the clothing and appearance of women. Sometimes candidates did little more than describe and did not move on to the AO2 part of the question.

1(c)
Whilst there were many good responses to this question, some candidates struggled to decide what was meant by 'site'. A surprisingly large number took it to mean an area within a particular archaeological site, e.g. there were discussions of Grave Circle A from Mycenae and the Stabian Baths from Pompeii. The comparisons made were valid but very often did not fully respond to the question of which site was more useful in teaching us about everyday life. It was interesting to note that some candidates made use of their knowledge from another unit, whilst others had clearly studied local sites. Human remains were the most popular topic for discussion but usually this did not lead to a detailed, focused discussion of everyday life. Here sticking to the facts about the bodies, rather than lurid descriptions of them, would have been useful.

2(a)
Although not a popular question, most candidates were able to offer some detailed knowledge of the layout and decoration of a Mycenaean throne room.

2(b)
The candidates who were able to see the link between the construction of large buildings, luxury goods, armies and a control of agriculture were able to present a good argument for the proof of an organisation with a hierarchy within Mycenaean society.

2(c)
The best answers discussed weapons and armour, the evidence of defensive structures such as the Cyclopean walls as well as evidence from the Linear B tablets.  Again, some candidates limited their responses by discussing only weapons and armour.

3
Though there were few responses to this question, there were some very thoughtful approaches displayed, leading to marks from the higher levels of the assessment grid.  Candidates who made use of plans tended to offer a logical, well thought out argument, making good use of sites with which they were familiar.

4
This question was by far the most popular of the essay questions, with a vast range of explanations of the various techniques.  Some explanations of the techniques were sketchy at best and some were simply inaccurate.  Most candidates managed to supply some relevant examples of how and where the techniques have been used.

5
Responses to this question were rather patchy.  Some candidates simple repeated their answer from 1(c) because they did not recognise that the questions were asking for different approaches and different things.  Again, it was pleasing to note that candidates were selecting sites local to them rather than the obvious Mycenae and Pompeii.

# F382 Homer's *Odyssey* and Society

**General Comments:**

This unit continued to be as popular as ever and there were numerous examples of scripts where candidates had clearly been well taught and prepared for the examination whilst also demonstrating an enthusiasm and enjoyment of the topic.

It was encouraging to observe the number of candidates attempting the second context question and this was a significant increase upon previous years. Question 3 was the most popular of the essays.

Once again, rubric errors were minimal although timing posed a problem for some – it is worth the effort of practising past papers in timed conditions just before the examination.

Question 1a
This question posed few problems and candidates were able to recall lots of detail including precise references to the games and the gifts Odysseus received. There were some sequencing issues and a few candidates recalled everything that had happened to Odysseus before he had met Alcinous and Arete, not after.

1b
Most candidates ignored the first two paragraphs and dealt only with the direct references to Ithaca. Candidates who explored the nostalgia implicit at the beginning did well. Plenty of data was gathered but not always interpreted. Candidates must also address the HOW in the question and not just focus on the WHAT, so as to maximise their marks.

1c
This question differentiated well and there was a significant range in the marks awarded to candidates. In general, with this type of question candidates should consider both sides of the argument as well as offer a range of examples from the text to support their argument and to demonstrate that they know what happens in the relevant books of the epic. Stronger responses also split up the quotation and considered 'pointless' and 'dull' separately.
There was good work on Odysseus' speaking skills with the supplication of Nausicaa well used in support. Many commented on character development but did not offer much detail. Most highlighted the importance of *xenia* in Homeric society and better candidates saw it as necessary to illustrate the barbarity of the Cyclops and of the Suitors. Many also commented that the episode was essential for getting Odysseus home. Very few, however, saw the need to build *kleos* and so amass the fortune in *xenia* gifts or the threat posed by Nausicaa or Arete's position in society. Some simply retold the wanderings and paid little attention to Scherie itself. Of those who did, the fantasy nature of the land was mentioned but very few made the bridging point.

Question 2a
Candidates were not as confident in their recall of relevant information as those in question 1a. Most were able to recall Penelope's challenge to the Suitors and talk in general terms about their unsuccessful attempts at stringing the bow. Telemachus' involvement was often overlooked or misplaced and very few mentioned Odysseus revealing his identity to Eumaeus or Philoetius or their involvement.

2b
As with Question 1b, lists of relevant details were aplenty but only the stronger responses accompanied these with apt interpretation or analysis. There was some excellent analysis of the list of crimes and comments on the ironies, however. More astute candidates spotted the poet himself intruding into his poem with the 'fools' reference and they saw how the whole thing was approved by the gods. Generally the quality of response was higher on this question than 1b.

2c
Most were able to identify at least three recognition scenes. Better ones explored them but the analysis of the Telemachus and Odysseus scene was less rigorous than it could have been, although top flight candidates saw that the scene had been anticipated ever since Telemachus was sent to Nestor and Menelaus. Some candidates, unfortunately, confused recognition with the use of disguise and discussed what the latter added to the *Odyssey*. Others thought that they needed to include a counter-argument – it is not relevant to this type of question. There were some lovely essays which went into the type of recognition scenes and saw some are deliberate and some accidental (though having asked for an old servant to wash his feet, Odysseus arguably intended Eurycleia to recognise him), some led to death (Suitors) and some to love and planning...and so on. The work was, on the whole, lively, thorough and pleasing to read.

Question 3
Most candidates were able to make some reference to the Cicones, Aeolus, Cyclops, Circe and events on Thrinacie and offer some sort of discussion on who is to blame for the men's suffering. Stronger responses cast the net wider and included the Lotus Eaters, Laestrygonians and Elpenor. Surprisingly few were brave enough to note that in some situations no blame can be attached. There were many good points made about how Odysseus does protect and value his men: his grief having escaped Ismarus, rescued them from the Lotus Eaters, buried Elpenor, saved them from Circe, fed them with the stag on Aeaea, did not frighten them with the warning about Scylla. Others considered the ramifications of Polyphemus' curse and Zeus' words at the beginning of the epic.

Question 4
Candidates were by and large able to refer to a range of incidents where Athene assists Odysseus, Telemachus and Penelope. There was generally close attention to detail and many appearances by other deities were also listed by most. Stronger responses, however, made an effort to discuss and compare the importance of these contributions and observed the significance of Fate. There were also some good comments on the continued presence of Zeus through omens which were discussed and analysed.

