



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

Classical Civilisation 2020

CIV1A: Greek Architecture and Sculpture

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 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 Architecture and Sculpture

Section One

Option A

About twice as many candidates chose Option A as Option B. In Question 01, most correctly identified the two *kouroi* in Photographs A and B, but many had more problems with the dates, particularly that of the Anavyssos (or Kroisos) *kouros*. Some interpreted 'approximate' too broadly and gave an entire century or more. In Question 02, more than three-quarters of the candidates knew the size of the statues with a reasonable degree of accuracy, frequently expressed in feet.

The best answers to Question 03 were based on detailed observation of the two sculptures, made comparisons issue by issue, and put forward a clear and consistent overview of developments exemplified by these two works. Where such a framework was expressed, the Archaic period was generally seen as a gradual move from stylisation towards naturalism but, this being true only to an extent, the argument required careful balance and nuance. Many candidates overstated the case by claiming, for example, that the greater intricacy of the patterning of the hair on the Anavyssos *kouros* made it more realistic. Much, too, was said about the archaic smile without checking the evidence of the photographs.

Question 04 elicited some superbly sensitive appreciations of the prescribed funerary *stelai*, which took into account both technique and emotional impact. Again, it was important not to exaggerate differences: for example, Dexileos is not portrayed as an individual but as a heroic type, as those who made a comparison with the horsemen on the Parthenon frieze realised, and the blank frontal gaze towards the viewer of the deceased in the Ilissos *stèle* can be seen as a development from that of the *kouroi*, with the inclusion of the bereaved being the significant innovation. Weaker answers sometimes confused the various *stelai* and often tended to give a general account of these reliefs, without sharp focus on the specific question and with only a token reference to the *kouroi* in the conclusion.

Option B

In Question 05, approximately two-thirds of the candidates correctly identified the relevant parts of the Parthenon; among the rest there was a tendency to reverse the *pronaos* and the *opisthodomos / adyton*. In Question 06, a very high percentage of candidates recognised that the statuary came from a pediment, but in Question 07 rather fewer correctly identified the subject matter, the most common error being confusion with the west pediment.

Question 08 received a similar percentage of excellent answers to Question 03, but it was generally less well answered, mainly because candidates failed to base their comments on precise observation of what is visible in the scene in the photograph. Consequently, although many candidates showed some awareness of the requirements of the triangular frame, they did not analyse in sufficient detail the ways in which pose, drapery and musculature produce a diminution in agitation from right to left until it is strikingly countered by the violent eruption of the horses of Helios from the pediment floor taking the viewer's attention back to the centre. Identification of the figures was not required, but there was a tendency mistakenly to regard the female on the right as Athena herself.

Responses to Question 09 were generally of a lower standard than those to Question 04 and suggested that candidates continued to find architecture, at least the earlier temples, more

difficult to recall and evaluate than sculpture. There were some candidates who used their mastery of architectural detail to make a valid assessment, but often they demonstrated only patchy and/or confused knowledge and presented this in a descriptive way without any evaluative framework or overview. The provision of a plan of the Parthenon should have helped with one element of the question, but there was frequently little evidence that it had been used effectively to inform the answer.

Section Two

Option C

Question 10, although an architectural one, attracted more candidates than Option B, probably because the focus was on four later, and more distinctive, buildings. What was also encouraging was that it produced work of a very similar quality to that on the sculptural Question 11. The tendency to regard all four buildings as temples led to some confusion, and knowledge of the Erechtheion was sometimes surprisingly sketchy, but there were many pleasing answers that, through the judicious deployment of relevant detailed knowledge, demonstrated understanding of significant developments and trends.

Option D

Approximately three-fifths of the candidates chose Question 11. Uncertainty over which sculptures each sculptor made, especially Polykleitos, was a problem for some, as was confusion over the material in which the original was made. More generally there was a tendency to write thumbnail sketches of each sculptor's work, with inadequate evaluation of its significance. The frequent disregard for chronological sequence, despite the order given in the question itself, further hampered any attempt at informed and reasoned argument. However, the best answers, taking their cue from a range of the bullet points, identified some overarching themes which were developed with appropriate reference to detail in a sustained evaluative argument. These included some particularly good assessments of the different ways in which Praxiteles and Lysippos increased interaction between viewer and sculpture compared, for example, to the frontal emphasis of Diskobolos, at least in the surviving copies.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion