

Classical Civilisation

Advanced GCE **A2 7816**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3816**

Report on the Units

June 2006

3816/7816/MS/R/06

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by ME.G. and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide 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 syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

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

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classical Civilisation (7816) Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classical Civilisation (3816)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	5
2736	Greek Epic	6
2737	Roman Epic	7
2738	Greek Historians	8
2739	Roman Historians	10
2740	Greek Tragedy 1	11
2741	Greek Tragedy 2	13
2742	Roman Satire and Society 1	15
2743	Roman Satire and Society 2	16
2744	Archaeology 1	18
2745	Archaeology 2	19
2746	Greek Comedy 1	21
2747	Greek Art and Architecture 1	23
2748	Roman Britain 1	26
2749	Greek and Roman Epic	27
2750	Greek and Roman Historians	30
2751	Greek Tragedy 3	32
2752	Roman Satire and Society 3	35
2753	Archaeology 3	36
2754	Greek Comedy 2	37
2755	Greek Art and Architecture 2	39
2756	Roman Britain 2	41
2757 & 2799	Individual Study (Classical Civilisation)	42
*	Statistics	44

Report on the Units Taken in June 2006

Overall Report From The Chief Examiner

The subject seems to be as popular as ever with increases in the entries for a number of modules at both levels. Overall there were more than 3,500 AS candidates, and an increase in the number of A2 candidates over the last two years.

At AS examiners felt that there was a good improvement in the overall standard in the middle of the ability range. At the top, there seemed to be fewer candidates who produced outstanding answers across the three modules or even a whole paper. At the lower end of the mark range there were far fewer very poor answers. As a result the overall percentage of A grades has fallen slightly and the overall pass rate has increased. At A2 the overall pass rate has remained fairly static but the percentage of A grades has risen significantly. This was felt to be a result of the thorough, detailed knowledge of many candidates. The performance across the modules, however, was uneven. In some modules there was evidence of detailed learning but it was not always carefully applied to the questions posed. In modules such as Roman Satire and Society 3 and Greek Comedy 2, there was more evidence of analysis and less use of detailed textual reference.

If enjoyment can be measured by the amount candidates wrote in their answers, then this year's candidates clearly enjoyed their Classical Civilisation studies! Almost every candidate resorted to extra booklets or supplementary sheets. The record was an 8 page booklet and 11 supplementary sheets, written on both sides! All too often, however, these extra pages had no treasury tags or string, and were in the wrong order. Such pages come adrift from scripts and with no means of identification, because candidates do not have time to fill in their details, it is difficult to reunite them with the original script. Extra sheets should be placed at the end of the script and not inside the booklet, and all pages should be numbered, as should the questions attempted.

Many candidates ignored the rubric about starting answers on a new page of the answer booklet. Examiners need space to write comments and their marks clearly.

As a result of the above, examiners have decided to make the following changes:

- From January 2007, candidates will use 8 page booklets and if extra paper is required they should use the 4 page booklet supplied rather than individual sheets.
- From January 2007, candidates will be reminded of the instruction about starting a new page of the answer booklet at the beginning of Section B.

There was a significant reduction in the number of rubric errors concerning questions attempted. There were several candidates, however, who have chosen to answer only context questions in past sessions and continued to do so in this session. Spelling was no worse than in previous years, with the exception of names of characters in the texts, especially those often printed on the paper as part of the question. Abbreviations for the names of characters seem to be on the increase, too. It is not appropriate to use Ody, Ag, Thuc, Her for the names of key characters or writers unless they are part of a plan or a candidate is running out of time. What concerned examiners most of all this year was the demise of the full stop and the reinstatement of the apostrophe. Commas appear to be the new full stops and apostrophe's [sic] are obviously to be used with any word which end's [sic] in an 's'.

2736: Greek Epic

General Comments

Candidates showed a detailed knowledge of the Odyssey – not just the set books. The majority made a good attempt to show their knowledge and seemed engaged with the text and to have enjoyed reading it. Most candidates had been well-prepared and knew how to tackle both context and essay questions. Many candidates scored highly on AO1 – the differentiation generally came with AO2: better answers tackled the questions as set and analysed and explained the information. Some answers still listed episodes, rather than answered questions, particularly in Section B.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) The performance in this question was generally good but only a very few gave Nausicaa's activities on reaching the palace. Also a lot of answers included information about Nausicaa before she set out for the palace.
- (b) Candidates were adept at picking out the relevant details from the passage as well as explaining the content. Many scored highly here, especially those who explored the simile and reference to Hephaistos.
- (c) Most understood Arete's unique position in society, made good use of the passage and were able to cite her activities in the Odyssey. Sensible references were made to Penelope and the strongest answers discussed at least two other queens and also considered the differences as well as similarities.

A2

- (a) The few who tackled this context generally set the scene well but some omitted the lying tale.
- (b) There were fewer very good answers than A1 (b). Most candidates were aware of irony but did not pick up on comments such as 'I fancy you won't leave this hall in one piece.' Several answers pointed out that Odysseus remained calm but did not say this was to be compared with Antinous' increasing anger.
- (c) Antinous' behaviour in the passage was generally well handled. Most candidates could point to the unacceptable behaviour of the Suitors elsewhere. Few answers referred to Antinous elsewhere in the Odyssey and even fewer were able to name Amphinomous.

B3

Most candidates were aware of the pantheon of gods in the Odyssey and of their basic importance – Athene helps the hero, Poseidon hinders him and that they move the poem along. Some good answers evaluated more deeply and dealt with topics such as Zeus being an arbiter of justice. A significant number of answers included fairly full accounts of the activities of the gods and then added a couple of sentences at the end of the essay to the effect 'also the gods were important because...'. The need to remain focused on the question at all times cannot be stressed enough, if AO2 marks are to be gained.

B4

The minority who did this dealt successfully with books 5-12 but sometimes ignored 1-4 and were sketchy about 13-24. In many responses there was room for more personal response and discussion about exactly what they found good and bad about the epic. As with B3, there was a tendency towards narrative and straying from the question.

2737: Roman Epic

General Comments

Overall it was felt that the majority of candidates showed a good knowledge of the Aeneid and had clearly been well prepared for the examination. Encouragingly there were more exceptional scripts which showed a real engagement with the text, originality of thought and a lucid line of argument. However there were more candidates this year who either failed to read the question (especially A2 (a)) or missed out part of the question (especially 'Was Aeneas right to kill Turnus?').

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Few remembered the name of the speaker and even fewer could spell Achaemenides correctly. Otherwise most candidates could explain his state of distress in general terms, though only the strongest answers recalled that he had fallen in with former enemies.
- (b) This question was well handled and many responses took full advantage of Virgil's rich description. Nearly all the candidates were quoting directly from the passage and a pleasing number were explaining how Virgil creates an atmosphere of horror.
- (c) Many responses handled the first part of the question well and talked about the passage's liveliness, fantasy and a surprising number saw the reconciliation between former enemies. Higher marks were not achieved often because other episodes with monsters were not recalled and so the second half of the question was not explored.

A2

- (a) Even though this was the most popular context, it was surprising how many answers failed to include adequate reference to the text or gave an account of what Dido had done and said.
- (b) As with A1 (b), this question was well handled and candidates had little difficulty in either picking out the relevant parts which suggest Dido's madness or in explaining their relevance. Only the better responses discussed the references to Greek Tragedy.
- (c) Unsurprisingly this question provoked some lively discussion and it was pleasing to note how many candidates made use of the prompt to the question. Nearly all responses talked about Dido, Aeneas and Juno. Some brought in Anna and a few also made a case for Iarbas. Not all answers addressed the 'most to blame' part of the question.

B3

By far the most popular essay question and generally well done. There was a good knowledge of Turnus' character on show, and pleasingly answers looked at both sides of his character. Not all responses considered the second half of the question, though some of the best made comparisons with Aeneas' own behaviour.

B4

Candidates had little difficulty in either identifying the passages in the Aeneid which praise Augustus or discussing his relationship with Maecenas and the Emperor. Stronger responses questioned whether there were other purposes behind the Aeneid and at all times made close reference to the text.

2738: Greek Historians

General Comments

This paper produced a set of very interesting answers, and candidates were fully able to show that they had, in general, got to grips with the texts of Herodotus and Thucydides. There was, in some scripts, a tendency to generalise, making points about the historians without much reference to actual detail, but on the whole, the scripts reflected sound understanding. There were no clear favourites in the questions, with each producing a wide range of answers across the ability range.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Although mostly answered well, there was some misunderstanding of the requirements of the question which produced a comprehensive account of events before Thermopylae, describing Xerxes' actions and motivations for coming to Greece. Such could not be credited. However, the vast majority of answers produced interesting and useful accounts of the arrival of the Persian force and what they had seen. Some described the Spartan warrior code in detail when referring to what Xerxes had been told about the Spartans' grooming, this tended to distract from the question.
- (b) Many candidates approached this question with a firm response in the positive. Aristodemus was criticised for his 'cowardice', as most answers showed an in-depth understanding of the 'come back with your shield, or on it' mentality of the Spartans. Some answers used this question as an opportunity to share knowledge and opinions of the Spartan education system. For full credit, answers required a personal response to the Aristodemus issue. Several candidates compared modern day attitudes to that demonstrated in the passage: this response was credited.
- (c) Most answers showed that they were able to compare this passage to Herodotus as a whole, describing his nebulous approach to battles scenes and his love of detailed description and use of anecdotes. Some answers answered part of the question only, referring to battles in Herodotus, without using the passage.

A2

- (a) This answer was not always as thoroughly completed as its counterpart in A1, and there were several generalised discussions about Xerxes or the current situation. Stronger answers showed understanding of who Pausanias was and the contemporary political situation in Greece.
- (b) There were many very strong analyses of how the letter appealed to various aspects of Pausanias' personality. Some of the stronger responses praised the ingenuity of Xerxes in writing such a letter that somehow manages to mix praise with command.
- (c) Some responses were prepared for this topic, as some answers gave interesting and useful accounts of speeches and letters but did not always use the passage given. A wide range of data was presented, showing that candidates are really understanding the use and reliability of sources in ancient historians.

