

Classical Civilisation

Advanced GCE A2 7816

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3816

Report on the Units

June 2008

3816/7816/MS/R/08

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 MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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

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

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

© OCR 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
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	1
2736 Greek Epic	3
2737 Roman Epic	5
2738 Greek Historians	7
2739 Roman Historians	9
2740 Greek Tragedy 1	11
2741 Greek Tragedy 2	13
2742 Roman Satire and Society 1	15
2743 Roman Satire and Society 2	17
2744 Archaeology 1	19
2745 Archaeology 2	21
2746 Greek Comedy 1	23
2747 Greek Art and Architecture 1	25
2748 Roman Britain 1	28
2749 Greek and Roman Epic	29
2750 Greek and Roman Historians	33
2751 Greek Tragedy 3	35
2752 Roman Satire and Society 3	38
2753 Archaeology 3	40
2754 Greek Comedy 2	42
2755 Greek Art and Architecture 2	44
2756 Roman Britain 2	47

2757 and 2799 Individual Study	49
Module 2799 – AS Level	50
Grade Thresholds	52

Chief Examiner's Report

Overall Report from the Chief Examiner

It is common to read in examiners' feedback just how much they have enjoyed marking their allocation for a particular module, and this year was no exception. Candidates write with enthusiasm and interest, and are keen to express their personal opinions and reactions to the texts and material they have studied. Such is their passion for particular topics that they write in detail and at great length; one candidate wrote 23 sides but it was not uncommon for many candidates to write 16+ sides for Epic, Tragedy and Art. Candidates are clearly well-prepared and revise in great detail; perhaps, however, they need more guidance in how to be a little more selective in the information they choose to present in an answer.

At both levels there were fewer outstanding performances and fewer very poor performances on individual modules or across modules. Generally, it was felt that the performance overall showed an improvement in the mid-range of marks. Grade percentages on individual modules are slightly lower than last year but the overall aggregation shows an increase at both AS and A2. This is probably accounted for by the fact that large numbers are now sitting their first module in January and many are taking the opportunity to re-take a module in their A2 year.

As mentioned above, some topics seem to encourage candidates to fill more than one answer booklet. This year there were many extra booklets and supplementary sheets without treasury tags. Extra sheets can go astray if they are not securely attached – as one Centre discovered this year. An examiner has no reason to look for extra sheets if the box on the front of the script has not been completed. Writing at length can lead to timing problems for some candidates. When a candidate writes 14 sides for a context and 4 sides for an essay there may well be timing issues involved, but also issues of quality, too. Some candidates are aware that they spend too long on the context question and are taking steps to overcome this. These include tackling the essay before the context question (mostly a successful tactic for those who employed it), and answering the context question in reverse order. The latter tactic was not on the whole successful as the context questions are designed to build up gradually from a question requiring only AO1 material to a more difficult question which has more marks assigned to the AO2 element.

There was more evidence of candidates planning their longer answers this year. It was felt, however, that spider diagrams do not help candidates order their thoughts in a particularly logical way, especially for the synoptic questions at A2. Some essays were in the stream of consciousness format; candidates should be advised to think carefully about what they want to write before they put pen to paper to avoid the proliferation of arrows, stars, and asterisks which afflicted some candidates' work. Answers also need to be clearly labeled with the appropriate question number and sufficient space between questions to enable the examiner to write a mark and a comment. Fewer candidates than ever started a new question on a new page of the answer booklet.

Examiners' reports expressed concern about a range of things mentioned in previous reports:

- use of bullet points to answer parts of the context question;
- use of abbreviations for names – Ag, Cly, Oed;
- spelling of words and names printed on the paper;
- sentence structure;
- punctuation.

The quality of presentation and handwriting seemed much worse this year, with a significant number of scripts bordering on illegibility and having to be referred to senior examiners. Candidates often penalise themselves as parts of their answers are unreadable and cannot be awarded credit.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

There were a couple of new trends this year: the coining of new words/phrases and a peculiar use of prepositions and relative pronouns. The new words encountered include disconcern, seducation and venimosity. In addition, candidates are sometimes careless with the spelling of familiar words and can end up giving the phrase a new meaning: 'trails and tabulations', 'pratagonist', 'onomatopoetic', and describing Cassandra as a 'porcupine' rather than concubine. Epic and Tragedy seem to invite candidates to use Greek terms to explain their answers but these words are often not understood or candidates are unsure about how to use them, so that some strange phrases are encountered in answers: 'Oedipus is suffering from hamartia' or 'Euripides uses his powers of pathos'. Prepositions and relative pronouns were very popular this year but they were usually used incorrectly – 'Cassandra disagrees to which Clytemnestra offers to which is death'. This is an extreme example but one which illustrates the point quite clearly.

2736 Greek Epic

General Comments

The performance in this module was generally good, with a number of outstanding efforts which were a joy to read because of the clarity of writing and fresh, interesting approach to answering the questions. There were a few candidates who were completely out of their depth either through inability or failure to revise. Most were well versed with the epic and seem to have enjoyed reading it. Consequently they were able to offer their best in the examination – the weaker ones could reproduce the storyline of the *Odyssey* with a fair amount of accuracy whilst the more able offered detailed and quite sophisticated analysis. By far the most popular combination of questions was A1 and B3.

Context question skills were variable. Those who followed the Exam Report's advice to give specific details of the immediate context scored well on the context (a) questions. The (b) questions offered the usual options: either a character-based question (Polyphemus) or a stylistic analysis (A2(b)). Candidates trained in these answer types performed well and used the passage at least competently; better students focused on detail to fine tune their analyses. Both (c) questions required examination of both the passage and elsewhere; better answers recognised this and, where required, did compare/contrast between the passage and elsewhere. The essay questions were generally well approached; in both cases the greatest rewards went to those who knew the text well and used it as the firm foundation for argument, rather than indulging in hypothesis, speculation or personal opinion alone.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Most candidates were able to remember the Cicones, Lotus-Eaters and Cyclops, although there was some confusion of events especially with the frequent inclusion of the Laestrygonian episode. Not all candidates managed to include very specific details from the immediate context.
 - (b)** Most candidates were able to see different elements of Polyphemus' behaviour, especially the brutal and barbaric side. The best also grasped the contrast of civilised/uncivilised behaviour and quoted precisely and concisely from the passage to support their argument. Weaker responses tended to either fail to look at both sides of the argument, or to quote from the passage or made vague generalisations.
 - (c)** Odysseus' heroism was often well analysed both from the passage and elsewhere. Clearly candidates had been well versed in the need to include specific examples. Stronger responses examined both aspects of Odysseus' heroism, good and bad. Some weaker responses tended to fail to examine the negative attributes or to discuss episodes beyond those specified in the question. Poseidon's curse was surprisingly often forgotten as was Odysseus' desire for *kleos*. Many candidates could have had a surer understanding of *xenia* and might have also considered the type of opponent Odysseus was facing.
- A2**
- (a)** This question was not completed as well as its equivalent (A1a) where many candidates either failed to include enough detail or confused the order of the conversations, or even included unnecessary details from Book 22. Many candidates struggled to get beyond the idea that Eurycleia had gone to wake Penelope to tell her the news of Odysseus' return and that Penelope was just about to go downstairs to meet her husband.