Question 5
The obvious servants (Eumaeus, Eurycleia, Melanthius, Melantho) and their respective virtues and vices were presented accurately and well. This was the least popular essay question which is perhaps a pity as there is much room for discussion and plenty of opportunity to show off knowledge of Homer's society. Stronger responses took advantage of this and also included reference to the other servants dotted around the epic.

# F383 Roman Society and Thought

**General Comments:**

The quality of responses was a little down this year. It was felt that candidates were less familiar with the context in which the texts were set and had a less secure grasp of Roman society.

In conjunction with this, many candidates tended to provide responses that were general, such as 'Horace tells us in the story of Town Mouse/ Country Mouse'. Those that provided detailed factual knowledge such as the country mouse lives on his 'store of vetch' gave a better impression of textual knowledge. In addition, the analysis, when interpreted as, for example, 'this shows Horace keeps to his Epicurean beliefs' at the end of a paragraph, needs explaining why or how according to the question posed.

Candidates are not required to identify Pliny's *Letters* by specific numbers nor any *Satires* but when candidates choose to do so it is expected that the references will be correct.

Legibility was an issue in many scripts, as was spelling of names of authors and characters. This is disappointing, particularly when many are printed on the question paper. Centres are reminded that the Quality of Written Communication is assessed in questions b and c of Section A and in Section B.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Section A
Question 1 was marginally more popular than Question 2

Q1a
In addition to the possible answers suggested in the mark scheme, references were accepted to known followers of the philosophy, including Horace, the scientific approach and reference to the role of and attitude towards the gods. Most candidates understood the basic principles and drew on knowledge from Horace, though analysis of his work was best suited to Question 1c. Some confused the philosophy with Stoicism or described Epicureanism as advocating gluttony. On occasions this question was omitted.

Q1b
The quality of literary responses has improved since the beginning of the specification. Candidates are able to select relevant phrases and offer analysis. Weaker responses include long quotations from the passage, which should be more selective. Many candidates omitted to mention what Horace's message was for the audience.

Q1c
Scholars are not wholly in agreement as to whether Horace was a follower of Epicurean beliefs and candidates who argued that he followed Stoic principles were awarded equal credit. In all cases there needed to be detailed textual support and an explanation as to how it tied in with said beliefs. This is where many candidates missed marks. The best responses gave a balanced argument: *on the one hand……however/on the other hand.*

Q2a
In parallel with Q1a, a few candidates omitted this question or were not familiar with the previous stories about Regulus. Some summarised the printed passage. The best answers were very detailed naming Verania and Blaesus. The marks awarded for this question were not on a 5+5 basis but marked in accordance with the specification marking grid. The response was judged as a whole.

Q2b
Candidates shared Pliny's dislike for Regulus and were able to select relevant phrases and offer analysis. As in 1b, weaker responses included long quotations from the passage. Evaluation of the linguistic point was needed and a link to Pliny's dislike.

Q2c
In this question some candidates offered a long list of letters, with varying amounts of detail, concluding after each 'that this shows'….The more successful responses grouped the letters into type - informative, advice and so on. However it was the perceptive who understood Pliny's revision of the letters for publication and suggested that these were designed to show him in a good light. A small number of candidates discussed the range of themes and topics about which Pliny writes without considering the reasons.

Section B
There was an even spread of responses across all three essays.

Q3
The theme of town and country was a familiar one to most candidates. However, caution is advised here. There were many fine essays on this theme but not so many which addressed the question. The responses achieving the highest level showed an understanding, from their knowledge of Roman Society, of what life was really like in the country and town and then assessed the extent of exaggeration of both Horace and Juvenal. Credit was also given for appreciation of the genre and the purpose of satire. A few candidates dismissed Juvenal as not writing about the country life and dismissed Horace as not writing about the town. Examiners accept that Juvenal, for example, wrote in greater detail about life in Rome and a perfect balance of material was not expected.

Q4
Most candidates came to the conclusion that Pliny had great respect for women, although this was qualified – as long as they behaved properly. Arria was held up as one who deserved respect, followed by Calpurnia. Beyond this, opinions varied as to whether Petronius would or would not agree. Fortunata was held up either as a wanton woman or a paragon of virtue. Detail from Petronius was frequently good. Most candidates agreed that Juvenal did not seem to respect women who were always depicted as poisoners and prostitutes, although some felt, that like Pliny, Juvenal felt women should know their place.

Q5
Most responses covered slaves and foreigners (often spelled incorrectly) but better ones appreciated that freedmen and indeed women had restricted rights. A good introduction to this essay would have been for candidates to show their knowledge of Roman society by defining their understanding of non-citizens and the position of slaves. Some candidates focused entirely on this approach and included very little textual support, which was expected from at least two of Petronius, Pliny and Juvenal. Again knowledge of Petronius was detailed.

# F384 Greek Tragedy in its Context

**General Comments:**

Greek Tragedy maintained its popularity amongst the candidates.  They once again demonstrated their enjoyment of the plays and had a good personal reaction to the issues raised by the questions.  Candidates seemed to have gained more confidence and knowledge of the newer plays in the specification, as shown by the essay question on *Ajax* being the most popular.  The usual problems remained from previous years – confusion between Aegisthus and Aegeus, and spellings of the Classical names, which seemed worse than in previous years.

Of the questions, Question 1 was the more popular of the commentary questions, while the most popular essay was the question on *Ajax*, followed closely by the essay on *Medea.*

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question No.

1(a)  Most candidates were aware of the general events which occurred before the passage began, although there was sometimes confusion about what information was given by the Watchman, Chorus and Herald.  The Watchman was at times credited with comments made by the Chorus, or stated to know what Clytaemnestra was planning.  Details of the *Parodos* and Choral ode varied, but most candidates were able to mention some details of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia.  Better answers dealt with the conversation between the Chorus and the Herald, but many candidates simply stated that he entered, or did not mention him at all. The amount of detail given in the answers varied considerably.