B3

This question was quite a popular one, with a very strong response that Thucydides was free from bias because he was so factual and dry in his narrative. The lack of sources cited was mentioned in most answers, and his eye-witness opportunity to have seen the events described for himself was often mentioned. However, most answers saw his unsensationalistic approach as evidence for lack of bias.

B4

Neither author stood out as a favourite in the responses to this, with each receiving a fair amount of votes. Xerxes was often presented as a case study, as was Pericles. Stronger answers tended to be those that gave equal room for discussion to characters from each text.

2739: Roman Historians

General Comments

Clearly the candidates that take this paper enjoy the salacious details of Nero's life as described by Tacitus and Suetonius as the interest in business such as murdering one's family members elicited enthusiastic responses. Pleasingly, candidates were mostly able to assess these stories in their historiographical context. All four questions received a healthy number of responses, with no particular favourite emerging.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Candidates were able to answer the first part of this question with confidence and aplomb, although the second part produced a generalised description of Claudius, rather than the description in the section before the passage given.
- (b) Several answers focussed a little too much on the content at the expense of discussion of Suetonius' style. However, most responded with a sensible and reliable description of how Suetonius writes history. He is clearly popular with candidates as they seem to enjoy his presentation of Nero.
- (c) This question tended to show that candidates had read Suetonius carefully, as most presented a detailed description of how Suetonius aims to present his subject from several angles, focussing on the different aspects of Nero's reign by category rather than chronology. Some scripts transposed details from Tacitus into this answer but most showed a sound understanding of Suetonius.

A2

- (a) Anicetus tended to be better known than Germanicus, whom several believed to be an earlier Emperor, but most answers explained the way in which Agrippina had been lured into a trap aboard a ship, as well as why Nero had come to want the death of his mother.
- (b) There were many very perceptive descriptions of what occurs in the passage given. There were several strong answers that dealt with the use of direct speech to emphasise the horror of the matter being discussed. The laconic manner of the advisers was discussed by most answers.
- (c) Some answers struggled to describe much of what the advisers do outside this passage, although the stronger answers dealt in detail with the death of Seneca and what happens to Burrus. Anicetus came under some scrutiny - clearly his involvement in Agrippina's death was a matter of interest to several candidates.

B3

This tended to elicit strong responses, although there was the occasional tendency to bring in Suetonius for comparison. This was acceptable, as long as it remained relevant, although it did tend to distract from the question that was set. The use of sources was not always discussed usefully, but there were firm opinions on how useful Tacitus is to us as a primary source for the life of Nero.

B4

Most answers managed to compare Suetonius to Tacitus, although several of the less successful responses focussed too little on Suetonius and his approach to writing. Most responses dealt successfully with the thematic, rather than chronological, approach and the (relatively) even-handed description of Nero - his actions and his character.

2740: Greek Tragedy 1

General Comments

The Greek Tragedy Modules proved to be as popular as in previous years. The candidates for both modules displayed a good range of personal response to the plays, and had a sound grasp of the details of the plays. However, they were not always able to use these details to their fullest extent in answering the questions. Many candidates still persisted in giving too much background detail in part (a) of the contest questions. There also seemed to be an increase in misspellings of Classical names, even though many of them appeared on the question paper. The names which caused most problems were Laius (spelt several ways), Dionysus (usually Dionysis) and Euripides (Euripedes). Use of the verb 'prophesy' continued to cause problems in spelling and usage, as did 'avenge' and 'revenge', but this year a new problem arose with confusion over the use of 'sympathy' and 'empathy'. An increasing number of candidates referred to events in the 'book', rather than the 'play'.

The answers showed that all four questions were generally equally popular.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) In part (a), most candidates were able to place the passage into its context in the play. The detail given varied in depth, with many answers failing to include all the detail necessary, especially not mentioning Creon's mission to Delphi or Oedipus' initial respect for Tiresias.
- (b) In part (b), candidates used a good range of material, commenting on the stichomythia and pace of the passage, the emotions of the two characters and the dramatic irony. The idea of literal and metaphorical sight and blindness, and the revelation of Oedipus' family history were mentioned less often.
- (c) In part (c) many answers simply narrated the myth, describing the prophecies each character received without analysing their role within the play. There were still a large number of which could not distinguish between the prophecy given to Laius and Jocasta (that their son would kill his father) and that given to Oedipus (that he would kill his father and marry his mother). Better answers did comment on the attitudes of Oedipus who believed in the prophecies, because he tried to avoid his fate and attempted to find Laius' killer, Jocasta, who thought prophecies were untrue due to her own experiences, and Creon, who not only brought the answer back from Delphi, but also refused to exile Oedipus before consulting the gods.

A2

- (a) Candidates generally had a good grasp of the details of the play. In part (a) almost all knew that Electra and Clytemnestra had been informed of Orestes' death, although there were many answers which confused the details of events. Some omitted either Pylades or the Tutor.
- (b) Part (b) also produced some good answers, with candidates able to comment on the dramatic irony, both deliberate on the part of Electra and Orestes, and the unconscious irony of Aegisthus' words. Answers varied in depth, with many only picking out a few details from the passage.
- (c) Electra's character in part (c) was generally well discussed although quite a few answers found difficulty in balancing the passage with detail from the rest of the play. Good comments were made on the contrast between Electra's calm behaviour in the passage and her emotional displays elsewhere.

B3

Answers to this essay varied in quality, but all candidates were able to discuss the play and the implications of the question. There was a good range of cultural understanding, with candidates discussing the emotions felt by both a contemporary audience and a modern one. Most answered the question from a modern point of view. All three emotions were generally dealt with, although a number of answers concentrated on one particular emotion without dealing with the others. Candidates were able to discuss the pity felt for Clytemnestra due to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, and Agamemnon's flaunting of Cassandra. Many felt admiration for her success in a man's world, and her ability to gain her revenge over a powerful, victorious king. Most however, felt anger to be the prevalent emotion due not so much to her killing of Agamemnon, but caused by the murder of Cassandra, and her revelling in her actions. Her affair with Aegisthus was also condemned.

B4

Candidates answering this question tended to concentrate more on Oedipus the King than on Agamemnon. This was mainly due to the limited role Agamemnon has in the play. Better answers were able to analyse the success of the two kings in ruling their kingdom, contrasting Agamemnon's victory at Troy as a warrior against Oedipus' concern for his people and attempts to remove the plague from the city. Some also commented that Oedipus' concern for his people could be seen at the end, when he insisted that he be banished, as the oracle had ordered. Candidates were also able to draw upon the opinions of their subjects – the respect shown by the Watchman and the chorus to Agamemnon being compared to the reactions of the Thebans to Oedipus. However, the question was made into a character study in some answers, discussing the reasons for the downfall each suffered, rather than their roles as a king. While better answers saw Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter and Oedipus' outburst at Tiresias as being signs of a good ruler, many saw them as a reason for the suffering they consequently went through. Character traits, such as arrogance and temper, were discussed, but not made relevant to their roles as kings.

2741: Greek Tragedy 2

General Comments

The Greek Tragedy Modules proved to be as popular as in previous years. The candidates for both modules displayed a good range of personal response to the plays, and had a sound grasp of the details of the plays. However, they were not always able to use these details to their fullest extent in answering the questions. Many candidates still persisted in giving too much background detail in part (a) of the contest questions. There also seemed to be an increase in misspellings of Classical names, even though many of them appeared on the question paper. The names which caused most problems were Laius (spelt several ways), Dionysus (usually Dionysis) and Euripides (Euripedes). Use of the verb 'prophesy' continued to cause problems in spelling and usage, as did 'avenge' and 'revenge', but this year a new problem arose with confusion over the use of 'sympathy' and 'empathy'. An increasing number of candidates referred to events in the 'book', rather than the 'play'.

The context question from Hippolytus and the essay question on Medea murdering her children were more popular questions.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Details of the play were generally known, although there were many who thought that Theseus cursed and exiled Hippolytus after speaking to him.
- (b) Part (b) was generally well answered, with candidates able to pick out details from the passage to support their argument. Most commented on the evocative language, but several details, including the simile (or similie., in many cases) and Hippolytus' words were often not discussed.
- (c) Part (c) also produced some good answers, with most candidates stating that the description of Hippolytus' fate in the passage evoked feelings of pity, with many picking up on his innocence of the charge of rape and the fact that his father was responsible for his death. This was contrasted with his arrogance and misogynistic views earlier in the play. Surprisingly few answers mentioned the final scene in the play, with Hippolytus forgiving his father, and Artemis' failure to save him.

A2

- (a) Most answers produced a full range of detail in part (a), describing the events leading up to the meeting, although many went back beyond even the start of the play. Tiresias' advice to Pentheus was often not mentioned. There was also confusion over the relationship between Pentheus and Cadmus, with many thinking Cadmus was Pentheus' father.
- (b) Part (b) showed good character analyses of the two figures, but many found it harder to discuss the contrast between them.
- (c) Part (c) produced a wide range of answers. Most were able to discuss the role within the passage, and saw Cadmus as the voice of reason within the play. Quite a few answers did not mention the final scene in the play, where Cadmus brings Agave to her senses, and even fewer discussed the fact that Cadmus was punished by Dionysus, despite joining in with his worship.

B3

The question produced a full range of answers. Many answers approached it on a superficial level, focussing mainly on Medea's behaviour and actions, and on the killings being necessary for Jason to be punished properly. Quite a few answers did not discuss Medea's pride as a motive for the killing of her children. Textual knowledge of the play was generally very good, but relating this to the question proved more of a problem. There were many answers which treated the question as a character study of Medea, and neglected the effect on the audience, although better answers did comment on the tension created by the build up to the murders, and the feelings of the audience when Medea finally killed her children. Few candidates seemed aware of the fact that Medea killing her children was an innovation of Euripides, not part of the original myth.