- (b) There was plenty of material in the passage to be discussed and many candidates found lots to say and did a good job in conveying the tension of the passage. The best answers used the whole of the passage and analysed both the physical and emotional tension.
 - (c) The majority of candidates might have found more to say from the passage. Most were able to cite the usual examples concerning Telemachus elsewhere – crying in the Assembly, his travels and some general comment about his behaviour on his subsequent return to Ithaca. The best candidates kept the focus of their answer on ‘maturity’ and traced its growth until the slaying of the Suitors and unfaithful maidservants.
- B3** The best essays were those which paid heed to the question’s prompt and examined Penelope’s situation from both angles as well as whether Odysseus was worth the wait. Some able candidates failed to score highly on this question because they concentrated on Penelope to the exclusion of anyone else. Others did not have a sure enough grasp of Homeric society or failed to provide any detailed reference to the text beyond ‘Mills and Boon’ style romanticised speculation on Penelope’s fate. The need to adhere to the question’s prompt and to demonstrate specific knowledge and understanding of the epic cannot be stressed enough.
- B4** This question allowed for a range of responses the best of which were analytical on the qualities of a good story and used well focused and detailed AO1. Weaker candidates tended to stray into the realm of recalling the story without making any attempt at explaining why it was effective.

2737 Roman Epic

General Comments

Overall it was felt that the quality of the candidates' performance this year was much better than 2007. The vast majority of candidates showed a pleasing knowledge of the *Aeneid* and had clearly been well prepared for the examination and, most importantly, about how to tackle each type of question. Far more candidates were including a range of details to support their lines of argument and there were more exceptional scripts which showed a real engagement with the text, originality of thought and a lucid line of argument.

There was a marked preference for questions A1 and B3 with only a valiant few choosing B4.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Many wasted time by ignoring the wording of the question and offering much irrelevant narrative from Book 1 or the cave/hunt etc. The answer only required details from the lines preceding the passage. Better responses included details of what Anna said and the sacrifices to the gods just before the passage starts.
 - (b)** This question was generally well handled and many responses took full advantage of Virgil's many narrative techniques deployed in the chosen passage. Nearly all the candidates were quoting directly from the passage and there was a marked increase from last year in the number of candidates explaining why a chosen quotation was effective. This was particular evident when discussing the simile.
 - (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 to help structure their response. There was an increase in the number of candidates making effective use of the passage and including a range of AO1 from beyond this starting point. Stronger responses remembered to balance their argument and argue that, although she is caught up in a situation which is out of her control, she also cuts a highly unsympathetic character in the latter stages of Book 4.
- A2**
- (a)** Nearly all of the few candidates who attempted this question were able to locate where this meeting was taking place. However it was surprising how many answers failed to include adequate recall of what had been said since the beginning of Book 10 or included details after the passage.
 - (b)** As before, it was pleasing to note how effectively candidates had been prepared to tackle this type of question. There was little difficulty in selecting a range of appropriate rhetorical devices deployed by Juno and analysing their effectiveness. Candidates could easily dissect the content of her speech, often alighting on her mendacity as an example of where she was far from persuasive.

- (c)** Weaker responses listed character traits of each goddess and often supported them with appropriate AO1 and then made some sort of comparison in the conclusion. Better responses were those which highlighted both the similarities and differences of the two goddesses with a breadth of relevant examples and made direct comparisons throughout the whole of their answer.
- B3** This was by far the most popular essay question and was generally well done. Nearly all responses offered some sort of definition of what qualities are essential for a hero (usually a good leader) and provided a range of appropriate examples, especially from Books 1-6. Better answers extended the depth of their analysis by including discussion of typical Homeric heroic values versus *pietas* and by also spending time considering examples of Aeneas' behaviour where he did not match up to these latter values. Very few candidates made links with Augustus.
- B4** Even though this essay was less popular, those bold few who attempted it provided some interesting responses. There was good recall of the different omens scattered throughout the *Aeneid*, especially from Book 3, although candidates were generally unable to make detailed reference to all three of the big patriotic prophecies. Candidates would have achieved higher marks had they discussed the latter half of the question in greater depth. Very few were able to develop their argument beyond the political dimension the prophecies bring.

2738 Greek Historians

General Comments

Many candidates answered well and in detail to all the questions that they attempted. However, there were several who relied on generalities and vague comments rather than specific facts and data about the events described by the specified historians and their methods of historiography.

It is clear that many centres are providing candidates with stimulating teaching. However, there were some answers that suggested the film '300' had provided more evidence than a careful reading of Herodotus.

Both context questions were answered by a wide range of candidates. The same was true of the essay questions. There was no evidence of stronger candidates opting for particular questions.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Few answers solicited the requisite amount of detail, preferring to dwell on a generalised account of the Persian war up until that point.
 - (b) There were many detailed critiques of the passage, dwelling on Xerxes' character. Although some answers focused on merely listing characteristics that were seen in the passage, it was pleasing that several responses made perceptive use of the text, analyzing and extrapolating from what was written.
 - (c) Several answers made the mistake of concentrating on either 'this passage' or 'elsewhere' rather than using both. Stronger answers tended to begin with an assessment of the boat digression in the set passage and then move onto an account of the role played by digressions, such as character based analysis, in the work as a whole. There were several responses, however, that limited themselves to generalities without evidence from the text.
- A2**
- (a) Some answers showed a sound understanding of the political machinations and background that led up to the situation. However, there were some responses that limited themselves to saying that there were some feelings of hostility between Athens and Sparta and that Potidaea was caught in the crossfire.
 - (b) As with its A1 counterpart, this question elicited some strong analysis of the language used by Thucydides. Most answers managed to find something positive to say about the text and were appropriately impressed by the detailed description of the situation. Some were of the opinion that this was not an exciting chunk of narrative. These scored well if they showed understanding and appreciation of the text.

- (c)** This question caused problems for some candidates who seemed uncertain where to start in answering this question. These answers tended to list the cause of the conflict rather than assessing the effectiveness of Thucydides' account. This is what the stronger answers focused on, as well as the psychological understanding and emotionless description of the author's work in this area.
- B3** This was answered by the full range of students with answers ranging from merely telling the story of Thermopylae (not always based on Herodotus' account) to detailed analyses and description of the several military conflicts. Most answers focused, as expected, on Herodotus' interest in individuals and unusual customs rather than military tactics. Several answers did not achieve higher marks because they lacked precise reference to the work. Answers to this kind of question require candidates to show that they are familiar with the work being read, rather than being reliant on generalised comments.
- B4** Several candidates did not know what 'impartial' meant but decided to answer this question anyway, presenting the examiners with a range of essays on religion, how 'interesting' or reliable each author is and the use of detail in the works, to identify but a few. Many answers, however, were more successful in answering this question with a discussion of the level of bias in the work. Several candidates were unfamiliar with the distinction between the words 'bias' and 'biased', but most managed to produce a balanced argument with a useful spread of data, before coming to the conclusion that Thucydides was the more impartial. However, there were some that championed Herodotus. The ones that showed textual understanding gained higher marks.