1(b)   The passage gave great scope for candidates to be able to identify and discuss dramatic irony, but in many cases, they did not do the passage justice.  Candidates were able to pick out examples of dramatic irony from the passage and usually explain the dramatic irony they contained, contrasting how the Herald and Chorus interpreted Clytaemnestra's words with their hidden meaning.  There were also interpretations which talked about blatant lies and/or sarcasm. Those who discussed the comments of the Chorus Leader variously interpreted them as innocent approval of the speech, or sarcastic criticism of her insincerity. Better answers not only analysed the chosen examples of dramatic irony, but also dealt well with the idea of how effective the use of the dramatic irony was in the passage.

1(c)  A wide interpretation of Clytaemnestra's character was revealed by the answers to this question.   Most candidates agreed with the description for the most part, arguing more strongly for the assertion than against it.  Details to back up the argument from the rest of the play, such as the persuading of Agamemnon to walk on the purple tapestries, were not always given. Most candidates found some justification for her actions in the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, but treated the death of Cassandra as purely evil.  Clytaemnestra's affair with Aegisthus and Agamemnon bringing Cassandra back were mentioned frequently, but not always with the appropriate contemporary context.  Surprisingly few mentioned Clytaemnestra's speech to the Chorus while standing over the two bodies, or the closing of the play.  Some answers also discussed whether Clytaemnestra was the embodiment of the Fury cursing the House of Atreus.  Better answers dealt separately with the two characteristics, analysing whether she was scheming, and whether she was evil.  Many candidates came to the conclusion that she was scheming, but not evil.  This question also provided candidates with the opportunity to use their favourite quotation 'that woman, she manoeuvres like a man', although very few spelt it correctly.

2(a)  Details of events in the play were well known, with most candidates able to give a reasonable answer.  Answers were generally detailed on the Cassandra scene, but some missed out the entry of Andromache, her discussion with Hecabe and the taking away of Astyanax.  Many did not give details of the *agon* between Hecabe and Helen, simply summarising it as Menelaus and Helen came on stage.

2(b)  Despite the wording of the question, very few answers dealt with the situation on stage, missing out the theatricality of the confrontation and the contrast in the appearance of the characters.  Most dealt simply with the words used and their tone, considering the effect they would have on the audience. Most answers dealt with the confrontation between Hecabe and Menelaus, with support from the Chorus.  Helen's desperation to avoid death was also mentioned frequently.  Most candidates picked up on Menelaus' joking reference to Helen's weight.  A few used their knowledge of the myth to discuss the dramatic irony of the passage, that Helen was not in fact killed on returning to Sparta, which backed up Hecabe's warning to Menelaus not to let her travel back to Greece on the same ship as him.

2(c)  A range of opinions was expressed in the answers to this question.  Some saw Helen as deserving no sympathy, because she caused the war but refused to accept any blame.  Those who knew the details of the *agon* which preceded the passage generally used that as evidence for her not deserving any sympathy. Her arrogant character and appearance in fine clothing were also used as evidence for her deserving no sympathy.  Others believed that she deserved some, either accepting her argument that it was Aphrodite who was to blame for the war, or arguing that she did deserve some sympathy because of her isolation and impending fate.  Answers also discussed the other characters, feeling a lot of sympathy for them.  However, there were those that argued that there were other female characters who deserved no sympathy either.  Cassandra was mad and happy, Polyxena was dead, Andromache was too self-pitying, and Hecabe did nothing but moan.  These other female characters also included Athena, who deserved no sympathy for turning on the Greeks.

3   A full range of suspects was analysed in discussing how far Ajax was to blame for his own death.  As well as his personality and actions, blame was attributed to Athena, the Atreidae, Odysseus, his family, (including his father and Teucer), the Chorus, Fate and the heroic code, and even Hector.  Most candidates did discuss his shame at killing the livestock, caused by Athena's intervention, and cited his desire to kill the Atreidae and Odysseus as being caused by his failure to win Achilles' armour.  Virtually all candidates accepted that the vote had been rigged, so felt Ajax was justified in seeking revenge. His *hubris* and stubbornness were mentioned as contributory factors, with the shame he felt when he realised what he had done to the livestock seen as the main reason for his suicide.  Athena was blamed, not for protecting Odysseus, but for how she did it, and how she enjoyed his humiliation.  The Atreidae were seen as being at fault for not giving Ajax the armour of Achilles, even though he deserved it, and rigging the vote.  The influence of his father Telamon and his opinion of Ajax was seen as a contributory factor.  Teucer, Tecmessa and the Chorus were blamed for not keeping Ajax in his tent, to thwart the prophecy of Calchas and Fate. Hector was blamed as it was his sword which Ajax used, much like the fact that it was Ajax's belt which Achilles used to drag Hector behind his chariot.  Most candidates agreed that it was the heroic code, and the shame and humiliation of being laughed at, which was the ultimate reason why Ajax committed suicide.  Many candidates saw the issue in simplistic terms – Ajax was to blame as he is the one who actually killed himself.  Most answers were well argued with good reference to the play.

4  Most candidates were able to distinguish differences in personality between Jason and Medea, although there were those who neglected to mention that he was Greek and she was a barbarian.  This led to the different attitude towards Jason's actions and motives for marrying Glauce.   Other differences discussed included her intelligence compared to him, which enabled her not only to fool him into thinking she had changed her mind, but also manipulate Creon and Aegeus. Another difference cited was her emotional nature, as opposed to his calm and logical approach to life.  This emotional nature was responsible for her choice of revenge.  Some answers put the reason

for the Tragedy more on the similarities in their personalities – both proud, both stubborn and unable to accept the other's point of view. Better answers used examples from the play for evidence, but there were those who simply narrated events from the play (or the myth) and failed to develop their arguments.

5 Most answers to this question dealt both with the way the plays were entertaining, but also other factors. They looked not only at plot and characterisation, but also other factors such as the impact of the Chorus, and the use of stage machinery, such as the *ekkyklema* with the bodies in *Agamemnon,* and the *mechane* at the end of *Medea*. This was referred to in most answers as the *deus ex machina.* Most answers also discussed the effect on the audience, creating horror and suspense, and even referring to Aristotle. Virtually all answers saw the plays as being more than entertainment. Mostly, they also discussed the various moral messages which the plays could convey. Frequent reference was made to *Trojan Women* and the Athenian sack of Melos, but also the effects of *hubris* as seen in *Agamemnon* and *Ajax*. However, not many answers went beyond the messages, with surprisingly few discussing the nature of the dramatic festivals in honouring the gods, and the competition between the poets. Most candidates went beyond the two plays required in the question, dealing with three or all four. The range of detail varied, but the best answers used specific examples to back up the points they were making.