B4

Candidates who answered this question produced a range of answers. The answers dealt with all three plays, although the role of servants is limited in *Bacchae*. Most considered the roles of the Nurses in *Medea* and *Hippolytus*, considering the Nurse in *Medea* to be sensible and good, while thinking that the Nurse in *Hippolytus* was good in trying to save Phaedra, even though her methods were disastrous. Some considered her to be selfish. The Tutor in *Medea* and the Huntsman in *Hippolytus* were often not considered. In most cases, servants were seen as being sensible, in contrast to the major figures in the plays. The guards and the Herdsman in *Bacchae* were generally seen in this way, giving Pentheus sensible advice.

2742: Roman Satire and Society 1

General Comments

There were very many excellent responses to questions this year. The mark scheme is not intended to be prescriptive and many interpretations were possible and were given credit.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) All candidates could identify 'this person' as the pest or bore. Better answers focused on his attempts to talk to Horace and what the pest said rather than summarising all of the previous lines (1.9 1-59).
- (b) Most could identify Horace's feelings though too few commented on the language he uses. Those who did produced some excellent answers though some missed the metaphor 'knife at the throat' and interpreted this as a genuine act of violence.
- (c) Candidates appreciated the theory of 'why use conversations' but did struggle to find examples beyond the passage. Only rarely did some insist that Horace never used conversation in his satires ever.

A2

- (a) The question gave scope for candidates to select the more amazing observations made by Encolpius. Candidates were given a prompt 'since arriving at Trimalchio's house' but nevertheless too many summarised all events from the beginning of chapter 26.
- (b) The term 'vivid' was universally understood and most candidates could select appropriate colours, metals, and sounds and could comment on the image created. It is encouraging to find that there were very few candidates paraphrasing the passage this year.
- (c) When faced with a question such as this candidates are expected to discuss both characters. Too many answers reverted to a character study of Trimalchio with little or no mention of Encolpius. Better answers appreciated that our view of Trimalchio is through Encolpius.

B3

This was a popular question with candidates. There were varied reactions. One reaction was that of outrage at the question, exclaiming that Dinner with Trimalchio is satire and meant to be funny. Others were more reflective and concluded 'when I think about it'...there is a lot of unkindness. All responses were given equal credit when supported by detail of both unkind and amusing actions. Candidates need to consider both sides of the argument.

B4

The main focus of this question was on city life rather than a direct comparison with country life. Examples were expected from what Horace says about life in the city, his relationship with Maecenas and the subsequent duties involved. The prompt here was 'exaggerating' to remind candidates that Horace is writing satire and some evaluation of this was offered by better answers.

2743: Roman Satire and Society 2

General Comments

There were many interesting responses to questions this year. The mark scheme should be used as guidance for centres and is not prescriptive. Candidates offered many varied responses which were considered and credited.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

Please note that in 2007 only 1 version of the text will be printed. This will be from the most recent edition – P. Green (Penguin – new 3rd edition).

- (a) Nearly all answers were able to identify some points from before the passage but better answers focused on detail relevant to wine, water and bread.
- (b) It is encouraging to find fewer paraphrases of the passage and more answers offering a comparison. Candidates were credited with information both from the passage and elsewhere in Satire 5. However there are still some answers with little regard for Juvenal's use of language and only a few addressed 'How effectively...'
- (c) Most candidates could find examples of the life of poorer members of society and most answers contained examples from Satire 3. Better answers offered a wider range. The second half of the question prompted candidates to consider the reliability of the picture Juvenal is painting and some appreciation that Juvenal may be exaggerating was expected. One candidate felt sympathy for the teaching profession: 'The poor also get the worst jobs as shown in Satire 7. They become teachers and get far less pay than they deserve.'

Overall candidates knew their Satires well and could communicate enthusiasm for the topics.

A2

Candidates often show an impressive knowledge of the letters, quoting Book reference and addressee. Candidates are given credit for such knowledge but detail from the content of the letters is required, particularly in essays, and should be offered.

- (a) The letter in part (i) was generally well known. Pallas was not always identified in part (ii).
- (b) Candidates were not penalised for any consequential errors as a result of not knowing about Pallas. However, as in A1b, answers are expected to contain some discussion of language – too few could select 'filth and dirt' or 'ridiculous farce'. Better answers commented on the how Pliny is not normally as unkind in his comments as he is about Pallas. Nearly all answers commented on his appreciation of Zosimus even though there were many variations in the spelling of his name!
- (c) Although both passages featured freedmen, 'feelings' about slaves was included to widen the material available to candidates for comment. There were many detailed answers from the letters mainly 8.16 and 3.14. Better answers discussed 'true feelings' commenting on the image Pliny was trying to portray and some mentioned the revision of his letters for publication.

B3

The key to better answers here was the range of 'aspects' of society. Candidates were often lulled in to writing a Patron-client essay and missed some opportunity to discuss other topics. Better answers discussed Juvenal's style and approach to satire.

B4

This was a popular essay with some modern comparison. There was an impressive range of Pliny's duties ranging from letters to Trajan to the Bithynians. Some forgot to consider Pliny's leisure activities. On the whole candidates felt that Pliny was a workaholic.

2744: Archaeology 1

General Comments

This summer seemed to show an increase of use of Classical sites in answering the questions. Whether candidates are going to see sites for themselves or centres are taking their students on field trips, candidates' answers certainly benefited from accurate deployment of things that have been seen. Across the paper, much enthusiasm was demonstrated, and no question was substantially more popular than another.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) There were some good answers for this question, although several had not revised this picture. Incorrect ideas ranged from building a museum to digging a hole with very large spades. However, the majority was able to give a competent account of the reasons behind reconstruction and/or experimental archaeology.
- (b) Most candidates were able to discuss specific sites in detail. Rubbish being left strewn over sites was mentioned by most, as was the potential for serious harm. Health and safety aspects were brought in. Much was made of the capacity for education. Some answers showed misunderstanding of what the question was asking, but, on the whole, this question was answered well.
- (c) There was much discussion of the Internet and television as means of bringing the Classical world to us today. Although some answers interpreted the question as a chance to discuss literary evidence, such as Homer or Livy, most were able to describe and discuss ways in which sites, such as Pompeii, can really teach us much about ancient societies.

A2

- (a) Candidates who recognised the diagrams from the specified set book tended to write with confidence about how planning frames are used, although some answers were too vague for high credit.
- (b) The question allowed for a wide range of answers. The question does not specify that specific sites are referred to, but stronger answers tended to be those that could refer to specific uses of recording. IT-based recording was a popular item for discussion. Any sensible forms of recording were credited.
- (c) There was a little uncertainty about how to approach this question, but the majority provided interesting discussion of various sites. The gyrus at Lunt was discussed by many, as was the methods used by Schliemann in assessing his finds at Troy.

B3

There was no firm favourite expressed here, with most candidates discussing a range of relevant techniques, with a generally solid discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each. Solid use of actual sites was required for higher marks. The majority of answers were able to fulfil this requirement. Wroxeter was used by many, although some assigned every surveying technique to this site.

B4

As with B3, Wroxeter was mentioned by many. If we were to believe that so many different techniques were used to such an extent, there would probably be a very large hole where central Shropshire used to be! However, the majority of answers made sensible use of a particular site. Several sites were deployed: several answers discussed the development of techniques at Pompeii. All methods of digging were used. The consensus was, as tends to be the case in real archaeology - a combination of techniques as suits the site and local environment is what is best.

2745: Archaeology 2

General Comments

This paper was answered with aplomb, with several answers demonstrating understanding of archaeological techniques that went beyond the requirement of 2745, but, in general, answers displayed good knowledge and analysis of the Mycenaean world. A1 was more popular than A2, but those that answered A2 tended to be slightly more confident in their responses.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Most candidates were able to recognise this object and to discuss what is thought about it in depth. Some answers showed unfamiliarity with what archaeologists believe the ring may show, but credit was given for intelligent discussion of plausible possibilities.
- (b) This question was answered with confidence, although a few answers used the word 'art' as a springboard for discussion of wall-painting. The stronger answers were those that tended to use precise examples, such as the great goddess ring to illustrate their discussions.
- (c) There was much discussion of fashion, methods of transport and soling, as well as reference to religion. The use of precise examples rather than vague unsourced references achieved higher marks. The 'bosomy lady' frequently appeared, as did the Ship fresco and the saffron-gathering scene.

A2

- (a) Most identified this site accurately and were able to give a reliable account of its defensive capability. Some were limited to a description of the door being closed to repel invaders. Stronger answers referred to the water supply. Several commented on how the site was fantastically well fortified against attack but that, in the end, Mycenae fell.
- (b) This answer tended to be answered well by those who had at their fingertips a wealth of usable artefacts and finds. Most referred to the goddess figurines, although many candidates did not discuss the range of architectural sculpture that could have been discussed.
- (c) Although this question was aimed at eliciting responses about the citadels themselves, many answers were about tombs. This is perfectly fine, although, on a few occasions, this diverted candidates into the area of burial practices. Most used the citadels well, and some of the stronger answers included discussion of the differences between the homes of the rich and those of the less wealthy.

B3

There were some unexpected answers here, such as several discussing the cultural impact of and on the Mycenaean world that came with increased contact with the outside world. Such answers were credited for accurate and reliable information. The vast majority were able to use a list of artefacts found with sound understanding of the usefulness to archaeology of such finds. Fewer answers than in earlier years relied on the 'shopping list' approach of merely listing artefacts and finds. There was much sound discussion of the relevance of such finds in the stronger responses.

B4

This question elicited a very firm disagreement, as candidates were very keen to assure the examiners that the Mycenaeans, with their array of different burial techniques, and fondness for grave goods, were very respectful of their dead! Lively response and solid use of actual artefacts characterised some of the stronger answers. As ever credit was given for discussion of the relevance and usefulness of individual finds. As with B3, there was less of a tendency to rely on lists of finds than has occurred in previous years.