2739 Roman Historians

General Comments

This year, there were no clear favourites in choosing questions – both contexts and essays were attempted by candidates. The story of Nero, with its gruesome and grotesque stories, such as Sporus' castration and subsequent marriage, incest, matricide, murder of family members and women giving birth in the audience of Nero's recitals, has evidently caught the imagination and enthusiasm of candidates.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Not all candidates were able to recall the detail required by the question and these tended to rely on a list of generalisations about Nero's excesses. Some candidates unfortunately misread the question as 'How did Agrippina die?', which meant that they did not score for this question. Several, however, clearly knew their text in sufficient detail to gain a high mark for this question.
 - (b) Although some candidates tried to wheel out a pre-thought-up essay on the character of Nero in the Annals of Tacitus, the more successful answers were able to analyse the nuances of the passage and discern what impression Tacitus wanted his readers to have of the emperor.
 - (c) The majority of candidates were able to describe and discuss the omen as used in the passage, as well as pick and evaluate the use of omens elsewhere in Tacitus' work. However, there were several answers which focused on either the passage or 'elsewhere', which unfortunately meant that they were not gaining high marks.
- A2**
- (a) It seems that many candidates have learned the life of Nero in chronological order. While it may well be beneficial in some areas, it did not help them in answering this question, as they tended to summarize various events from Nero's reign, such as the death of his mother or the fire of Rome, rather than what has been discussed between Claudius' death and this passage. Higher marks went to the answers that could describe the relevant sections of Suetonius' life of Nero in detail.
 - (b) Most answers successfully drew relevant facts and references out of the passage on the paper and were able to assess the choice of data and nuance well. Some were limited to a brief character sketch of Nero as seen by Suetonius, but the stronger answers made firm use of the passage.
 - (c) Although some candidates chose to focus on one particular aspect of Suetonius' writing, the stronger answers tended to be those that picked up several aspects and discussed them in some detail. Not all answers made much effort to analyse the passage, but relied on generalised points about the writing techniques and sources of Suetonius.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- B3** There were many very good and interesting responses to this question. Candidates relished the chance to discuss Tacitus' determination to remain unbiased before launching himself into a vicious and one-sided character assassination of the man Nero. Not all candidates managed to remember to deal with the other side of the question and preferred to spend their time regurgitating ideas on the presentation of Nero. Higher scores were given to answers that dealt with the nature of being a good historian, and the impact of bias on historiography.
- B4** Not unexpectedly, Suetonius seemed to be the winner here, as most candidates were taken by his more colloquial and lively style. His lack of chronological order and focus on the more scandalous aspects attracted many fans. However, Tacitus had his fair share of admirers. His attention to detail and view of the entire empire as opposed to just one man was mentioned by several candidates. As ever, credit was given to evidence that the candidates knew the text in detail.

2740 Greek Tragedy 1

General Comments

2741 (Euripides) had marginally more candidates than 2740 (Aeschylus and Sophocles). Problems seen in previous years continued to appear, most commonly in the spellings of proper names (e.g. Euripides and Laius were, as usual, often misspelt,) and other common words such as the various forms of prophesy. The misuse of technical terms, such as *stichomythia* and *anagnoresis* noted in previous years continued to be a problem for some candidates. The majority of candidates had a very sound knowledge of the plays, and the large degree of personal opinion which emerged from the papers showed the continuing enjoyment and appreciation of the plays by the students. A number of candidates seemed to simply regard the plays as literature, without treating them as pieces of drama.

A1, from *Agamemnon* was the more popular of the two context questions, while B4, the essay on sympathy for Agamemnon and Oedipus, produced far more answers than B3, the question about Creon and Teiresias in *Oedipus the King*. Some candidates seemed to work more from the myth than the plays, confusing details from *Agamemnon* and *Electra* as if they were part of a series. Candidates also still showed a certain amount of confusion over the prophecies in *Oedipus the King*.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Candidates were generally confident in the main details of the events leading up to the scene in Part (a), but the amount of detail varied.
 - (b) Part (b) gave the candidates plenty of material to work with. Virtually all were able to find examples of Aeschylus' technique as a playwright, including the language, imagery, Thyestes' feast and Agamemnon's murder. Candidates were not always able to analyse why the passage is so dramatic, being limited to listing features without discussing them or stating how they contributed to the drama of the play.
 - (c) The role of Cassandra in Part (c) produced a variety of answers. Many candidates did not go beyond the passage, while better answers discussed several aspects to her role, such as her position as Agamemnon's trophy – evidence of his sack of Troy and a provocation for Clytemnestra. Her role as a messenger reporting Agamemnon's death was also mentioned, but few answers talked about her prediction of the future.
- A2**
- (a) Candidates were generally less secure on the details in *Electra*. Not all answers included the argument between Clytemnestra and Electra, and there was some confusion over the reporting of Orestes' death and who carried the urn.
 - (b) Part (b) on Clytemnestra's feelings was generally well answered, with most candidates appreciating the different feelings she had in relation to Orestes' death. Fewer dealt well with her feelings about Electra, and the discussion of effectiveness was also a problem for some candidates.
 - (c) Electra's opinion of her mother produced varying degrees of detail. A common scene which was neglected was the death of Clytemnestra and Electra's reaction to it, but in general, most candidates were able to discuss the

antagonism Electra felt for her mother. Better answers were able to see both sides of the story.

- B3** This essay was not tackled by very many candidates. Those who did found plenty to say about the roles of Creon and Tiresias. However, although Creon appears three times in the play, many answers neglected to mention at least one of his scenes. Most candidates were able to discuss the part both characters played in revealing the negative aspects of Oedipus' personality, and in driving him on to discover the truth about himself. Better answers also dealt with how the characters were used as a contrast to Oedipus, especially Creon's calm demeanour when arguing with him and at the end of the play.
- B4** This was by far the most popular of the essay questions. Most candidates had a good knowledge of the plays, but many found themselves drawn into narrative, often in the case of Oedipus, of his life story. They were unable to show discrimination in the material they chose. Candidates were able to find reasons for feeling sympathy for both figures, with most choosing Oedipus because 'it was not his fault' that he committed the acts he did. Some felt sorry for Agamemnon because of his dilemma about sacrificing Iphigeneia, and being forced to walk on the tapestries by his wife, but many did find his actions less sympathetic than those of Oedipus. A number of candidates failed to address the question fully, discussing which of the two figures deserved his fate more, rather than considering the concept of sympathy.

2741 Greek Tragedy 2

General Comments

2741 (Euripides) had marginally more candidates than 2740 (Aeschylus and Sophocles). Problems seen in previous years continued to appear, most commonly in the spellings of proper names (e.g. Euripides and Laius were, as usual, often misspelt,) and other common words such as the various forms of prophesy. The misuse of technical terms, such as *stichomythia* and *anagnoresis* noted in previous years continued to be a problem for some candidates. The majority of candidates had a very sound knowledge of the plays, and the large degree of personal opinion which emerged from the papers showed the continuing enjoyment and appreciation of the plays by the students. A number of candidates seemed to simply regard the plays as literature, without treating them as pieces of drama.