*OCR Report to Centres – June 2014*

# F385 Greek Historians

**General Comments:**

Candidates generally had a good grasp of the details of all three historians' work.  Commentary Question 1 proved to be the more popular by far while, of the essays, Question 5 was answered by most candidates; few attempted Question 4.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question No.

1(a)  Most candidates knew the main details of Croesus' life as presented by Herodotus, some even going as far as to discuss his ancestry.  The level of detail was variable; some answers described virtually everything mentioned by Herodotus, while others had only a few examples.  Solon's meeting with Croesus was not mentioned by some, and a fair number of candidates misunderstood the words of the oracle.  The fate of his two sons was also frequently omitted.

1(b)  Candidates were able to pick out features of Herodotus' writing style from the passage, with relevant examples.  These included his personalising of Croesus and Cyrus, the use of direct conversation about which he could have known nothing, and the mention of the gods and oracles.  However, candidates were not always able to find parallel examples from the rest of the text.  Better answers also mentioned features seen elsewhere (e.g. in the battle scenes) which are not found in the passage.

1(c)  Most answers contained details of how Herodotus portrayed non-Greeks from the text.  The most popular example, not surprisingly, was Xerxes. He was generally seen as being portrayed as a hubristic tyrant, with examples such as Pythius' son, and the whipping of the Hellespont, but even here candidates were able to detect some sympathetic features, such as his weeping over men's short lifespan. Other non-Greeks mentioned were Mardonius, also treated unfavourably, and Artemisia, who was portrayed sympathetically.  Some candidates mentioned the length of Herodotus' ethnographic writings on the Persians and the Egyptians as evidence that he did have sympathy for non-Greeks.  There were a number of candidates who, despite the wording of the question, did not discuss the passage, or even Croesus.  Most, however, did and saw some sympathy in Croesus' fall from power, although his attitude to Apollo in the passage was seen by many as arrogant.  A few candidates, picking up from the passage, discussed Cyrus, who received almost universal approval.

2(a) Although less popular than Question 1, there were still several answers, which did reveal knowledge of this section of Thucydides' text.  There was some confusion over the points made in the speeches before the passage, with some including what Archidamus had said, despite not being required by the question.  Better answers summarised the points made by the Corinthians and the Athenians, some even with a good range of quotations

2(b) Analysis of the points made varied in quality, but most answers had some reference to the text, and analysed whether the speaker had put his points forward in a convincing manner.  Better answers considered not only the content, such as references to Sparta's allies and the Athenians' behaviour but also the style, especially the exhortations to fight at the end.  These answers were able to analyse the points made as a counter-argument to the speech of Archidamus just before the passage began.

2(c)  Virtually all candidates made reference to Thucydides' methodology in assessing their answer.  Comments about paired speeches, their common style, and the 'made up' nature of

most of them were made in most answers.  Candidates were able to quote examples from elsewhere in the text, the most notable being Pericles' Funeral Oration, but also the discussions over Corcyra and the debate of which the passage forms part.  A few candidates mentioned the unusual style of this speech, which does not conform to the normal rhetorical structure seen in speeches in Thucydides, but seems to be more of the type of speech a Spartan would give.

3  There were a variety of approaches to this question.  Many candidates looked at how useful Thucydides' work is in giving information to the modern world about the events and people of the time.  They discussed his presentation of the events of the war; particular mention was made of his description of the plague and its symptoms.  Some candidates saw his approach to speech writing as a 'handbook' for modern politicians.  While some saw his writings as historically useful, there were those who argued that Thucydides' work had nothing to offer us in 2014.  Several candidates went beyond the historiography, and were able to consider his comments about human nature remaining constant; they considered his analysis of why the Peloponnesian War broke out, and saw modern parallels in the outbreak of the First Gulf War, and even the current crisis in the Ukraine.

4  Although not answered by many candidates, this question did produce some good answers.  Candidates showed a familiarity with both biographies, and were able to separate out comments about the stories Plutarch told from his skill as a biographer.  Comments were made about how he divided up his work, especially concentrating on the early lives of his subjects, and their deaths.  They included examples of the various anecdotes about Themistocles' drive to succeed at an early age because of his parentage, and the strange shape of Pericles' head.  These were treated as stories, but some argued that it was his skill as a storyteller which made him such a good biographer.

5  Candidates were able to discuss the different approaches to historiography found in the work of the three authors.  Most started by defining what they felt a good historian should be like, and then analysed which of the three fitted their idea the best.  Herodotus was given credit for being the first historian, and how the informal style of writing made his *Histories* enjoyable to read, but he was criticised for his digressions and inclusion of supernatural elements.  Thucydides was seen as being a good historian because of his use of chronology and seeming accuracy of descriptions, especially where military matters are concerned.  Criticism of his style centred on his 'made up' speeches, and his boring and dry style of writing.  Plutarch was commended for his accounts of Themistocles' and Pericles' lives, and the details they shed on events not covered by the other two authors, as well as his references to his sources, although, in many cases, the candidates did not approve of his choice.  Negative aspects of his work included the narrowness of his narrative, although most candidates did point out that Plutarch was a biographer, so different from the other two writers.  All three historians had their advocates, but overall, Thucydides was the choice of most candidates.

# F386 City Life in Roman Italy

**General Comments:**

The quality of responses continues to improve and candidates communicate a real enthusiasm for the topics in the unit.

However, some candidates are still providing responses that are general, such as 'the Suburban Baths were highly decorated'. Those that provided detailed factual knowledge such as 'the Suburban baths were extensively decorated with marble wall panels and stucco figures' naturally gained marks in the higher levels for Assessment Objective 1. Those using the sources to compare or contrast gained marks in the higher levels for Assessment Objective 2. Sometimes analysis is interpreted as 'this shows X was important' at the end of a paragraph of detail. Candidates should be reminded to evaluate the material with the question in mind.

Legibility was an issue in many scripts, as was spelling of some basic and technical words. This is disappointing, particularly when many terms are printed on the question paper. Centres are reminded that the Quality of Written Communication is assessed in questions b and c of Section A and in Section B.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Section A
Candidates' responses were divided equally between Q1 and Q2.