2746: Greek Comedy 1

General Comments

The Examiners were pleased by the general standard of the candidates. Many had a sound grasp of the plays' contents and of the distinctive features of the genre. More candidates than in previous sessions followed the guidance and included material from the passage and from elsewhere in their responses to the Section A part (c) questions. Both Section A questions proved accessible, while B3 was more popular than B4. It is worth pointing out, as before, that in Section B nearly half the marks are available for detailed citation from the play(s) to support an argument. Answers often allude to such material when they should spell it out in detail.

Some Examiners commented, yet again, on the poor standard of legibility. The correct spelling of 'humorous' still causes a problem.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Better answers here were able to spell out at least a passing reference to the agon between father and son and a fairly substantial list of the items improvised for the home court. Answers that named one item followed by 'etc' were not full answers.
- (b) Candidates now seem well prepared for this kind of question! It was pleasing to see many had understood the references to the Cleon/Laches dispute and could relate this to the comic trial. The visual comedy was underrepresented in many answers. It is always worth reading the stage directions!
- (c) In some cases, the prepared material on the character of Procleon kicked in here, to the exclusion of any focus on Anticleon or discussion of the particular scene. Only the best identified Anticleon as court official and, later, defence counsel. Procleon's softening was rather surprisingly often ignored.

A2

- (a) This was usually answered well. For full marks it was necessary to make a detailed reference to some of the religious 'perks' promised to Hermes.
- (b) This was thought to be a slightly more taxing question than its equivalent in A1. Better answers were able to put forward the general pattern of Trygaeus adding a humorous comment to a serious prayer. For others, at least there were a 'cuddly little tart' and good old Cleonymus to grab hold of.
- (c) Despite the prompt in the question, some failed to say anything about Peace and/or War. However, the majority managed to cover all three gods, with a competent analysis of their significance. All candidates had something to say about the comic side of Hermes: it was far more demanding to go beyond that and remember some details of his explanation of the causes of the war.

B3

Prepared material on the character of Dikaiopolis was put to good use here. A pleasing percentage of answers recalled his altruistic stance at the Assembly and were thus able to put forward a balanced argument. Congratulations to those who made the excellent point that he did not trade the eels with the Boeotian but rather unsympathetically demanded them as a market tax.

B4

Here, prepared answers on the nature of Aristophanean comedy proved a downfall for some. Fantasy elements (sometimes not even identified as such) were just one of many factors given equal weight. It is clearly legitimate (indeed essential) to mention such factors as satire and political messages but the focus has to be on fantasy.

2747: Greek Art and Architecture 1

General Comments

This year's questions received much more even treatment than in previous years, and all questions had their share of both outstanding and very poor responses. The quality of the answers in the mid-range and lower end of marks seemed much improved this year, and there were remarkably few very poor scripts.

Candidates were generally well-prepared and many had a good detailed knowledge of some aspects of the course. Few were able to sustain a consistent level of performance across the whole paper, or even across a whole question in some cases.

Rubric errors were few and most candidates employed their time well. It is, however, characteristic of candidates' performance at this level that they spend more time on the context question than the essay. The only candidates who seemed to suffer in this respect were those who seemed to enjoy writing about women's position in society. Some candidates had much they wanted to say and set about saying it at length – often as much as 6 sides! As usual the discriminating factor must be the ability to identify appropriate material and analyse it in relation to the particular question posed.

Examiners felt that spelling was a little better this year but expressed dismay that the comma has become the one-case-fit-all punctuation. There were also too many asterisks/stars/ arrows etc. leading an examiner through a confusing maze of an answer. Candidates should take time to think and plan before writing a stream of consciousness.

Comments on Individual Questions

The two context questions attracted approximately an equal number of responses. The quality of response varied from Centre to Centre. Some Centres produced excellent responses to the pot question whilst others scored more highly on the temple question.

A1

- (a) Identification of pot, painter etc.
Many candidates were able to secure very high scores in this question, but there were fewer full marks than in recent sessions. The recognition of the shapes of the pots proved the most problematic. There were no reported cases of candidates writing at great length and most seemed to tackle the part questions efficiently.
- (b) Content and composition of the scene on the pot
There were some very perceptive answers concerning the composition of the scene, particularly with regard to the scale of the women and the illusion of depth. The strong verticals of the composition were rarely mentioned. Some candidates provided detail about the women's activities all around the pot. Others had difficulty coming up with the word loom and often referred to weaving machine.
- (c) Which is the more accurate portrayal of women's lives?
This question was effective in differentiating between candidates because it enabled them to display a wide range of knowledge and produce informed argument. Answers ranged from those who used only the two scenes on the paper to those who quoted virtually every pot on the film-strip. Examiners were fascinated to note the subtle differences in perception of a woman's role between male and female candidates.

A2

- (a) Identification of the temple of Aphaia
As with A1 (a), there were fewer full marks than in previous sessions. Most could identify the Aphaia temple but had difficulty with the date and the materials used. Virtually everyone was able to identify the order as Doric, but a few candidates did choose Ionic.
- (b) Typical features of the Doric order
This question was answered less competently than expected. Candidates tended to focus on one aspect of the order and did not discuss the features as a whole. A large number of responses offered only a diagram with no word of explanation. In a module which has Quality of Written Communication marks it is not an appropriate way to answer a question. Diagrams may be used to help explain an answer.
- (c) Was the temple of Aphaia more impressive than the temple of Zeus?
For those unable to identify the temple of Aphaia, the principle of consequential error was applied. In general, this seemed to have little effect because candidates tended to ignore the first part of the question and decide the temple of Zeus was more impressive before they started writing. Candidates should be prepared to present an argument on paper. Those who had studied Tom Linson [sic] were able to provide detail about the monolithic columns, the poor quality stone, the off-centre door, and setting of the Aphaia temple. Most candidates found the temple of Zeus more impressive because of its immense size, but mostly because it housed the chryselephantine statue of Zeus. The best argued answers often preferred the temple of Aphaia.

As with the context questions there was a much more even distribution of answers between the two essays this year.

B3

Limitations placed on painters by the shapes of the pots they decorated. This was an enjoyable question to mark because it elicited a good range of answers and it offered plenty of scope for candidates to choose whichever pots and painters they wanted. There were several common approaches to the question:

- (1) a developmental approach discussing the merits of the black-figure and red-figure techniques;
- (2) the selection of a number of different shapes to illustrate different approaches to subject matter;
- (3) the selection of three painters to illustrate their approach to decoration of pots in general;
- (4) the identification of shapes with some simplistic comments [a dinos is large and spherical] which were not referred to again.

The best answers, however, took a shape, identified the problems associated with it and discussed several examples of how painters dealt with it. The most successful discussion of any shape centred on the decoration of a kylix. It was common to think that a tondo was a shape of pot.

Candidates need to be able to refer to specific, recognisable pots in their answers rather than making general references to a 'pot with Herakles on'. One answer clearly showed the belief that the Greeks were a very advanced race when it referred to a pot which depicts Herakles stealing Apollo's i-pod!

B4

Differences and similarities between Athenian Acropolis and Delphi

The majority of candidates were able to offer relevant material about both sites - although they tended to be better informed about the Acropolis buildings and this led to some unbalanced answers. Better answers were able to compare a range of features (e.g. buildings, layouts, locations, functions, topography of sites etc.) and reach convincing conclusions about which was the more impressive. Surprisingly few made the distinction between Delphi's Pan-Hellenic nature and the more local use of the Acropolis. Most candidates seemed to be aware of the fact that Delphi was an ancient site and that its buildings were constructed over a long period of time. Although candidates realised that the Acropolis sanctuary was planned and re-built in a relatively short space of time, few seemed to realise that it too had an ancient past.

As with previous questions of this type, candidates tended to be so over-dependent on AO1 material, particularly on the Acropolis buildings, that they did not always address the demands of the question effectively.

The Acropolis buildings always generate much comment, and it is not always positive or complimentary. Candidates should be encouraged to use appropriate language to express their opinions. Some examples which aroused comment from examiners this year include:

- 'The Acropolis is just a load of hype'.
- 'The Acropolis was so organised it was almost anal.'
- 'The Parthenon is just a great big jewellery box.'
- 'The resident house-god was Athena...'

2748: Roman Britain 1

General Comments

The quality of scripts varied considerably this year. There were a number of answers which benefited from revision of Hill and Ireland as well as the Caesar and Tacitus set texts and were written in a detailed and thoughtful way. However this year there was a significant number of answers which did not have enough knowledge to answer the questions with either enough depth of knowledge or focus on the question. The importance of backing up one's response with a range of relevant answers cannot be stressed enough.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Many answers struggled to adequately place the context of the passage and recall what has happened in the events preceding the passage.
- (b) Most answers were able to identify the relevant sections in this passage which talk about Caesar and there were many who offered a thoughtful analysis about how far it is possible to trust Caesar's account. However it was surprising to note the number which went beyond the confines of the passage.
- (c) The depth of detail on offer in the (c) part of the context was much improved on than in previous years and many were able to identify key aspects and events of Caesar's 1st invasion. However many failed to use their AO1 in relation to the quotation and therefore were unable to score highly with regard to AO2 as they were not answering the question.

A2

- (a) The first half of this question was generally well done although only those who were well prepared performed successfully in the second half of it.
- (b) Most answers were able to talk about the Antonine Wall in sufficient depth but knowledge of the Stanegate and Gask Ridge was in many cases very hazy.
- (c) This question posed few difficulties and was often very well answered though only the best considered how its function changed over time.

B3

Claudius' motives for invading Britain were well recalled and with a good depth of detail. Unfortunately not many scripts showed a detailed knowledge of the pre-Agricola governors; points were sparse and patchy showing very little awareness of what happened between Claudius invading and Agricola becoming governor.

B4

Candidates had little difficulty in identifying Tacitus' purpose of trying to praise his father-in-law in writing the Agricola. Unfortunately a significant number of answers did not consider whether Tacitus had any other purposes or failed to consider the prompt to the question which asked for a discussion of the work's content and its strengths and weaknesses. Had this been adhered to many more answers would have gained more marks under both AO1 and AO2.

2749: Greek and Roman Epic

General Comments

As last year, many candidates managed to do themselves justice in communicating their knowledge of the text and their synoptic abilities. Generally, candidates' knowledge of both texts was good. Weaker candidates did manage to adduce some conclusions from their more limited AO1 understanding and more able students produced some fine combinations of thoughtful argument and apposite textual evidence.

Also as last year, there was again a considerable body of candidates throughout the ability range whose performance in the relatively straightforward context (a) questions fell considerably short in relevance of data and its proximity to the examination passage; this, in turn, tended to result in a lower overall mark for the paper than the candidates' other responses appeared to merit. Despite advice in previous Examiners' Reports and on INSET days, the context question in general seemed to suffer from poor answer technique. The need for only an approximate 200 lines summary previous to the passage cannot be stressed enough.

Question choices were much more evenly distributed than in recent years; no one question seemed especially favoured.

NB There is a marked and increasing tendency for candidates in essays and the context (c) question to avoid a clear conclusion in favour of one point or epic and hedge their bets by finding the poems equal in the aspect under discussion. Centres could, perhaps, advise their students that none of these questions has a definite right or wrong answer in favour of one epic or the other. What is required is for them to show their ability to use both texts in roughly equal proportions to debate an issue.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

(a) This and A2 (a) used the same accustomed format, identical to that used in the 2005 paper. It was, therefore, possible for centres, with the aid of the 2005 Examiners' Report, to prepare their candidates fully to meet the technical requirements of an AO1 only question: a balanced and detailed summary of the events recently preceding the passage (i.e. about 200 lines), with no intrusion into the examination passage. It was frustrating to see so many candidates with an obviously detailed textual knowledge be awarded low marks because the material provided was outside the scope of what was required.

Most candidates were secure on the details of Odysseus' voyage, Poseidon's storm and Ino's help, but precise detail about Calypso's dealings with him (the oath, promise of immortality, details of her help in tools/materials for raft, lovemaking) were often omitted.

Very many candidates spent too long detailing the council of gods at the beginning of Book 5, which was not required in any depth.

(b) This is a common question format in A2 contexts. The best answers focussed first on the passage, identifying, with appropriate short quotations, the devious and manipulative approach of Venus to Juno's suggestion. Surprisingly, some candidates shot themselves in the foot here, by believing every word Venus said, which then warped their subsequent expansion into 'elsewhere'. Two strands of AO1 developed from the passage: other examples of Venus' dealings with Juno, highlighting the more direct hostility evident in Book 10, and examples of Venus' care for her son and her manipulative and sometimes seductive methods with her fellow deities; oddly, making Dido fall in love with him for his protection was often omitted. Most candidates could produce useful evidence though few produced the full possible range. There were those who thought it was Juno who had sent Cupid to 'infect' Dido with love for Aeneas.

- (c) Fewer candidates than last year produced excessively short, time-constrained answers to the (c) question for A1 and A2.

There was, however, a small but disturbing number who did not know what 'deities' meant and who tied it to the heroes' characters rather than the gods'. As last year, the instruction to '...use these passages as the starting point...' was not always heeded, limiting the overall AO1 mark. Again, list of AO1 without comment will inevitably limit the final mark; it is essential for candidates to comment on the question requirements as they go along, rather than in a couple of lines at the end. The best answer began with a definition of 'godlike' (most commonly: powerful, detached, regal, mysterious) then compared and contrasted Poseidon's and Athene's power over nature in the Homer passage as well as Poseidon's just cause in punishing the hero for blinding his son with the devious and petty sparring between Venus and Juno for their own personal motives. They then went on to consider the main six deities elsewhere in the epics; most commonly conflated (or omitted) were Zeus and Jupiter; only the more perceptive saw the distinction between the Zeus of Justice and 'xenia' and the Jupiter of Fate, often besieged by his wayward wife/sister and daughter. Generally candidates found the Odyssey deities more 'godlike'; whilst a conclusion balancing both epics evenly is possible, provided apt distinctions are made between them, candidates are generally advised to reach a definite decision about which epic shows the required features more clearly.

A2

- (a) Although the majority of candidates identified the outline of events, performance was often limited by a general failure to focus on events within about 200 lines of the passage; in a few extreme cases, candidates went back to the beginning of the epic and many certainly went back to Aeneas' landing in Italy in Book 7, whereas the detail of the fighting after Aeneas' return from Evander and the Etruscans (aristeias of Aeneas and Pallas, Pallas rallying his Archadians, Juturna's intervention, Pallas' prayer to Hercules) were often omitted.
- (b) As last year, those who had been taught the skills of literary analysis (as opposed to the character analysis required in A1(b)) were at an advantage here. The demands of A2(b) are to use the whole passage, to identify and comment on the relevant material and to use the text in specific detail, rather than in large, copied extracts. There seemed to be a greater effort this year not to quote large chunks but some candidates were too sparing in their references and/or quotations and omitted telling details such as Antinous' 'black look' or the rock simile. The best answers selected detail from the whole passage and found vivid aspects in the use of vocabulary and imagery, the contrast between Antinous' vicious anger and Odysseus' self-imposed restraint and 'beggar' act as well as the frequent examples of dramatic irony in the situation. A few candidates thought Eupheithes was another suitor.
- (c) As always, the skill of (c) context questions lies in using both passages and text elsewhere to adduce a balanced amount of evidence for the Suitors and Turnus and in keeping focussed on the question in order to reach a clear conclusion. Some candidates made little of the useful evidence in the passages and moved on too swiftly to 'elsewhere' (perhaps feeling that they had already commented on Antinous in (b)). Consequently the aggression of Antinous and his abuse of xenia were sometimes given inadequate treatment. A surprising number of answers did not analyse the boastful vocabulary of Turnus and his abuse of Pallas' body, but just mentioned the baldric; fewer still commented on the narrator judgement which ended the passage.

Once the answers moved on to 'elsewhere', confidence grew; most identified the

Suitors' general offences against *xenia* in Ithaca (though with varying beliefs about how long they had been at the palace) but were sometimes short of specific examples. The plot against Telemachus' life was a common feature. Few, however, differentiated between the Suitors and remembered Amphinomus' remonstrations with them. Most saw Turnus' nobility as a warrior, Juno's perversion of his warrior instincts through *Allecto*, his frustration at being removed by Juno from the battle and his justifiable hostility to the foreigners who had invaded his country and taken his bride-to-be. Predictably, the Suitors were generally felt to deserve their fate more than Turnus.

Again, the clearest synopticity came from those who compared the characters as they went along rather than those who dealt wholly with one, then the other, with a final short synoptic paragraph.

B3

Most candidates who chose this question managed a competent array of data for women helping Odysseus and hindering Aeneas. Fewer investigated the opposites: hindering Odysseus (*Melantho*) and helping Aeneas (*Andromache*, *Sibyl*, possibly *Creusa*). As in the context (c) questions, the approach to synopticity was often limited to a litany (often very impressive) of AO1 for Homer, the same for Virgil then a short final synoptic paragraph. Candidates should be advised to attempt synopticity well before the end of the essay by comparing/contrasting AO1 from both epics as they go along.

B4

The same synoptic weakness as above sometimes beset this essay too. Most answers correctly identified the expected AO1 in both epics but did not compare it until the end. Simpler responses often limited themselves to the heroes; more perceptive answers differentiated at an early stage the types of loyalty in the epics, mostly finding that in the *Odyssey* centring on family and that in the *Aeneid* on a cause, i.e. Aeneas' destined foundation in Italy. Also expected was some debate about loyalty, e.g. Odysseus' loyalty as husband and leader and Aeneas' as lover and slave of duty in Carthage. The more candidates identify the nuances of synopticity the higher their attainment in AO2.

B5

This question attracted a wide range of response. Some showed an impressive knowledge of the possibilities of computer-generated imagery (CGI and the *Massive* software) used in crowd scenes in recent epic cinema. It is important, however, to keep in mind the real aim of this answer: to show knowledge of both texts in apt detail along with a facility in comparison and contrast of the merits of each given circumstance (here, cinema). Some limited themselves to a review of the heroes of each whilst others ranged so widely that they became too superficial. The best answers selected a range of topics to review (e.g. monsters, locations, heroes, war, fantasy) then measured the epics against these criteria. Generally, the *Odyssey* was favoured for its swashbuckling simplicity and fantasy and the *Aeneid* for its more thought-provoking (and realistic) moral dilemmas.

2750: Greek and Roman Historians

General Comments

Many candidates taking this paper have clearly understood the nature of history writing in the Greek and Roman worlds. Many answers showed enthusiasm and solid revision, although some of the part (c) and essay question did tend to generalise without solid evidence to back up points and arguments.

Specific Comments

A1

- (a) The amount of numbers in the Herodotus passage may have deterred some from opting for this question, but most answers showed a decent understanding of the background. Some answers floundered in the entire extent of the Persian war, but the stronger responses focussed on the immediate build-up to the passage given.
- (b) This question gained a strong response, with most candidates enjoying the descriptions of arbitrary violence. Most candidates expressed horror or shock, although some of the stronger responses were also able to discuss the fact that Nero was also risking his own life in carrying out his methods of entertainment.
- (c) This question showed a lot of sound discussion of both authors. Suetonius came out as a favourite, as most answers felt that Herodotus, although he does use much detail, was less reliable in his approach to writing. The passages were used well by candidates, although some had clearly thought about this topic in advance and trotted out several useful points with only a scant regard to the sections given on the paper.