A1 on *Medea* was marginally more popular than A2 from *Bacchae*. Of the two essay questions, B4 on Euripides' female characters was the more popular question by far.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Most candidates knew the general details of events before the passage started. However, many omitted details, with the argument between Jason and Medea surprisingly being left out by a considerable number of candidates. There was also confusion about when Medea revealed her plan to kill the children – many answers mentioned this before the arrival of Aegeus.
 - (b) Part (b) produced a range of responses. Candidates were able to extract relevant material from the passage, and there were some good responses about the language used, although there was less appreciation of the situation and mood of the passage. Many neglected to mention the shock value in Medea's announcement of her intention to kill her children.
 - (c) Part (c) showed candidates' appreciation of Medea's character. Many answers simply listed traits of her behaviour, but there were areas which were not explored. The ending of the play, and Medea's doubts about actually killing her children were often not mentioned. The challenge many candidates found was to include both detail from the passage and elsewhere, with appropriate analysis.
- A2**
- (a) While most candidates knew the main details of the play before the scene in the paper, many omitted the speech of the Herdsman, and Pentheus' reaction to it.
 - (b) For Part (b), almost all candidates could select and explain some examples of dramatic irony, but found explaining its impact and effectiveness more difficult.
 - (c) In Part (c), candidates often focussed on the issue of Dionysus' control of Pentheus, and neglected other areas, such as their earlier encounter and the end of the play. Good answers tackled both sides of the question, analysing how power seemed to shift from Pentheus to Dionysus, and including Pentheus' sudden realisation of Dionysus' divinity just before his death.

- B3** Although not a popular essay, the question elicited a good range of responses. Much depended on how the candidates viewed what constitutes a “complex and interesting character”. For many, Hippolytus was boring simply because he was ‘good’. Candidates also seemed to be more familiar with the first part of the play, and could give little detail of what happened after Phaedra died. Better answers showed a balance between the two characters, and discussed them in detail. The vast majority of candidates decided that Phaedra was the more interesting character, though some argued, often convincingly, that Hippolytus was more interesting.
- B4** This was by far the most popular of the essays. All three plays were discussed in varying degrees of detail. Many of the candidates tried to include all three plays, but may have been better off limiting themselves only to two plays and expanding the amount of detail offered. In general, answers concentrated on the main characters, especially Medea and Phaedra, with little mention of minor characters such as the Nurses. A few candidates drifted away from the question, changing the focus to ‘All evil and twisted characters are female’ and dealing more with male characters, while others agreed that while the women’s actions may have been evil, it was all the fault of the men in their lives. Better answers included not just the major characters, but also the minor ones, and included, quite legitimately, Aphrodite and Artemis in their discussion.

2742 Roman Satire and Society 1

General Comments

The quality of answers in this unit is gradually improving and candidates were able to respond to all questions. In Section A both questions were equally popular and in Section B the question on Horace was marginally more popular.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) The question asked for detail from *other writers* and Lucilius should have been mentioned. Better answers included details about Crispinus and Fannius. Details of Horace's approach to writing satire was not required in this answer.
 - (b) There were several good responses to this question. Many candidates were able to appreciate the imagery mentioning the *acid of malevolence*. Some thought that dirt was literally being thrown at the dinner party. Literary devices were identified which was expected from better answers.
 - (c) As one candidate stated, *Horace is generally a nice guy* but though this was the general feeling better answers did consider Horace's nastier side. The bore/pest in Satire 1.9 was used as evidence here. Analysis here could have included discussion of the *smiling satirist*.
- A2**
- (a) Credit should go to centres for the thorough preparation of this text. The details required were drawn from the opening section of *Dinner with Trimalchio* and some detailed knowledge was expected. Many candidates were able to describe in detail the ball game but often forgot about the scene with the masseurs which happens before Trimalchio is carried to his home.
 - (b) Candidates responded in different ways to this question. Some approached it through the literary devices used and were able to mention the colour – red and green; the metals – gold and silver; the marble and all the detail of the mural – *painstaking and with descriptions underneath*. Another interpretation was how the description of the entrance is in effect a warning of what Trimalchio is going to be like. This was a good approach to the question provided that there was sufficient detail in support.
 - (c) Exaggeration is a common theme in satire and all candidates were able to appreciate the exaggeration (albeit frequently with incorrect spelling of the word) of the main character Trimalchio. Better answers were able to extend the argument to the food and entertainment and to analyse the reactions of the guests. Quite often the passage was ignored despite the instruction that it be used as a starting point or candidates needed more detail from the story as a whole.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- B3** This was a popular choice with a wide spectrum of candidates. Better answers kept to themes covered by Horace and many dealt carefully with Horace's likes and dislikes with some discussion by candidates. However quite frequently the idea of being a friend to Horace was overlooked. Juvenalian rants against Horace tended to lack both textual detail and in depth analysis. Candidates who tackle these questions must remember the need for specific reference to the texts together with discussion of a range of topics.
- B4** There were some very fine answers to this perennial theme. Candidates covered the idea of the novel and the satirical attacks on Nero's court with mature analysis. However there was a significant number of candidates who made little or no reference to elements of satire found in *Dinner with Trimalchio* as the question prompted. One answer did however respond:
'Dinner with Trimalchio has no moral (except perhaps never go out with someone who has their own private baths and a silver pissing bottle).'

2743 Roman Satire and Society 2

General Comments

The quality of answers in this unit was very good and candidates were able to respond to all questions. No question stood out as being more popular and the impression given was that candidates had been well prepared to tackle any of the authors set.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) The passage was taken from Satire 3 302-322 and so candidates were expected to draw on only some of the detail which has preceded the passage. Better answers kept to the *housing of the poor* rather than a complete summary of the previous three hundred lines.
 - (b) Nearly all candidates were able to appreciate the negativity of the language used citing words such as *street-apache*, *obsolete*, and contrasting phrases from when times were better – *how fortunate*, *how happy*. Surprisingly few pick up on the obvious literary techniques – repetition of *How* and the alliteration *shops stand silent*.
 - (c) Exaggeration is a common theme in satire and all candidates were able to appreciate the exaggeration and the picture Juvenal paints of Rome. Better answers were able to extend the argument to other references of life in Rome. Quite often the passage was ignored despite the instruction that it be used as a starting point.
- A2**
- (a) The natural feature was the source of the Clitumnus. A very limited amount of credit could be given to those who simply summarised the passage but those who gave detail *making reference to the letter as a whole* gained appropriate marks.
 - (b) In order to give candidates the opportunity to use more material the question was widened to include reference to other letters. As a result some candidates forget the instruction *using this letter as a starting point*. This was not a comparison of town and country but *how* Pliny makes the countryside appealing. Some discussion of literary devices was required and this could be expected from using the passage.
 - (c) Yet again this was not a comparison of town and country which some candidates supposed but asked for detail of what Pliny does in Rome (not Comum/Como). There was a range of detail – dinner parties, Macedo, Death of Martial – all used effectively by many candidates.
- B3**
- There were some fine answers on Juvenal's purpose in writing satire. Better answers included discussion of the *angry satirist* and considered Juvenal's style. Some discussion of Satire 1 where he specifically states his reasons for writing satire could have been expected although some fell into the trap of only making reference to Satire 3.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- B4** Many answers kept to the first half of the question and were able to discuss what we learn from Pliny about Roman society. Better answers addressed the second half where discussion of Pliny the man was required. Pliny's revision of his letters and subsequent publication is important and, as a few candidates appreciated, gives us the view that Pliny wanted us to see.