Q.1a
This question was answered well with many candidates providing considerable detail. Whereas bullet point answers are acceptable as a format for Q1a (and 2a) candidates need to provide a sufficient level of detail and explanation. The bullet points in the mark scheme are for the guidance of examiners in their marking and do not represent a sample answer. There was some confusion between the tomb of Naevolia Tyche and that of her husband, Munatius Faustus, in some responses.

Q1b
This question provided candidates with the opportunity to discuss the passage and draw parallels with other tombs and there were some very good responses. Unfortunately, some candidates did not use the passage at all. Others did not provide the breadth of comparison which was required, discussing one tomb only or mentioning two without any or sufficient detail. Some candidates believed erroneously that the bisellium was associated with the cult of Augustus and others considered that Fortunata was the goddess of luck, rather than Trimalchio's wife.

Q1c
This question was generally well done, although some candidates did not provide a sufficient range of information specific to Pompeii. Better responses considered the position of freedmen and the likely prejudice from others. Less strong responses restricted information to fun and leisure activities available.

Q2a
This question allowed many candidates to demonstrate their detailed knowledge of the Samnite house. A few appeared to depend *only* on the photograph shown or stated that the Samnite house had very little decoration and was made from cheap materials, a possible confusion with the House in Opus Craticium. Additional credit was given for dates as well as details about the upper floor and the decoration of the house, though candidates should also be advised to expand on 'first style' and 'fourth style'. Basic facts such as the house had an *impluvium* and *conpluvium* were noted but remained peripheral to the other details required for a full answer.

**Q2b**
Most candidates agreed with the statement that the Samnite House was the 'most shabby' house in Herculaneum, although the best responses provided a balanced argument for and against, supported by detail from the buildings cited, and drawing a reasonable conclusion at the end. Unfortunately, some candidates did not note 'in Herculaneum' and provided detail from houses in Ostia and Pompeii.

**Q2c**
This question provided an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of houses in Ostia and to draw comparison with the Samnite house. Some candidates provided extensive detail about all the houses in Ostia and used this to address the potential needs of the Samnite house owner. Others again did not read the question and provided detail regarding houses other than in Ostia. There was confusion among some candidates between the House of Apuleius and the House of the Dioscures. Nevertheless a number of candidates entered into the spirit of the question and made very convincing estate agents.

**Section B**
**Q3**
Many answers were very general and demonstrated knowledge of the bathing process and the rooms in baths. The weakest responses did not address the question at all but instead focused on about the importance of the baths. Many candidates did not discuss any decoration at all and others confused the Suburban baths in Herculaneum and the Forum Baths in Ostia. Only the best responses explored in detail the baths being more splendid than they needed to be. This was the second most popular question.

**Q4**
This was the most popular question and many candidates did this very well, citing a range of information on a range of houses and gardens and building a convincing argument using this. There was an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of the detail of each house, a broader knowledge of patronage and to use secondary sources in this question. Indeed a few candidates provided all of this, whilst others mentioned a broad range of housing but did not provide enough detail, which then affected the strength of their argument. There was confusion for some candidates between the House of Octavius Quartio and the House of Menander and between some of the Ostian houses. A number of candidates also stated that the House of Menander did not have a garden.

**Q5**
This is a type of question which has grown in popularity over the course of this specification. Some candidates did very well on this question, discussing the disadvantages of the Tiber, the growth of Portus, Claudius's motivation and the advantages of the location for Pompeii. They referred to the Great Warehouse, the Vigiles and the Piazza of the Corporations in Ostia and the garum merchant, Scaurus and the freedman Numerius Popidius Ampliatus and his connection with the temple of Isis in Pompeii.

# F387 Roman Britain: Life in the Outpost of the Empire

**General Comments:**

There was a slight increase in the candidature for this unit this year.  Examiners felt that there were also many more fine scripts and far fewer weaker ones.  It is still disappointing to read responses which are very generalised with no **specific** examples from sites or texts.  Even when candidates did give examples they often gave so many that their line of argument tended to get lost or become obscured.  Using some time to plan longer answers is never wasted time.

A few candidates clearly did not make effective use of the time allocated and had to resort to bullet points to complete their answers or sometimes their answers just tailed off.  This was often the case with those who chose to start with Section B.

Quality of written communication seemed the same as in previous years but examiners were dismayed at the increasing number of scripts which took a considerable time to decipher.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question No.

**1(a)**
Some candidates struggled to interpret the diagrams and the captions with sufficient care.  So some assumed the Flavian palace was a different building from Fishbourne Roman villa. A few assumed the Flavian palace referred to Domitian's palace in Rome. None used the term Flavian as a guide to date. Some seemed to assume that the Lockleys and North Leigh diagrams were of the same villa.

Most answers kept very rigidly to the information provided with many candidates answering the question 'How useful are these diagrams?' Few knew much about North Leigh (or Fishbourne beyond its ownership by Cogidubnus).  Many knew about the heyday of villas in the 3rd and 4th centuries. Few candidates could add information about other villas.

**1(b)**
This aspect of the question was better done but not many candidates could  focus both on 'villas as proof' and 'way of life changing'.  A surprising minority did not refer to the differences between wealthy and poor. Many contrasted town and rural life.

**2(a)**
Some candidates struggled with this question and there was much misunderstanding of both the inscriptions and their context.  Some candidates commented on the usefulness of the inscriptions without relating it specifically to the question of how the army helped to develop the economy. There was also little understanding of the references to soldiers and their status.  The reference to Holy Trinity Church in York led to some wild claims about early Roman churches.
A few candidates felt the inscriptions gave little information about how the Roman army helped the development of the economy and were able to give a well-reasoned argument to support their view.  Many also commented on the lack of time spread but most considered the geographical spread to be reasonable.

2(b)
Most candidates were well-prepared for the topic of the economy and found this question relatively straightforward.  Such candidates could list many examples of changes to the economy, although only a few really concentrated on specific evidence. Some were aware of changes during the period of the Roman occupation and a few could relate these to developments within the wider Empire.

3
The question on roads was generally well-answered.  All candidates could list contributions of the road network and the majority saw the need to discuss alternative factors.  There was much variation, however, in the ability to give specific examples in support, even of roads and their routes.  The factors contributing to the development of the province seemed to be a topic most candidates were so familiar with that many essays contained a great deal of description without relating it directly to exactly how a particular factor contributed.