A2

- (a) Several candidates were determined to give an account of why the Boudican revolt took place, although the passage given is actually the very beginning of that section. Stronger answers discussed the British campaign in detail, focussing on what Suetonius Paulinus had been doing in North Wales.
- (b) No one seemed to be too excited by the passage, although most candidates gave a reliable and well-argued account of what happens in this passage and how Thucydides tried to make it interesting. Candidates focussed on the tension of the decision-making process, as well as the significance of the event in question.
- (c) There were a few candidates who took this question to mean that they could discuss battle scenes in the two authors, which, if used as part of a larger scope, may have gained some points, but the stronger responses were the ones that focussed on the escalation of hostilities between the Greek city states and the biographical approach of Tacitus who likes to explain the characters behind what happens in the story.

B3 There was no clear winner here - candidates found it hard to decide between the two authors. However, as long as both historians were discussed in detail, appropriate credit was given. Stronger answers discussed how Thucydides only tended to cite himself as a source, whereas Suetonius was given access to various sources in researching his work.

B4 Both authors were discussed in detail, although some answers tended to generalise, thus missing the precision in citation that was really required to answer this appropriately. Tacitus' description of the character of Nero tended to be well discussed.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2006

- B5** The examiners were expecting most candidates to prefer the shenanigans of Nero's place to be more appealing, but a pleasing amount of candidates were more interested in the military descriptions found in the Greek historians. Whichever was chosen, credit was given for sensible ideas backed up by firm evidence. Several candidates misunderstood what the question was asking and decided to write about which of the four authors they liked best, rather than discussing whether they were more interested in Nero and his presentation or the military campaigns of the Greek authors.

2751: Greek Tragedy 3

General Comments

The overall performance on this paper was slightly weaker than that of last year's. Although there were some very weak papers at the bottom end, generally the standard at the E boundary was much better and the rise in the overall percentage of passes reflects this. There were also some outstanding answers at the top end of the mark range.

Candidates were generally confident in their knowledge and understanding of the basic details of the mythological background, plot, and depiction of character and were well versed in literary techniques. Electra continues to cause problems for some who seem not to have read the play but a synopsis and confusion about the sequence of events was evident.

There was a move away from the purely narrative essays of previous years, but synopticity was less well handled than last year. Examiners were concerned by significant number of cases in which candidates failed to read the question properly, and so answered with reference to the wrong play or did not address the question fully. There were examples of this in A2(b), A2(c), B3 and especially in B4.

The quality of written English was probably slightly better than last year, but spelling was roughly at the same level. There were some random and inconsistent spellings of prophecy [phopercy, propesy] and names such as Dionysus [Dyonisis, Dieonisis] and Orestes [Oerestes, Ourestes]. Rhetorical questions were a stylistic feature of some answers but they do not tend to provide an adequate foundation for a developed argument.

Comments on Individual Questions

A2 was by far the most popular question on the paper and was tackled by almost 80% of the candidature. There was a return to the lengthy (a) response this year, with many writing at great length about the mythical background to the play. This was particularly true of A2(a). A new trend emerged in answering (a): 'Previously, in Euripides' Hippolytus ...'. On a more positive note, there were no reports of candidates explaining the passage.

A1

- (a) This was generally done well. Candidates were able to provide a good deal of relevant detail, with some being able to give the immediate context with pinpoint accuracy.
- (b) Most candidates could comment on the passage, though not all used it well. There were some rather bizarre judgements made about Creon on the basis of this passage; some felt he was power hungry, others that he was idle and content to sit around while Oedipus did the work. It was rare to see an answer which offered a range of evidence from elsewhere in the play. There was much debate about whether he was nice or nasty at the end of the play. Some answers introduced irrelevant material by discussing the portrayal of Creon in Antigone.
- (c) This question was adequately done but was not as well answered as this type of question in previous years. The best answers saw the difference in tone of the two speeches, despite the similarity of the arguments being used. Such answers used the passages as a starting point, but also provided detail of what was said in the rest of these scenes. Candidates recognised the emotional nature of Hippolytus' speech but were split between whether this made him more or less convincing. Others identified Hippolytus as arrogant and believed that this helped his cause. Some candidates' showed good personal response by 'putting themselves in the sandals' of Theseus and Oedipus in order to marshal their arguments.

A2

- (a) This question was poorly answered. Too many answers related all the events from the Trojan War onwards, or even earlier with an entire history of the house of Atreus, and often strayed into the area of Agamemnon. The role of the Tutor was often misunderstood.
- (b) This question produced a range of answers, some of which were superb literary appreciations of the passage. It was probably the best answered question on the paper, with the majority of candidates able to discuss the main ideas and techniques. Rather worryingly, some seemed to think that Euripides intended Pentheus' death to be comical rather than horrific. A number of candidates did not read the question properly and answered it with reference to Sophocles' *Electra*. In the discussion of the descriptive language of the passage adjectives were most commonly mentioned but the examples given were usually verbs or nouns.
- (c) Candidates were able to write well on either Clytemnestra or Pentheus but rarely were they able to write well on both. Many answers were not explicitly synoptic, and seemed as though they were relying on examiners to make the synoptic links for themselves. Facts from *Agamemnon* often formed part of the evidence backing up arguments concerning Clytemnestra as portrayed in *Electra*. Few mentioned Orestes' divine instruction. On the whole, Clytemnestra was viewed more harshly than Pentheus. It was common for candidates to be drawn into discussing who was the more sympathetic character. Some candidates made effective comparisons concerning the different reactions of the C5th audience and a modern audience, particularly towards *hybris* and religious disrespect.

B3

This was a relatively popular essay [attempted by about 20% of the candidates], but there were few very good responses. Most candidates preferred *Medea*, and agreed with the statement, but this led to an imbalance in their answers, with much less on *Agamemnon*. Once again, as in previous sessions, candidates found it difficult to write with any confidence about Aeschylus' play. The chorus was omitted from many answers. Some found no religious or moral issues in *Medea*. The very best answers were able to highlight aspects of a religious and moral nature and elements of human psychology in both plays. Too many failed to address the second part of the question about which approach they preferred.

B4

This was the most popular essay question by a long way [attempted by about 66% of the candidates], and it was probably the best and worst answered of the three essays questions. Most wrote well on Pentheus, and particularly enjoyed discussing the humiliation caused by his being dressed up in women's clothes. Many thought this crueller than the *sparagmos*! Often answers struggled to discuss Oedipus [dubbed 'Oedipus Wrecks' in one] beyond the two prophecies given outside the play [answers are still failing to distinguish between the prophecies given to Jocasta and Laius, and Oedipus] or get to grips with the different treatment meted out to the two characters. One of the best answers came to the conclusion that Oedipus was the more cruelly treated but he was not a plaything, that honour fell to Pentheus.

A number of candidates wrote about Hippolytus rather than Pentheus, and several wrote about all six plays. Some answers strayed into who deserved to be punished or who deserved to die. [some failed to appreciate that Oedipus survives the end of the play].

B5

This essay proved to be the least popular choice on the paper [attempted by about 13% of the candidates]. As usual with this type of essay, the majority of those who tackled it seemed overwhelmed by the amount of material at their disposal and chose to write about all six plays. This, inevitably, leads to superficiality and, often, an over emphasis on the plays of Euripides. Most responses had plenty of valid comment but they lacked detailed reference to the plays and synopticity. Answers which concentrated on fewer plays generally produced more coherent, thoughtful arguments.

This question was sometimes used as excuse to use prepared essays or recently set essays, especially on the theme of revenge. Those that insisted that the plays were exclusively to do with putting forward messages [often this became 'messages'] about the 'dangers of women and foreigners', or 'all to do with revenge' did not fare as well as those who examined the plays first and lifted messages from them. One excellent response began with the concept of mythology and how messages could be inherent in myth and how a dramatist was able to twist a myth to put his own slant or message on it.

2752: Roman Satire and Society 3

General Comments

Candidates knew their texts well however there were fewer very good synoptic answers. When asked to compare two authors candidates would be advised to avoid 'x says this, y says that so ...' and use a more integral synoptic line of argument.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Candidates were less selective over material with some answers covering the whole of the satire. Whereas such answers will offer above average detail there should be more discrimination in the selection of material. There was a prompt encouraging candidates to focus on Horace's life.
- (b) Again answers fell into the trap of paraphrasing the passage. 'Genuine' was a prompt to consider whether this was simply the image Pliny wanted us to see and the very best answers considered the revision of his letters for publication.
- (c) There were some very good references to Horace although Pliny was not so well used. The comments above regarding synoptic reasoning apply here.

A2

- (a) As with A1 (a) answers could have been more discriminating in choice of material. The prompt in this case was 'literature and law'.
- (b) There was scope to draw on material from outside the passage in this question and there were good responses from those who did so. Paraphrasing of the passage was a temptation for some but on the whole most could appreciate the impression created and many were appalled by the bad grammar!
- (c) Better answers recognised that this was a question about the nouveaux riches. The second part of the question was sometimes forgotten or used as a closing sentence. More discussion of 'effective' was expected here.

B3

This was a popular essay and on the whole answers were competent. The question was partly designed to incorporate the society element of the specification so better answers had the scope to show knowledge of Roman slavery. Despite the 'excitement' of living in Trimalchio's household most candidates opted for the more 'steady' Pliny.

B4

There were solid answers to this question provided they avoided a list of characters. Good characters proved more difficult to identify but many had fun with the bad and the ugly. Synoptic reasoning was not so effective.

B5

There was a wide range in quality. Some of the best responses to essays were elicited from this question with a detailed knowledge of the ancient text. Studies in Juvenal were most popular followed by Petronius. Modern parallels were found covering exaggeration of individuals' traits. One response was imagining Trimalchio murdering a song in the X Factor auditions!

2753: Archaeology 3

General Comments

In general, candidates handled the synoptic Archaeology paper well. Some candidates may have been concerned by the appearance of two 'pot' related pictures, but the subsequent questions did allow for discussion of very different topics - technology and trade. The paper provided candidates to demonstrate an understanding both of the Mycenaean world and the way that archaeologists have learnt about this time period.

