



General Certificate of Education

Classical Civilisation

CIV1A Greek Sculpture and Architecture

Report on the Examination

2011 examination – January series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

CIV1A Greek Sculpture and Architecture

Option A

The performance in the short factual questions was rather uneven. Although in Question 02 nearly all candidates correctly identified the location of the statues, and in Question 03 about four-fifths of them knew that they were part of a group illustrating a chariot race, fewer were able to expand on this basic information in Question 03, and only about two-thirds gave a date for the temple within the tolerance allowed in the mark scheme in Question 01.

Question 04 produced answers of widely varying standard. Many candidates wrongly identified the seer as a river god and did not appreciate that the poses of the statues reflected the shape of the roofline, with the centre of the pediment to the viewer's left. The best, however, successfully combined detailed observation of the contrasting musculature, actions and poses of the two figures with discussion of the way they suited the triangular frame, led the eye to the central figures and created mood and psychological tension.

Answers to Question 05 were generally of a higher standard. Some candidates did not consistently realise the need to discuss *groups* of two or more figures of different ages and wrote about isolated single figures which did not individually exploit differences of age. However, those who took their cue from the suggestions in the bullet points and/or other relevant examples such as the portrayal of Herakles as increasingly mature in the Olympia metopes generally produced a coherent argument with some pleasing insights. The Tyrannicides was generally well known, the Riace Warriors less so (and usually judged unsuccessful in portraying differences in age); the River Ilissos *stele* was often omitted, and sometimes wrongly identified, but where known it was often treated with understanding and sensitivity.

Option B

Approximately the same number of candidates chose Option B as Option A, but with rather different outcomes. For example, knowledge of temples in Question 06 and the subject matter of the sculpture in Question 08 was more secure than the comparable questions in Option A, whereas the identification of the carving as a metope in Question 07 was less well known than that of the pediment statues in Question 02.

However, In Question 09 the quality of response to the metope was significantly higher than that to the pediment figures in Question 04. A much larger proportion of candidates reached Level 3 or above by putting forward judgements based on detailed observation of what is visible in the photograph in combination with more general knowledge. Those who merely relied on recall of overall theme and message without looking closely at the particular example were less successful.

However, there were fewer very good answers to Question 10 than to Question 05: a roughly similar proportion reached Level 3, but in Question 10 only just over a quarter attained Level 4. In general, accurate description of the temples was thin (for example, a very common basic error was to describe the Erechtheion either as Doric or as containing all three Orders) and there was frequent assertion of the splendour of the Parthenon without detailed discussion of how this was achieved. Above all, candidates tended simply to write down what they could remember about each temple in two disconnected sections with little attention, if any, to

considering whether the architecture and decoration of each temple represented fundamental differences in approach.

Option C

Fewer than half as many candidates attempted Question 11 as Question 12, in line with the preference for sculpture over architecture that has been evident in previous examinations. Question 11 on architecture was also generally less well answered than Question 12 on sculpture, reflecting the difference in performance already noted for Question 10 and Question 05.

In Question 11 knowledge of Olympia was generally stronger than that of Paestum (some candidates irrelevantly attempted to move away from Paestum to Athens), and a secure grasp of chronology and significant detail at Paestum was often lacking. The very best answers were structured according to issues, as suggested by the bullet points, but those which ran through the examples chronologically were also able to include a thread of argument that demonstrated understanding of development. Discussion of the Philippeion, which was quite common although it is not strictly a temple, gained credit where it was not merely described but used to highlight the limit of originality in Greek temple architecture.

Option D

Most candidates were able to demonstrate clear knowledge of the appearance of five examples as required for Question 12, and by adding some relevant comment were able to reach at least the bottom of Level 3. However, some candidates paid too much attention to sculptures which do not survive and are known only through reconstructions and drawings, such as the representations of Athena on the Parthenon pediments and in the chryselephantine statue in the *naos*, rather than focusing on examples which, even if damaged, can still be viewed and judged in three dimensions. As always, close observation was the fundamental key to success – the very frequent misuse of ‘catenary’ tended to suggest where candidates were not looking themselves but relying on what they had been told – but the best answers went beyond concluding a series of descriptive paragraphs with a brief judgement, and from the outset developed a clear point of view. This was usually that increasing attention to the female form was matched by equally increasing attention to drapery, not only to reveal and conceal, but also to support, to add drama and to create flamboyant patterns of light and shade for their own sake.