4
Again this proved a very familiar topic for most candidates.  Many went for the simple interpretation that it was neither Classical nor native but fusion which was the most popular form of art.  Some answers just went through a list of artworks categorising them as Classical, native or fusion.  Some answers did address the 'became more popular' aspect of the question and tried to discuss changing styles of art but most candidates were very hazy and inaccurate about the dates of the pieces of artwork they were describing.  The division between the civilian zone and the military zone was dealt with exclusively from the point of view of wealth and the desire for 'Romanisation' with no appreciation of the differing origins of the military units.

# F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World

**General Comments:**

This unit continues to remain a popular option. There were many informative and interesting responses written by candidates who were clearly both enthused by the art and architecture they had studied and had been very well prepared throughout the course and for the examination. The level of personal response, especially on Question 2(b) and Question 4, was quite impressive. Marks on this unit tend to cover the whole mark range and this year was no exception, with several candidates achieving full marks on individual questions.

By far the most popular choice of questions was 1 and 3. It was disappointing that so few - less than 10% of the candidature - attempted Question 2 and Question 4.  To improve their performance candidates need to answer the question from the paper and not adapt it to a version of the question they want to answer.  Close reference to the wording of the question tended to keep an argument from straying into tangential issues.  As usual there were those who were able to quote Woodford verbatim; there were times, however, when it seemed that candidates had not really processed what Woodford is trying to say and so her words were used inappropriately or at best inaccurately.

There were no rubric errors this year and most candidates made extremely good use of their time. Examiners believe that the value of planning answers at this level cannot be over-estimated. Fewer candidates seem to be offering diagrams to support or enhance their arguments – where they were employed, they were used to good effect.

Legibility and quality of written communication were noticeably worse this year.  As for spelling of technical terms – as well as good evidence of the usual suspects [symmetry, repetition, drapery, *kore, korai*], there were some new favourites this year: buttox, titled [tilted?], subtitles [subtleties?] and the Berlin Standing Goddess's harmartia [*himation*?] and centenary folds.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question No.

**1(a)**
This question asked for a discussion about which pot's narrative scene was more successful in terms of content, composition and aesthetics.  Most candidates preferred the Pan Painter's *hydria* because his painting is more naturalistic, though a few found positive points in the *dinos*, such as the Gorgon Painter's 'realistic' depiction of Gorgons and his ability to convey a continuous narrative.  Some spent too long discussing the merits of the decorative friezes of the *dinos*.

Many candidates were able to say a great deal about these two pots, often focusing more on the Pan Painter.  It is important in questions like this to discuss both examples as equally as possible, rather than just the favourite.  Better answers to balanced their discussion between the two pots and gave the Gorgon Painter *dinos* a fair analysis as well.

There was a surprising amount of misidentification: some did not realise that the subject matter was the same on the two pots; some identified Perseus as Hermes, Jason [and Medusa as Medea] and Herakles.  It was clear that a few candidates answered this question purely by observation and displayed little knowledge of the pots beyond what was on the paper.

1(b)
Many candidates had problems with the word 'sophisticated', taking it to mean 'serious', 'robust', or even 'tragic'. Clearly this affected their answers. They had no trouble with the word 'playful', however, and were well able to demonstrate this from the Medusa pot. Most candidates were able to describe the Boreas and Oreithyia [often given in a variety of spellings, even to Ophelia and Arrhythmia] *oinochoe* and some knew the Artemis and Actaeon *bell krater*. The very best answers used the vocabulary 'playful and sophisticated' to explore the Boreas pot in a nuanced way, and also to related it quite closely to the Medusa vase in terms of style.

Far too many candidates decided to compare the Pan Painter's work with other painters, or misattributed vases to him.

2(a)
There were fewer responses to this question. Of the few candidates who did tackle it, some had considerable knowledge and were able to make a pleasing assessment, making use of the accurate detail which was essential for a good answer. Examiners were surprised how few candidates made reference to the Periclean building programme and the fact that this enabled the design of the sanctuary area to have some overall unity. One candidate took the word 'sanctuary' to mean the Parthenon itself. Some candidates seemed to believe that the Athenians had built the Acropolis itself.

2(b)
This question triggered some quite informed answers and lively discussion of the Acropolis sanctuary and either Delphi or Olympia. Some candidates slanted their arguments one way or another, while better answers discussed both religion and propaganda. Such an approach made for a more reasoned response, with candidates trying to detect both aspects as present simultaneously.

3
This was the essay of choice or 92% of the candidature. Almost everyone who answered it had a range of examples to discuss, and opinions about them. Most candidates agreed with the statement in the question, although some more thoughtful essays argued that Archaic sculpture had its merits, or at least had merits in the eyes of those who originally used it. There was some attention to the fact that Archaic sculpture developed and that late Archaic had more naturalism than very early works.

Not all candidates read the question with care. Some noted that later sculpture was in fact more realistic, and that this may or may not have made it better. This approach produced carefully argued answers. Others argued that later sculpture was obviously more realistic, with the assumption that this was equivalent to 'better'. These answers tended to be more one-dimensional.

The quality of answers depended partly on number of examples but mainly on the detail and the degree of nuance in analysing them. It was gratifying when Archaic examples – especially the illustrated Berlin Goddess – were explored for merits. This made praise of later works more meaningful, as it was not simply the obvious realism that was praised. There was good attention to drapery in most answers, and its uses ranging from calm modelling to violent motion were attended to with some relish.

Excellent answers showed pleasing observation and a detailed analytical approach. Weaker essays showed less capacity for observation, even making very little use of the illustrations given, and filling in with imagined narrative detail such as the expression on the face of the Raging Maenad.

There was also a problematic use of the word 'idealised' to describe Archaic style, almost as a synonym for 'symbolic' or 'stylised', and in opposition to the naturalism of later Classical art. Despite the images for this question, one candidate wrote about *kouroi*.

4

There were very few candidates who answered this question on Doric and Ionic friezes, but the quality of answers tended to be of a higher level. There were some excellent answers from candidates who knew their *friezes* and *metopes* really well, and could make genuinely detailed appreciations of the selected individual examples, or sections of examples. Opinions as to which form of frieze was the more successful varied, and it was the quality of the critique which gained marks from the higher levels of the assessment grid. Excellent answers not only included a good amount of accurately remembered visual detail, but showed an ability to argue with it, to relate it to the terms of the question and, by doing so, to bring the essay to an interesting level.