Specific Comments

A1

- (a) Most candidates write with confidence about the uses of such diagrams to archaeologists. Some were distracted by the picture and chose to discuss the different uses of the different pots. However, the vast majority of answers were strong.
- (b) The reference to particular examples was lacking in a few answers, but most candidates were fully able to discuss in detail how useful archaeologists find pots. Specific references were required for higher marks. Figurines were credited if discussed appropriately, although the accidentally-fired Linear B tablets were not.
- (c) This question formed a firm division between those who could not cite actual examples, and those who could not. Higher credit was given to those answers that deployed precise examples, such as rings. Several answers brought in very useful discussion of the copper ingots found on the sea bed.

A2

- (a) Most who attempted this question were successful in the object's attribution. It allowed for candidates to discuss the technological achievement that faience is. Credit was given for any sensible discussion for the usefulness of such techniques.
- (b) Kas and Gelidonya were used well in answering this question. Some of the answers even managed to refer to the pros and cons of underwater archaeology and conservation. Higher credit was given for accurate reference and use of specific examples of artefacts found. The 'ship's log' appeared frequently, as did terebinth.
- (c) There was, in a few answers, a tendency to rely on merely listing the different finds and where they came from, but the vast majority were able to demonstrate more evaluative skills and discuss the relevance of major finds. The mines at Laurion were frequently brought up, as well as the significance of copper and Cyprus.

B3 This was not the most popular choice of essay question, but those that answered it tended to do rather well. There was a lot of use of synoptic reasoning, although it needed to be tied to Mycenaean chronology. The Thera eruption and its possible role in the decline of the Minoans was frequently discussed as was the possible impact of the Trojan War and Dorian invasions. Correlation with Egyptian chronology was discussed, as were various dating techniques. As ever, credit was given to reliable use of data.

B4 Schliemann came in for a lot of flak from candidates here! The majority of answers relished the chance to demonstrate synopticity and comparison between Schliemann's Mycenaean sites and other sites, such as Roman Britain, helped several candidates to score well. However, many very solid answers focussed on Mycenaean archaeology.

B5 This was the most popular choice and was handled competently by most candidates. Linear B appeared in virtually all answers and credit was given for solid use of the tablets. Homer (and Virgil) appeared in most answers and tended to be well used, although higher credit was given to answers that demonstrated the possible limitations (especially if using Virgil) of such a source.

2754: Greek Comedy 2

General Comments

The standard of response was very much in line with that of previous years. Many candidates showed a thorough knowledge and understanding of the plays, and had clearly enjoyed studying them.

The major factor for differentiation continues to be the amount of detail cited to support an argument in Section A (c) and in Section B.

The Examiners felt that on balance the standard of written work was a little better this year, although they continue to be irked by those who fail to spell correctly the names of principal characters (a misspelling of Pyrrhias might be excusable but Lysistra and Knemnon?).

A considerable number of candidates again showed a missionary zeal to spread their knowledge of the differing socio-political backgrounds to Aristophanes' plays as opposed to Menander's, however tangential to the question such knowledge was!

A1 was answered by c70% of candidates, and B4 was twice as popular as B3. The Examiners continue to enjoy, and learn from, the input of individual teachers.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) This proved to be quite a challenging question. Because it asked specifically about Cinesias, such details as the treatment of the Magistrate and the Chorus' activities were neither needed nor rewarded. As the Mark Scheme shows, candidates had to recall the details of the 'teasing' scene between Cinesias and Myrrhine, together with a little general background to explain where Myrrhine was and why she was there.
- (b) Most candidates had no difficulty identifying and discussing the references to the phallus (with some very limp attempts at the plural being seen!). Better answers were able to explain why 'cock-up' was a pun, rather than just saying it was one. However, candidates should remember that a question containing 'to what extent' is certain to have another element (here the Herald's ignorance of Athenian politics in lines 1-2 and his alien accent) which will need to be addressed for high marks.
- (c) As often in the (c) question, references to the passage were sometimes insufficient. High marks cannot be obtained without use of the passage, even if this means a little repetition from (b).

Elsewhere it was a struggle to achieve a balance between the visual and the verbal: good answers were able to discuss both from the same scene (e.g. citing Lysistrata's wool analogy alongside the decking out of the Magistrate). The Chorus' stripping off, as seen in a recent production, seemed to have left an indelible and dominant impression in some candidates' minds! Others were so inspired by 2005's question that they wrote exclusively about props.

- A2**
- (a) Better answers were able to give the details of Blepyrus' appearance and the reasons for it, while summarising Praxagora's rehearsal scene. It was necessary to mention that the neighbour was also minus his clothes and his wife.

It is pleasing to report (*mirabile dictu*) that hardly anyone summarised the passage here.

- (b) This question differentiated well. There were some impressive answers that showed sound knowledge of the significance of the red rope, the level of payment for Assembly attendees and why shoemakers were atypical Athenian citizens, *inter alia*.

Weaker answers produced such insights as 'there were cures for eye problems' and 'they had many gods because the goddess of childbirth is mentioned'. There was a second question here, trailing a significant proportion of the AO2 marks with it. Sadly this was missed by some of those who had answered the first question successfully. Those who addressed it were able to find some scatological references to support an overall evaluation.

- (c) Because Chremes is rather a dull character, candidates found it difficult to remember details, especially from his scene with Praxagora. However, an encouraging number analysed him as the 'feed' for other characters' humour, in both the passage and elsewhere.

Those few who found him more interesting than Praxagora earned high marks because they supported their assertion ('lively and vigorous' AO2 Band 2) with relevant data.

- B3** Whilst better answers came up with (and talked knowledgably about) the sorts of themes suggested in the Mark Scheme, others struggled with the concept of 'theme' and settled for characterisation or the importance of action.

In discussions on love, there were some who focused too much on Sostratos, to the exclusion of Pan's significance and the insignificance of the girl.

The Examiners felt that any discussion of Aristophanes here was a sign of desperation.

- B4** The anomaly in many answers here was that candidates were able to put forward a reasoned response (that most events in the play are a reaction to Knemon's cantankerousness or that Lysistrata is strong but more of an enabler than a successful comic character) but failed to back it up with detailed evidence. So AO2 marks were often much higher than AO1. Those who did cite some evidence often took it from early in the plays (Knemon's assault on Pyrrhias or Lysistrata stopping the escapees) but then gave up.

The Examiners hope that candidates will keep in mind that nearly half of the marks are for supporting evidence.

2755: Greek Art and Architecture 2

General Comments

Whilst the overall standard of this year's scripts did not quite reach the heights of last year, it is clear from the range of marks awarded that the division of the material by topic, rather than by date, is continuing to produce good results. Examiners were pleased to be able to award very high marks to some excellent papers at the top end of the mark range, but felt that the biggest improvement was in the middle of the mark range. There were, however, some disappointingly poor marks at the bottom end of the mark range.

As with many other modules this year, candidates often wrote at great length on both the contexts and the essays. There was little evidence, however, that there was any misuse of time, and the vast majority of candidates completed their answers within the allotted time. Examiners reported only two infringements of the context/essay rubric.

Poor handwriting and poor spelling, particularly of Greek names, technical terms and words from the questions, gave examiners some cause for concern again this year. As well as the usual favourites [e.g. variants of symmetry, repetition, kouros] this year there were the following misspellings: draps or drapes for drapery, auto man for automaton, and arachaic for archaic. In addition, there was some confusion between the meanings of particular words, e.g. aesthetic and erotic, and sensual and sexual.

It was pleasing to see that huge numbers of candidates are making use of sketches and composition diagrams as an aid to explaining their answers. A word of warning must be inserted at this point: the diagrams cannot replace the words or the discussion required by the question.

In both the context questions and the essays free-standing sculpture proved to be more popular with candidates than architectural sculpture. There were remarkably few candidates who were equipped to tackle a question on each of the subject areas. Examiners felt that many candidates had made a deliberate decision not to revise the architectural sculpture material.

Comments on Individual Questions

The factual questions were, on the whole, tackled much more competently this year. Few candidates wrote at length and many were able to achieve good marks on these questions. A small minority failed to provide all the details required by the questions. Although fewer candidates tackled A1, the answers were generally of a higher standard.

A1

- (a) Most candidates could identify the buildings and locations. Many found it a little more difficult to explain the location of the frieze on the Parthenon and why it was unusual. Often diagrams were employed to help with the explanation, but not always to great effect.
- (b) Candidates wrote well on this question and were able to refer to more or less contemporary works to support their answer. Some answers concentrated solely on archaic features such as the hair, the smile and drapery. The very best answers were able to provide a more balanced response with comment on the interest in pattern, repetition and the dominant horizontals and verticals. Both architectural sculpture and free-standing sculpture were used as reference material.
- (c) There were some excellent responses to this question. The best responses were able to combine close scrutiny of the two friezes with sensitive and sophisticated comparisons. The most common flaw in answers was to spend too much time on one of the friezes, usually the Parthenon frieze, at the expense of the other. By far the majority of candidates preferred the Parthenon frieze over the Siphnian Treasury frieze, though better answers often chose the latter as the more aesthetically pleasing. There was some difference of opinion as to the identity of the deities in the Siphnian Treasury, with many candidates identifying all the figures as female, with the exception of Ares.