2744 Archaeology 1

General Comments

Clearly many centres are cultivating a great deal of enthusiasm and interest in this subject in their candidates. Many scripts radiated keenness for archaeology and particular sites. However, there was evidence of a growing tendency for random and incorrect allocation of sites to use as evidence, such as describing radiocarbon dating and then announcing that it was used to date the destruction of Pompeii, or using the salvage dig of central London's Gresham Street to back up discussion of crop marks in aerial photography. Maybe these candidates were hoping that they could fool the examiners. As ever, correct and relevant use of sites was rewarded with higher marks than generalised responses. There was an increase in use of *Time Team* episodes as sources of evidence this year. This programme was used, on the whole, effectively and relevantly. Coberly, Dinnington, Cirencester and Gresham Street were only some of the *Time Team* episodes utilised.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Most candidates were confident in identifying and attributing the objects, although there was a clear distinction in marks between those who were able to recall the description in the set text and those who were attempting to guess.
 - (b)** There were a worryingly large number of candidates who tried to answer this question by describing various forms of prospecting. Several wrote with confidence about aerial photography and field-walking. However, those that focused on excavation tended to use a wide range of appropriate techniques, such as the various forms of trenches and/or salvage work, and these answers gained the higher marks.
 - (c)** The majority of candidates were able to approach this question with a confident and convincing range of facts and ideas. There were some very interesting and enthusiastic accounts of excavation. As per usual, the answers that contained detailed discussion of what has been gained from specific digs, rather than rambling accounts of the uses of excavation with brief reference to actual sites, gained higher marks.
- A2**
- (a)** The majority of candidates were fully capable of identifying and describing the diagram and in producing a list of viable techniques. Some candidates relied on random guesswork.
 - (b)** As with its A1 counterpart, several candidates chose to describe various irrelevant techniques, such as various forms of excavation. This meant that few, if any, marks were given to these answers for this question. Higher marks were given to those that were able to describe and evaluate the different methods of prospecting with confidence and accuracy.

- (c) Some candidates did not identify suitable sites for use, and relied on misattributed examples, but the majority made use of relevant finds and surveys. The set text book was exploited by many and they were able to discuss various works. Most made extensive use of the geophysical survey work employed at Wroxeter and the information gained about the site. There were some centre's that referred to the 'University of Wroxeter', which was presumably meant to be a reference to the Archaeology Department of the University of Birmingham.
- B3** This question was slightly less popular than B4, although it did elicit some very strong responses. Most candidates were able to recall the major dating techniques and attribute them to actual artifacts and sites, such as the dendrochronological work carried out on the Gresham Street waterwheel. Several candidates announced with conviction that radiocarbon dating was more accurate and reliable than any other technique, purely, it seemed, on the basis that it was more 'sciencey' and modern than dendrochronology, typology or stratigraphic conventions. Fewer answers discussed palaeontology and geological dating than in previous years.
- B4** It would appear that this year's candidates have been off on lots of site seeing trips. The examiners were pleased and interested to read about candidates' opinions of sites and museums that they had seen. As ever, the stronger answers went beyond "what I saw on my day out" into an assessment of presentation and access. Sites discussed included Vindolanda, Caerleon, the City of London Mithraeum, Wroxeter, Athens' Parthenon, the Colosseum in Rome, Fishbourne and Pompeii. Several candidates chose to focus on non-site presentation, such as books, TV, journals and the Internet. Some candidates chose to make generalisations about how archaeologists *might* choose to present information without any particular reference to sites. These answers did not achieve the higher marks.

2745 Archaeology 2

General Comments

Once again, the evidence is that candidates are enjoying learning the material for this course. This period of pre-history is known primarily through archaeological evidence, and centres are clearly getting to grips with enthusing their candidates with the required knowledge and understanding.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) The vast majority of candidates were well able to identify the sites and give the required information. The possible causes for destruction were not always excessively precise, but most candidate gained high marks for this question.
 - (b) This question tended to be answered reasonably well, although sometimes the attribution of natural resources was random. Some answers had, for example, gold being mined at Mycenae itself, while others had the Mycenaean people traveling to India for it. Stronger answers knew what artifacts had been found and the provenance of the raw materials. Some answers focused more on 'unfortunate' more than 'fortunate' which did not always lead to a balanced answer. Some candidates could not discern which resources counted as 'natural' resulting in discussions about the easy availability of glass, secret cisterns and amphorae.
 - (c) This question produced some rather strong answers. Most went for either Mycenae or Pylos and discussed the usefulness of the finds made and the sites themselves. There were several unexpected choices – the Kas wreck and the houses of Akrotiri were not expected but often well-used and gaining high marks. Credit was given for any site, as long as the answer showed clear understanding of the finds and significance of the site.
- A2**
- (a) Most candidates were able to identify the location of the finds, but not all were able to cope well with the rest of the question. Several claimed that the snake symbolised snakes and that the women symbolised women without mentioning any theories that have been mentioned about these objects.
 - (b) Very few answers failed to identify the site in part (a), but some credit was given in (b) if they discussed a site other than Mycenae. The majority showed great understanding of the site and could use the *tholos* tombs to sound effect, as well as the grave circles and their goods.
 - (c) Although the word 'demons' is not used in the set text book, which uses the more specialist term of 'daimon', this did not cause any real concern to the candidates, who seemed to relish the chance to talk about this topic. There were many very interesting and well-informed mini-essays which discussed the available evidence for belief in the supernatural. Pleasingly, more answers made use of Linear B as a source of evidence than in previous years, and fewer relied on generalisations than on similar questions in the past.

- B3** Although 'economy and society' is a chapter heading in the set text book for this course, many candidates struggled to remain concise in this essay, preferring to interpret the word 'society' as meaning 'people'. The stronger answers tended to be those that focused on social structure and trade. Many candidates wheeled out a lengthy list of traded items and artifacts without attempting make much effort to analyse and evaluate. More credit was given to those answers that drew conclusions and showed understanding of the significance of the evidence.
- B4** Most answers provided the examiner with a fine explanation of the usefulness of art in teaching us about food and clothing, although some seemed to believe that the Mycenaean people lived on nothing more than saffron and monkey meat. Stronger answers were those that used actual works of art to back up their points. Most cited the 'Mistress of the Animals' scene and other evidence was utilised such as the Warrior Vase and the various inlaid daggers. Credit was given to any relevant examples and sensible analysis.

2746 Greek Comedy 1

General Comments

Many candidates showed an impressive understanding of the genre, with those who were able to provide ample evidence for their assertions gaining the most credit. Sadly, some clearly able candidates failed to realise the importance of detailed evidence to support an argument.

Question A1 was much more popular than A2, perhaps because part (a) of the latter demanded very precise recall. The Section B question on *Peace* found fewer takers than B4.

'Wierd' was second only to the perennial 'humourous' in this year's panoply of mis-spellings. The currency of modern Greece was perhaps the inspiration for 'Europides'.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Virtually all answers were able to name Euripides (in one form or another) as the source of the beggar's outfit. Lengthy descriptions of Dikaiopolis gaining access to the poet seemed unnecessary here. Relatively few candidates named the Acharnians as opposed to 'the Chorus', 'the Assembly' or even 'the audience'. Better answers were able to distinguish the rags as belonging to Telephus and to itemise some of his accessories.
 - (b)** The humorous nature of most of the passage was sensibly discussed by many candidates with 'sarcasm' and 'mockery' at the fore. As often, the translator's stage directions proved a useful prompt. But on the more serious content of lines 35-42, few did more than quote the lines as if their content was totally self-evident. Good answers interpreted the 'three cuckoos' remark and showed that the trip to Thrace was as an ambassador rather than a holidaymaker.
 - (c)** Most were able to argue, with varying degrees of sophistication, that Lamachus symbolised all that was wrong with the pro-war faction in Athens (at least from Aristophanes' viewpoint). Better answers contrasted his portrayal with that of Dikaiopolis. Those who gained high AO1 marks gave detailed evidence of the items demanded by the two characters before going off on their diverse engagements and of Lamachus' predicament on his return. Any mention of Lamachus' contribution to the humour and spectacle of the play gained AO2 credit. The most engaging claim came from the candidate who wrote that Dikaiopolis returned from the dinner with 'two dancing girls under each arm'. Lamachus was no match for that!
- A2**
- (a)** This question (as mentioned in the general comments above) demanded precise recall. However the Examiners felt that this was balanced by the relatively straightforward nature of parts (b) and (c). There were a few excellent answers that covered everything in the Mark Scheme but many found it difficult to distinguish between what Xanthias reported about Procleon's escape attempts and what was depicted on stage (for example, the escape under the donkey was often cited erroneously).
 - (b)** Candidates who discussed the idea of the humour of exaggeration and were able to apply this to specific items of the court scored heavily here. The examiners were particularly impressed by an attempt to establish a 'love-sick' motif exemplified by 'yearns', 'pines', fluttering dreams and 'doting on you'.