Others were able to cover a lot of ground, even including the Bassai frieze. Ideas about the Olympia *metopes* being dynamic (with analysis) and the Parthenon frieze being finely crafted (with detailed examples), or similar combinations, applying the adjectives of the essay title, tended to do very well. In a very small number of cases there was some confusion over which pieces came from which building and in one case a candidate who wrote about pediments.

# F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World

**General Comments:**

In Section A, Q.1 was about twice as popular as Q.2; in Section B, Q.4 was more popular than Q.3.

In general, there was good engagement with the plays, with the best responses displaying an understanding of performance conditions and historical context. Of the two Aristophanes plays, *Lysistrata* was better-known than *Frogs*, though in some cases responses focused just on the rude bits of both. Some candidates were familiar with other plays and made good use of their knowledge. The two Plautus plays seemed equally well-known, though in weaker responses it was clear that candidates were unsure of which character appeared in which play.

It was noticeable that those candidates who had clearly planned their responses generally scored better on AO2 than those who had not. This suggests that writing down a brief plan may help candidates to evaluate the material more consistently and organise arguments more logically. Timing seems to have been a problem for some candidates. In most cases, they spent far too long on the commentary questions – often because they included too many irrelevant facts – and then ran out of time for the essays. In some cases it was obvious that they had left space for the (b) question, come back to it and then run out of time.

Handwriting is still an issue, particularly where candidates are not accustomed to writing solidly for two hours or more. Centres are advised to think carefully about which candidates should be advised to use a word-processor to produce scripts.

Candidates are advised to think carefully about their use of asterisks to indicate omissions or second thoughts. It is often difficult to see or find asterisks within crowded written responses. If later there is no corresponding asterisk, or the same symbol is used for two different points, it is sometimes difficult to work out what the candidate means. Candidates are reminded that spelling of regularly-used technical terms (which in this case includes frequently-occurring names) is taken into account when assessing AO2(b).

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

Question 1(a)
Candidates were required to assess which of the types of jokes/humorous techniques displayed in the passage were found elsewhere in Lysistrata, and also to comment on whether any significant styles of humour shown elsewhere in the play were not represented in the passage. Stronger responses were thematically arranged – example from passage linked to a similar example from elsewhere in the play – and covered areas such as wordplay, visual comedy (i.e. stage 'business' or costumes), social or political references, insult or crude language. The dressing-up of the Magistrate, the overpowering of the policemen, the attempts to escape from the Acropolis and Myrrhine's duping of Cinesias were the most frequently-cited examples from elsewhere in the play. Weaker responses tended to showcase candidates' delight at being able legitimately to use rude words in an examination. It should be stressed that while close reference to or quotation from the passage was expected, there was no need at all for candidates to quote words with which they were uncomfortable. Identifiable indication of context (e.g. giving a specific line-number from the passage on the paper) would have gained the same amount of credit. The words 'typical of' were sometimes misunderstood; some candidates had clearly taken this to mean that they should concentrate only on types of humour which could be regarded as not 'topical' to Aristophanes' own time.

Question 1(b)
Candidates were free to define for themselves the criteria by which they would assess 'better use of the Chorus' but to do well their arguments and assessments had to accord with the evidence from all parts of both plays. The role of the Chorus in *Lysistrata* was generally well-discussed, with most being able to identify the way in which it echoes the themes of division and reconciliation and almost all being able to comment on its contribution to the overall comic effect and spectacle. Some commented on the use of the two Chorus leaders as extra speaking characters. There were some good comments about the Frog Chorus in *Frogs*, but too many completely omitted the Chorus of Initiates or else said that their role was limited to a rude song and giving directions to Pluto's palace.  The word 'Parabasis' was often notable by its absence. The strongest responses, however, were able to make good use of the Parabasis of *Frogs* and commented on how the serious message was delivered in *Lysistrata* in the absence of a traditional Parabasis. Many came to the conclusion that the Chorus were used better for plot cohesion in *Lysistrata* and for delivery of the authorial message in *Frogs*. Answers depended in part on whether the candidate regarded the Frog Chorus as on or off-stage, but there was general agreement about the contribution of both Choruses in *Frogs* to the musical element of the play.

The entrance of the Initiate Chorus in *Frogs* was often misunderstood.  It was a specific Eleusinian Hymn which was parodied (as stated in the text). The other parody was of the public procession which formed part of the Eleusinia. The actual Mysteries – as rightly pointed out by many candidates – were not publicly known and any parody of those would indeed have been sacrilege; this was not, however, what Aristophanes was doing.

Question 2(a)
Rather unusually, this question required discussion of two shorter passages rather than just one, and this may explain why, overall, Q 2 was far less popular than Q 1. Candidates seemed evenly divided between those favouring Passage A (the actual opening lines of the play) and those regarding Passage B as the potentially better opening.  Those who favoured Passage A commented on the focus on Pyrgopolynices, noting that otherwise he would not have appeared until over half way through the play. Some commented on the effect that the removal of this scene might have had on the perceived coherence of the plot.  Some very strong responses commented on performance context – the need to attract an audience amid the noise and bustle of the Megalensian Festival. Those who favoured Passage B chose to focus on the way in which it enabled an audience to understand the plot and enabled Plautus to use dramatic irony later on in the play. The fact that Artotrogus appears only in Passage A and does not appear at all in the play was also cited as a reason for preferring Passage B. Weaker responses tended to comment on which one was more boring to read – thus totally missing the point.

Question 2(b)
It was very clear from the responses to this question that most candidates had at some point discussed these two slaves and were generally able to analyse their characters and their roles in the plays. 'Well-developed' was interpreted in a number of ways. Weaker responses generally compared the autobiographical information given about Palaestrio with that given about Pseudolus and then forgot about 'interesting' altogether, instead giving a brief summary of the two plays. Stronger responses considered their relationships with other characters in the play and the extent to which they were treated by Plautus as devices to create humour rather than as potentially credible human beings. Where Pseudolus was seen as more interesting, the focus was on his ability to improvise his way out of trouble and the suspense created for the audience by the fact that failure in his enterprise would lead to his being sentenced to hard labour.  Where he was seen as 'well-developed' the arguments rested on his uncertainty about the success of his plans and his fear of being betrayed or outdone by Simia. Those who decided he was less 'well-developed' and less interesting justified their assessment by saying that he was more in line with the stock 'servus callidus'. Palaestrio was often seen as less well-developed and less interesting because he spent so much time in the background, leaving nearly everything to the three main female characters and Periplectomenus. His flirtation with Milphidippa was often used to justify his being more interesting.

Question 3

Most of those who chose this question were able to discuss the portrayals of the main characters in all four plays and perhaps whether they were more varied in the Greek plays as opposed to the Roman ones. Weaker responses stopped there, evaluation rarely going beyond 'so those are some examples of characters from the plays I have read and Playwright A's characters are more memorable/funnier than Playwright B's.' The key to real success, however, was whether or not the candidate had engaged with 'more important as a source of comedy'. Stronger responses focused on the ways in which the authors used the characters to create comedy, either by being comic in themselves (e.g. the portrayal of Dionysus in *Frogs*) or, by contrast, acting as conduits of humour (e.g. Lysistrata as 'straight woman'). Another way of tackling the question was to consider characterisation as one of the ways in which the two authors created comedy: was this primarily from the characters or from other sources? Many successfully argued that Plautus exploited or subverted stock characters and situations to create humour, but also used wordplay and dramatic irony to entertain his audience, while Aristophanes simply used his characters as humorous devices on which to hang a series of comic sketches. Others decided that the question was too simplistic and it all depended on the play, with *Pseudolus* and *Lysistrata* as least reliant on characterisation as a source of comedy and *Frogs* almost completely reliant, with *The Swaggering Soldier* being reliant equally on characterisation and plot. As ever, the consistency of the argument and the effective use of pertinent evidence was the crucial factor.

Question No. 4

This question seemed a safe topic for many candidates, since almost all of them were aware of the main purposes of comic drama in the ancient world and the most notable differences between the plays of Aristophanes and those of Plautus. Those who focused on the importance of the serious message in Aristophanes' plays sometimes spent too much time discussing the general historical background and omitted evidence from the plays. Good use was made of the comments about the role of the dramatist in Athens, using either the Parabasis or the Agon of *Frogs*. Where such a reference opened a response, the resulting discussion was often very well balanced between 'entertain' and 'advise' for both Aristophanes and Plautus. Comments about Aristophanes tended to cover the ways in which serious messages were delivered in the plays, the role of music and dance and the literary criticism and political discussion in the Agon of *Frogs*. Those about Plautus tended to cover social comment – especially Periplectomenus' diatribes about marriage and manners. Some recalled the comments in *Pseudolus* about the reasons for tolerating Ballio's presence in town, while others commented on the subliminal messages about the treatment of slaves and family relationships. Less successful candidates seem to have treated this question as their opportunity to write their prepared 'this is funny for an ancient/modern audience because' essay. A few also discussed Menander's *Dyskolos* in addition to Plautus and Aristophanes, despite the wording of the question. Study of Menander is not required, but credit was given for comments relevant to Roman Comedy and its origins.

# F390 Virgil and the World of the Hero

**General Comments:**

This unit continues to be the most popular of the A2 units and once again there were many examples of responses containing detailed knowledge not only of the epics but also of the issues raised by them.

Rubric errors were very few although several candidates discussed the wrong passage in question 2a. Timing does not seem to be an issue with this unit, especially if this is judged by the length of a considerable numbers of scripts. Quantity, however, does not always equal quality and many candidates would have been better off using some of their time to plan their answers to avoid spilling out a wealth of details connected by a very patchy train of argument. That said, at the other end of the spectrum, there were those scripts which were original, perceptively argued and, quite frankly, a delight to read.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

**1a**
Nearly all candidates managed to make relevant points from the passage although weaker answers tended to list omens and prophecies without explaining their importance in the *Aeneid*. There was particularly good recall of the omens and prophecies in Books 2 and 7 and it was surprising to observe the number of candidates including details from Book 3. Stronger responses made reference to the propaganda aspect although there were many who made no reference to Books 1, 6 and 8.

**1b**
There was much lively and intelligent discussion of the very end of Book 12, the killing of Turnus, but there was not nearly enough whole-book awareness. There were some splendid comments on the epic abruptly ending. Good candidates commented that since Aeneas' destiny had been stressed so frequently in the epic, we knew he would marry Lavinia and build Lavinium and so there was no reason to write another book. Those who focused exclusively on the death of Turnus had not read the question properly, which clearly indicates 'Book 12' and not 'the death of Turnus'. Candidates who ventured beyond Book 12 (e.g. Aeneas' *furor* in Book 10), were rewarded when their discussion was linked back to the final book of the epic.

**2a**
This context question was by far the most popular and there were many very good responses which made reference to the whole of the passage and identified precisely what emotions are evoked. Better answers also drew attention to narrative techniques and explained their effectiveness. Weaker ones either just kept referring to imprecise 'emotions' or failed to explore the emotional impact at all. The number of candidates who did not use the final paragraph was surprising.

**2b**
It was pleasing to note that nearly all candidates referred to the passages and the two epics as a whole. There were some very good responses to Dido as an excellent leader who gives way to passion and loses the respect of her own people. There were some very sensitive responses to Andromache, Helen, Hecuba and Creusa and some candidates also considered the references to the Trojan women firing the ships in *Aeneid* and seeking news of loved ones from Hektor in *Iliad.* Some students argued the concubines in Homer were highly thought of, better answers included this and followed it by explaining the other view, it was honour lost due to possessions lost, not important women. Less sensitive answers saw a woman's work on the loom and distaff as trivial.

Weaker students tended to work with each poem separately and make a short conclusion at the end, better students linked the poems and/or the women throughout.

**3**

This was the most popular essay and nearly all agreed that duty was the more important. The best answers distinguished between Roman and Homeric character traits, made a valid effort to compare the different traits and evaluate which was the most important to Aeneas. Others concluded the given qualities were so intertwined that it is difficult to separate them. Candidates who tried to remember all they knew about Aeneas wrote long and sometimes tedious responses and would have been better off trying to plan their essay.

**4**

This was the least popular question but most of those who opted for it achieved well. There was some impressive use of well-remembered detail and many well-chosen comparisons between the epics to illustrate which the candidate felt was the more powerful in their portrayal of warfare. Weaker candidates tended to write about all they could recall about warfare with scant regard for the given question.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

**www.ocr.org.uk**

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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS

001