A2

- (a) Again, many candidates knew the relevant details of the two statues and were able to score good marks. Aside from lack of knowledge, the most common problem here was the failure to address each aspect of the question, with some candidates leaving out the dates or the sculptors. Hermes was sometimes identified as Apollo.
- (b) Many answers were either unable to identify any fourth century characteristics in the Eirene and Ploutos statue or focussed on drapery to the exclusion of any other points. Often the examples chosen to 'prove' that the statue was from the fourth century were inappropriate [e.g. 'you can tell she is from the fourth century because she does not have an archaic smile like the Peplos Kore']. Even those who were able to identify some fourth century characteristics often failed to go on to discuss the 'to what extent' part of the question. The best answers were able to give a range of fourth century characteristics, such as humanising the gods, concepts and emotion, but were also able to give a more balanced argument, backed up with close reference to other examples of fourth century sculpture.
- (c) Most candidates were able to respond well to this question and seemed to enjoy writing about these two statues. Opinions were almost equally divided on which was the more aesthetically pleasing, but there was a slight preference for the Hermes and Dionysus. Almost every candidate had some useful points to offer in their comparison of the two works. The discriminating factor was whether a candidate could develop a range of points based on careful analysis of the works in question and discuss their preference with maturity and sensitivity.

As in June 2005, the question on free-standing sculpture was by far the most popular question on the paper. Though it attracted approximately 90% of the candidates, it was not always well answered.

B3

There were two common approaches to this question:

Many understood the word Kouros to mean any male free-standing statue, or sometimes any female free-standing statue, of any date – consequently there was much irrelevant discussion.

Many dealt with the question in a chronological way and produced a development essay which did not always address the question effectively.

There were, however, some first class answers to this question. These answers tended to adopt a thematic approach and could provide a wide range of specific examples as supporting evidence.

B4

This was the least popular question on the paper but was probably the best answered overall. Candidates showed a good knowledge of a range of metopes, both Archaic and Classical. Candidates generally wrote perceptively and knowledgeably about the Herakles metopes, but fewer were able to deal with the Parthenon metopes in the same depth. Here the tendency was to describe and comment on the quality of the sculpture rather than to address the question posed.

Most candidates were able to identify a number of problems and refer in detail to specific metopes, often with excellent composition diagrams to support their answers. The very best answers were able to analyse a problem and refer to several examples to show how different sculptors dealt with it at different times. Some failed to identify particular problems faced by the sculptors and just compared the various metopes or produced a development essay.

There were several candidates who thought that metopes were pediments.

2756: Roman Britain 2

General Comments

There was a marked improvement in the quality of scripts this year, especially at the lower end, and it was felt that centres had taken on board the advice given in last year's report and at the various INSET sessions.

Knowledge of Hill and Ireland was good and candidates had less difficulty in identifying the diagrams in the context questions. Clearly much effort had gone into preparing for this year's examination. Most impressive was the way many candidates handled the breadth of B4 and pulled together the many aspects of the unit.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1

- (a) Candidates had little difficulty in identifying the cities nor in discussing their layout.
- (b) Many answer displayed a good depth of detail in relation to Colchester, though many responses were patchy when it came to discussing London and how it became the capital city. Many answers omitted Boudicca's rebellion.
- (c) There was an excellent knowledge of the Roman administration of Britain and evidently much effort had generally gone into revising this topic. Unfortunately not all answers linked this knowledge to cities and towns and considered their importance in the administration of the country.

A2

- (a) This question posed few problems for those with knowledge of the relevant diagrams in Hill and Ireland.
- (b) Many candidates scored highly here and managed to cite a range of relevant villas and consider both of their functions.
- (c) There was a tendency with this question to write about farming practices in Britain and how the Romans changed them rather than considering the importance of agriculture to the economy of Roman Britain. In many cases, answers displayed a rather shaky knowledge of the economy of Roman Britain and clearly had not read the relevant pages in Hill and Ireland.

B3

This question was generally well covered; most answers had a firm understanding of the Roman practice of amalgamating native religious beliefs with their own wherever it was possible and could cite a range of relevant examples. There was also good coverage of Druidism, Christianity, Mithraism and most answers managed to keep the focus of the essay on the idea of a conflict of religions.

B4

Given the breadth of the question, there were a surprising number of excellent essays written covering a breadth of relevant points (e.g. art, religion, administration, towns etc.) as well as evaluation considering how much of an impact the Romans had in Britain. Clearly candidates have taken on board the need for detail in their answers as well as argument which looks at both sides of the question.

2757 and 2799 Individual Study

General Comments on Both Levels

There was a pleasing increase in the number of Individual Studies submitted this year, back to the numbers of 2004. As in previous years, candidates continue to delight the moderators with the wide variety of title and subjects offered. It is always pleasing to read Individual Studies which are obviously the product of a deep interest in the subject matter rather than something which has been imposed on a student. The former invariably produce better, well-considered pieces of research and argument.

Only a few Centres managed to meet the 15th May deadline for MS1s and samples of 10 and under. It is important to keep to this deadline, which is set by inter-Board agreement, because the submission date is so close to the half-term holiday. It is equally important to reply to moderators' requests promptly so that the moderators can keep to the deadlines set by the Board for the completion of the moderation process. In several cases this year there were severe delays in providing the requested sample, the CCS160, or the forms used for addition errors or remarking. Most Centres are now using the correct documentation, which can be downloaded from the OCR website, and this enables the moderation process to run more smoothly.

Moderators need copies of the MS1 or a Centre's list of marks if they have been submitted by EDI and the Centre Authentication Form [CCS160] before they can deal with the Individual Studies for a Centre. It is vital, therefore, that these documents are included in the first communication with the moderator.

Moderators also need the Teacher Assessment Sheet to be completed so that they have information about the examined units and the word count for each Individual Study. It is also helpful for the candidate's Proposal Sheet to be attached to the coursework.

Moderators were pleased by the increased level of annotation on the texts of the work. Such comments are helpful in understanding why a teacher thought well of a piece and how the marks were awarded. There were no reported cases of teachers using the wrong Assessment Grid this year. Although the boundaries for particular grades were kept at the same level as last year for A2, it was felt that, on the whole, the marking was a little more generous than last year, particularly at the top end.

Unit 2799 – AS Level

The number of candidates taking the AS Individual Study showed an increase on the previous year. Art and Architecture was the most popular subject, although Roman Britain is now challenging this position. Comedy remained popular as a topic. The choice of title also varied; there were, as last year, two main approaches. Some centres preferred more 'conservative' titles, drawing on previous exam questions or going back to the Independent Study. Several centres also limited the number of titles their students were permitted to use. Other centres allowed their students to explore their own areas of interest within the Module. Both approaches produced a number of interesting Studies, which showed a variety of good ideas and personal response to the subject matter.

There were, however, still a number of centres which did not take enough care over the selection of Study Titles. As Individual Study must be based on the material prescribed in the particular module being replaced. Some Art and Architecture Studies dealt with themes such as sculpture, both architectural and free-standing, while a few Roman Britain topics covered not just the Invasion and Conquest of Britain, but also Settlement and Culture. It is vital for centres to seek approval for titles and the planned scope of Studies from the Chief Moderator to ensure that the material and areas of study conform to the Specification. Use of illustrations for Studies involving material culture, such as Art and Architecture and aspects of Roman Britain was improved this year. Length continued to be an area of concern to the moderators, with several studies which exceeded the accepted word count considerably, without due account being taken in the internal moderating and a growing tendency to use copious footnotes used to supplement the word count. Teachers should consult the Subject Specific Instructions for Moderation.

Overall, the Individual Studies revealed a good level of interest and achievement amongst the candidates. Despite the reservations expressed above, most centres have come to terms with the requirements of the Individual Study, and the work produced was generally lively and interesting.

Unit 2757– A2 Level

Candidates seemed to enjoy exploring topics as varied as the archaeology of a local farmstead to a comparison of Alexander and Julius Caesar, from the influence of Polykleitos and Praxiteles on Michelangelo to a comparison of the life of prostitutes in Greece and the modern world. There was some stunning work on Plato and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Such studies are interesting to read and the enthusiasm of the candidate comes through very clearly, even when the argument and expression are not terribly sophisticated. Moderators would urge teachers to think carefully about allowing their candidates a freer rein in choosing their topic rather than restricting them to a single title or one of a small number on offer. Candidates who choose their own topic tend to learn more about not only the topic but also methods of research and approaches to the subject. It is also an appropriate means of improving their own learning.

It is essential that candidates are truthful in their bibliographies, and especially their 'webographies'! As in previous years, a number of studies were less than honest in their approach to varying amounts of their work but vigilant teachers and moderators were able to deal effectively with these.

There are still a good number of candidates who submit studies which are substantially over the permitted word count. The word count for this module is 3000, but up to 3,500 is allowed to take account of quotations. Some teachers gave too much credit for Individual Studies which breached the word count. Action was taken by moderators to ensure that all candidates were treated evenly and fairly.

Most Centres had their candidates' titles approved in advance, but there were several Centres this year which submitted the proposal forms with the studies – this is too late! Proposal forms should be submitted by the end of March in the year the Individual Study is being submitted. A growing number of Centres failed to submit any proposal forms at all and a few Centres who had submitted proposal forms chose not to follow the Chief Moderator's advice. It is important to gain approval for titles so that candidates do not tackle topics which would lead them to breach the rules regarding using subject matter/material from examined units.

Advanced GCE Classical Civilisation (3816/7816)

June 2006 Assessment Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2736	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2737	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2738	Raw	100	73	65	58	51	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2739	Raw	100	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2740	Raw	100	73	65	57	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2741	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2742	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2743	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2744	Raw	100	71	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2745	Raw	100	73	65	57	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2746	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2747	Raw	100	71	63	55	47	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2748	Raw	100	73	64	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2749	Raw	100	75	66	57	49	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2750	Raw	100	73	65	57	49	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2751	Raw	100	76	67	59	51	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Report on the Units Taken in June 2006

2752	Raw	100	70	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2753	Raw	100	77	68	59	51	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2754	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2755	Raw	100	74	65	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2756	Raw	100	78	69	60	51	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2757	Raw	100	84	74	64	54	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2799	Raw	100	86	74	62	51	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3816	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7816	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3816	20.9	45.7	68.9	84.9	95.0	100.0	2764
7816	25.0	58.9	84.1	96.5	99.2	100.0	2408

5172 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: helpdesk@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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2006