- (c)** This proved a straightforward question, with responses differentiated by how candidates provided an evaluation of the relative importance of the minor characters. On Xanthias, the major omission was his reporting of Procleon's misdeeds at and after the symposium. Much was made of the appearance and physical activities of the Chorus but only a minority recalled how its members, along with Procleon, were swayed by Anticleon's arguments. There were only a few references to the parabasis.
- B3** Some candidates were seduced here into lengthy narrative descriptions of Act 1 and then, through lack of energy or time, gained few AO1 marks from the details of Act 2. There were some very good answers that discussed Act 2 as the working-out of the 'great idea' via confrontation with the opposition and then celebration, in the tradition of Old Comedy.
- B4** Whilst all candidates could identify some actions of the protagonists they deemed to be mad or weird (Dikaiopolis' private peace brokered by a demigod being surprisingly rarely mentioned), only the better answers argued that these characters had their saner moments and/or (as one candidate put it) were operating 'madly but in a mad world'.

2747 Greek Art and Architecture 1

General Comments

Examiners continue to be delighted by the enthusiasm generated for the subject matter of this unit. The quality of personal response from candidates across the ability range was impressive. What serves to differentiate between candidates at this level is the ability to combine personal response with accurate knowledge of recognisable examples from pots or sanctuaries and/or temples. Candidates tended to be well-informed but were less adept at manipulating the information to answer the question set or use their skills to analyse material in a slightly different way.

A few more rubric errors crept in this year. Only a minority of candidates started their answers on a new page of the answer booklet, despite the reminders in the Instructions to Candidates and at the start of Section B. There was some evidence that candidates did not read questions carefully enough: some analysed Pot B rather than Pot A; some missed out part(s) of a question or ignored a key word or the command word within the question. Only two candidates answered both context questions and just one failed to offer an answer to two questions.

In line with other modules, examiners felt that the presentation of scripts was markedly worse than in past sessions. Handwriting was often difficult to read and spelling, particularly of technical words relevant to the unit, was generally weaker. There were many variations on column and colonnade (collum, coloom, columb, colonade, collonade, columbnade); hetaira(i) was invariably wrong; even Parthenon, Doric and Ionic caused problems.

Comments on Individual Questions

The Parthenon question meant that there was a much more even balance in the selection of the context questions, with about 50% of the candidature opting for each of the questions. Both questions produced answers which covered almost the whole mark range.

A1 **(a) Identification of the Pan Painter oinochoe**
There were no significant problems in identifying the painter, the type of pot and what it was used for. Few noted that the high handle enabled the handler to avoid putting his hands into the wine as the jug was dipped into the krater/dinos.

(b) Content and composition of the scene on Pot A
The myth behind the scene was either very well-known or not known at all. The spelling of the names was often surprisingly accurate. Whilst many candidates were able to describe what is depicted on the pot with some degree of precision, there was often some confusion about the sex of the three figures, and what each of the figures was doing.

Analysis of the composition was not as well handled as in previous years. Candidates should be able to look at a scene and discuss how a painter has combined the different elements of the scene and the dominant lines of the composition. Those candidates who handled this question well produced some very insightful comments, drawing out the meaning of the scene from the composition in sensitive terms, such as the way Oreithyia is separated from her father.

A few candidates answered using Pot B rather than Pot A as required by the question.

(c) Comparison between the two Pan Painter Pots

Pot B, depicting Perseus, Medusa and Athena, was often better known than the Boreas and Oreithyia pot. Here, too, candidates' knowledge of iconography was often insecure with Perseus variously identified as Hermes, Peleus and Theseus, and Perseus was thought to be carrying a baby in his bag. Although the comparisons offered were sometimes limited and sparse, candidates were much more confident about stating their preference and being able to offer sound reasons for their opinion. It was pleasing to read answers which recognised the contrasting moods in the two pots. Most candidates preferred the Perseus and Medusa hydria but those who preferred the oinochoe were more successful in finding a range of points on which to comment.

A2 (a) Identification of the Parthenon

The Parthenon was correctly identified by the vast majority of candidates. Its location, the architects and the marked areas were also well known. The temple was often identified as being dedicated to Athene Promachos, or Polias, or even Nike. It was sometimes identified as the temple of Zeus at Olympia.

(b) How typical is the Parthenon of the Doric order?

Almost everyone stated that the Parthenon was of the Doric order, although a few went on to talk exclusively about Ionic elements rather than highlight some of the typical Doric features first. The most common error concerned the siting of the Ionic frieze, which many thought was inside the naos/cella.

(c) The Parthenon 'was clearly intended to be the most magnificent temple in Greece.'

Almost everyone had an opinion to express in answer to this question, often in quite dramatic terms, but sometimes the supporting evidence was rather weak. The guidance for the question offered four separate areas for consideration but one or more was often forgotten or glossed over: size was invariably remembered; materials were often well discussed; refinements were often omitted or not fully understood. Location caused the most problems, with few able to offer more than 'it was on the Acropolis', and one candidate stating that 'the Acropolis at Athens was on the top of Mount Parnassos'.

Candidates tended to talk in hyperbolic terms about the wonders of the Parthenon, without realizing its innovation in comparative terms, for example, whilst it was remembered that the Parthenon was built in marble, few seemed to recognise that it was the first temple to be built completely of marble.

Examiners noted with some pleasure that there was a more or less equal division of candidates between the two essay questions. This indicates that more candidates are deciding to revise both topics to give themselves the opportunity of making an informed decision about which question to tackle in the examination room. Whilst the vase-painting essay generally produced a better level of personal response, the sanctuaries essay tended to benefit from school trips to the sites in question. Candidates who had visited the sites often found it easier to visualise the ancient sanctuary and comment on what made one more impressive than the other.

B3 'Painters portrayed the daily lives of women in a lively and vivid way.'

This question often produced 'lively' and vigorous, if not 'vivid', essays with some excellent personal response backed up with close reference to a range of pots from the filmstrip. Knowledge of the pots tended to be good to very good, with 6-8 pots used on average. There were, however, some exceptional essays which referred to more than twenty recognisable pots, in varying degrees of detail. Such responses showed a real

engagement with the material and were a pleasure to mark. There are still candidates who appear not to have seen the Women and Symposia filmstrip and struggled to find appropriate examples from Woodford, often employing mythological scenes to support their line of argument. As always there were essays which were too generalised in approach and did not mention a single specific scene from a pot.

There were two obvious errors in candidates' approach to this question:

1. Some chose to write at length on women's lives/roles in society rather than their depiction on pots. Such answers tended to make only passing references to pots.
2. While some commented on 'lively and vivid' throughout, others reserved the comment until the final paragraph. Candidates should be reminded to read the question carefully and keep it in mind throughout the essay.

Reactions to the scenes depicted on the pots were often individual with some coming to the conclusion that some depictions of women were men's fantasies. It was also felt that these depictions were not to be trusted because they were painted by men and as men were not allowed to go into the women's quarters, how could they possibly know what women got up to.

B4 What are the main differences and similarities between the sanctuaries at Olympia and at Delphi? Which do you think is more impressive?

Overall, examiners felt this was a well-rehearsed topic which enabled candidates to shine. Factually, candidates were surprisingly strong, with a good variety of buildings remembered and very little confusion between the sanctuaries. While most were able to structure the differences and similarities at least capably, some candidates took the opportunity to reel off everything they had been taught about the two sanctuaries. Those that looked beyond the obvious similarities and differences managed to come up with some subtle and insightful points and present a close comparison throughout their essays. There were, however, frequent omissions, especially of the theatre and stadium at Delphi, with a few even omitting the oracle. Treasuries were mentioned by almost all candidates but not always accurately. Most candidates assumed there were only 3 treasuries at Delphi (Siphnian, Sikyonian, Athenian). No candidates argued that at Delphi there were nearly double the number of treasuries compared with Olympia or that the Olympia treasuries were Dorian based – so no Athenian treasury, for example. A significant number of candidates struggled to apply their knowledge to the second part of the question about which sanctuary was the more impressive and the decision was often offered in a couple of sentences at the end of the essay, almost as an afterthought. The overwhelming majority voted in favour of Delphi because of the location, whilst a few opted for Olympia because of the games and the statue of Zeus.

2748 Roman Britain 1

General Comments

Candidates' performance varied widely with much work showing a high level of competence and knowledge of the appropriate texts, while a few scripts demonstrated signs of insufficient ability to meet the requirements of the tasks, indicating difficulty in understanding some material soundly enough to apply it appropriately and effectively to discussion.

By far the most popular combination of questions was A1 and B3. There were, unfortunately, still several rubric infringements where candidates attempted both context questions and some spent too long on parts (b) and (c) of the context and so were short of time for the essay question.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Very few candidates were able to identify Anglesey correctly. Britain was by far the most common response. Only the best were able to give specific details about how the Romans were taking advantage of the Britons or cite details from chapter 21 which went on to explain how Agricola Romanised the province.
 - (b) There was some lack of focus on the 'how' part of the question indicating weak lit. crit. skills, with the inclusion of some peripheral detail. Many repeated that the description was biased without analysing further.
 - (c) Some lost sight of military in their discussion of Agricola's talents or failed to discuss the given passage. However there were many examples of detailed and balanced arguments which included details from conquering the Ordoevices to the final battle of Mons Graupius.
- A2**
- (a) This question posed few problems though some technical terms were not recalled. However the general quality of response to the diagram question was much superior to previous years.
 - (b) A few responses showed a loss of focus on the diagram and even strayed into part (c). However the majority produced well analysed answers and effectively applied their understanding of the archaeology.
 - (c) This question posed few difficulties and was often very well answered though only the best considered how its function changed over time.
- B3** This question was mostly well handled with some educated political insight. Some essays were rather short on military detail and others on parallel comparison. Some tended to make statements which, although factually accurate, were not always related to relevant discussion. There were, however, many highly competent responses.
- B4** This question attracted less interest but there were several outstanding responses which demonstrated a mature and detailed understanding of all parts of this question. Some fell short through dwelling at length on the reasons and causes of the revolt without relating these to the chances of success or failure, e.g. Prasutagus' will, the ill-treatment of the family, Roman injustice towards the Britons. Better answers considered the changing chance of success during the course of the revolt and Roman tactical superiority.

2749 Greek and Roman Epic

General Comments

Candidates generally acquitted themselves competently on a paper which gave all abilities enough scope to show their knowledge of the texts and their ability, at whatever level, to examine texts closely and to compare and contrast themes and issues in the two epics.

There was some improvement in the ability of candidates to tackle the context (a) question with succinct and relevant AO1. It was nevertheless disappointing, given the stress on this issue in both in-service training and examiner reports, to find whole centres where the demands of the question, to give the salient AO1 of a maximum of 200 lines, had obviously not been properly understood and practised. Similarly, in the context (b) questions, there were, despite some perceptive and thorough responses, many in the middle and lower ranges who did not seem to grasp the appropriate techniques for either stylistic analysis or comparison moving from within the passage to other parts of the text.

The ever popular Cyclops drew many to attempt context A1; although A2 still had its adherents, some had obviously not looked ahead to the (c) question and dealt only superficially with it. B3 and B4 each attracted many whilst B5 was often attempted by the (justifiably) extremely confident or by those who hoped to bluff their way through with minimal reference to the texts.

Spelling of names appeared to have improved in general but the same chestnuts reappeared, especially *Ithica*, *Posiedon* and *Aenied*. The comma to replace the full stop seemed slightly less ubiquitous than in some years; possessive punctuation after '*Cyclops*' often involved the usual '*Cyclop*'s'.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1 (a) This and A2(a), as ever, required a detailed summary of the events recently preceding the passage, usually about 200 lines, ending at the point the passage begins. There were still many candidates with an obviously detailed textual knowledge who at best wasted valuable time and at worst gained lower marks than they might have done because they did not observe the correct parameters and included the Cicones and Lotus Eaters in detail.

For this passage, there was no need to go back further than the approach of Odysseus and his twelve men to the Cyclops' cave. Despite the fact that this narrative is so well known to candidates (or, perhaps, because of it) what could, and should, have been fine answers were marred by an excessive focus on one section, usually the events of the inebriating and blinding of the Cyclops. Many omitted, or dealt cursorily with, events between the approach to the cave and the sharpening of the stake. Many could have raised their marks by more precise detail, e.g., Odysseus taking twelve men (rather than '*some*' men), the Cyclops eating two men at a time (rather than '*some*' men).

(b) This familiar question format required candidates to quickly identify the different phases of Aeneas' behaviour in the passage, with appropriate direct references to the text, in order to establish a firm foundation from which to broaden into comparison and contrast with Books 10 to 12. The main aspects of the hero's behaviour in the passage were his attempt to deter Lausus from fighting, his

overwhelming anger and the brutality of the killing, and his remorse and identification with Lausus' *pietas* towards Mezentius afterwards. A surprising number either ignored the first two lines, mistakenly attributed them to Lausus. Candidates also commonly thought his efforts to deter the youth from fighting were, in fact, taunts which they then compared to his taunting of Mezentius and Turnus in the later books. Although many did see Aeneas' anger, many ignored it (perhaps because '*the leader*' did not alert them as much as '*Aeneas*' would have done). Surprisingly, few of the candidates picked out the violence of the killing: '*drove*', '*burying it to the hilt*', and '*straight through*'. The best candidates saw all these and selected short and apt AO1 to illustrate their points.

Comparisons of the above with Books 10-12 varied in depth. The most thorough selected apt incidents as parallel or contrasting behaviour from Aeneas; some, however, focussed only on the pursuit and killing of Turnus and/or ignored evidence of Aeneas' desire **not** to fight. It is always essential to keep a focus on the question asked, to examine both sides and to reach a clearly stated conclusion. Given the short time allowed for this section, the premium is on concise but detailed use of text and argument.

- (c) There were some fine responses to this question from those who noted and kept to the key words, '*physical violence*', examined and contrasted both passages in this light, extended to the rest of the epics with continuing comparisons and contrasts and reached a clearly stated conclusion. Most saw the contrast in the passages between Odysseus' violence towards the mythical Cyclops in order to escape and Aeneas' chosen *furor* towards Lausus in a human war situation. Differentiation here came in the precision of the references to the passages and the depth and range of the comparison. Subtler candidates questioned Odysseus' violence to a drunk and sleeping monster, usually concluding that his trapped situation justified it; similarly the brutality of Aeneas' killing drew either criticism or understanding. References outside the passages needed to be well selected to offer both width in range and detail in presentation, using frequent comparisons between the epics. The Suitors and the killing of Turnus were essential, with broader answers seeing also the punishing of Melanthius and the maids and the harsh reality and personal tragedy of the Trojan and Italian war. Some over-elaborated and thereby reduced the amount of time they could spend on the essay. The general consensus was that the *Odyssey's* violence was often mythical, one-sided or unrealistic whereas the *Aeneid* showed human courage, *furor* and personal tragedy in its depiction of physical violence.

- A2 (a) There were some well-selected and detailed answers from those who knew the text. The less secure missed the detail of the conversation between Dido and Anna and/or that between Juno and Venus. Dido's reactions to her love after talking to Anna were the most commonly omitted episode. The second half of the mark scheme was generally known and differentiation arose from the level of detail given. Most common misconceptions were that Juno originally caused Dido's love for Aeneas and that Venus was present in the cave; Iarbas' relationship to Jupiter was often missed.
- (b) This classic stylistic analysis question drew responses pitched at all levels of the mark scale. The basic requirements of such questions are to use the text in detail, preferably in the order of the passage and to use specific stylistic terms to explain why the passage creates a vivid effect. Most identified the initial isolation of Odysseus and the foreboding created by vocabulary of darkness. The speed of the storm when it comes was well illustrated; better candidates

isolated and quoted specific words rather than reproducing a run of several lines from which the examiner is expected to pick out relevant words. There were apt comments on the violence and pathos of the helmsman's death; although many saw the simile here and the one following later in the passage, fewer actually explained how and why each created a vivid picture. Vocabulary creating sensory appeal was usually spotted; again, not all explained how these made the passage vivid. The final struggles of Odysseus to survive drew comment; those using Rieu's version often commented well on the hero becoming, '... *the sport of the furious winds*'.

- (c) This question required a mini-essay, starting with each passage and moving on to the rest of the epics. Some were superficial in their reference to the passages and missed the chance to compare and contrast the deities' actions before broadening out the answer. It was very evident that some, who had chosen A2 before thinking through the demands of (c), found themselves struggling to include wider detail of the gods. Others had obviously revised these gods specifically and were able to produce material from the whole span of each epic, presented concisely with apt comparison en route. Noting all the material from the *Odyssey* followed by all the material from the *Aeneid*, with a final paragraph of comparison is unlikely to gain more than a mid-range mark at the highest. Constant apt synopticity gains most marks. Given the passage used, Zeus was usually seen as the upholder of justice, acting on behalf of other gods whereas Jupiter was seen as the mouthpiece and promoter of the demands of destiny. There was a pleasing range of interpretations ranging from those who thought that Zeus was much more active than Jupiter to those who thought the latter dominated events in the *Aeneid* whereas Zeus was always at the mercy of lesser deities doing their own thing - the *Aeneid*, with Venus and Juno also met with the same view.

B3 Those who knew (or thought they knew) their heroes will have sighed with relief on seeing this question. The structure and depth of answers, however, varied greatly, usually arising from the analysis of the word, '*tested*'. Superior candidates categorized types of testing: physical, mental and emotional involving the hero's own situation, his links with his family, his travels, his relationship with his men, his personal responses to difficulties and so on. As always, the best synopticity came from those who made comparisons as they went along and reached a conclusion at the end (rather than stating one right at the beginning - never advisable). Conclusions did vary: supporters of Odysseus cited his eventual isolation on his travels, his lack of divine assistance in periods of his journeying, his unreliable crew members and the greater perceived challenges with which he was faced in the Cyclops, Scylla and Charybdis, Calypso and Circe et. al. They compared this with Aeneas who had a clearly outlined destiny, much divine help and a son who accompanied him all the way through. Aeneas, on the other hand, was appreciated by those who saw his personal isolation in a destiny unchosen, its demands on his personal life especially in leaving Dido, his loss of home, comrades and family members and the turmoil of an undesired Italian war with its *furor* and frustration. They argued that Odysseus used his superhuman cunning and strength to get himself out of situations often of his own making, had divine help when needed especially in his unrealistic defeat of the Suitors against ridiculous odds and was so classic a hero that his tests were an enhancement of his heroism rather than a burden.

B4 Many candidates opted for this question, feeling, often rightly, that family was so fundamental to both epics that material and arguments would come easily. Some, however, tended just to throw down apt AO1 in any order for the *Odyssey* then the *Aeneid* and then give the impression that they felt their work was done. As with B3 the best essays were from those who compared epics as the essay proceeded and saw beneath the detail to the issues fundamental to each epic, *nostos* and *xenia*/justice

in the *Odyssey* and *pietas* in the *Aeneid*, the latter being, most surprisingly, often omitted. AO1 was easily identified but not always offered with the precision and detail required for the higher grades; for both epics, material outside the hero's family was less frequently identified. More often the *Aeneid* was felt to emphasize family values because of the link between the hero's *pietas* and his dynastic destiny. Those who missed this link often opted for the *Odyssey*, despite Odysseus' dalliances on his journey, citing his refusal of immortality from Calypso and marriage to Nausicaa from Alcinous as proof of his ultimate attachment to his *oikos*. Mere lists of material from the epics, however extensive, will not reach the required AO2 demands.

- B5** This question, as usual, allowed for a wide scope of response, requiring text detail and comparison along with a clearly constructed argument. A number of candidates fell into the trap of making sweeping (and sometimes eloquent) statements of comparison with minimal textual proof, an approach not recommended for high achievement. The best responses categorized various aspects of each epic and compared/contrasted with the other epic as they went along. Opinions were divided between those who with apt text reference saw the *Odyssey* with its adventures, monsters, enchanting goddesses and black and white morality as a 'ripping yarn', appealing to all times and cultures and those who preferred the more grey tinted, morally confusing world of a Trojan hero forced into a life involving loss, warfare and a world view extending through the ages to the Roman empire, a world felt to be more akin to our own than that of the *Odyssey*. *Odyssey* supporters tended to see the *Aeneid* as too long, too complex and too boring with (apart from Dido) unappealing characters and long catalogues, especially in the war books. *Aeneid* supporters saw in the *Odyssey* a simplistic children's story with an unrealistic Superman hero and a long drawn out second half.

2750 Greek and Roman Historians

General Comments

This year the paper was generally well-handled by the majority of candidates. They seemed to have enjoyed reading about the exploits of Nero, as seen by Tacitus and Suetonius. It was felt that more enthusiasm was shown than in previous years for the military aspects of the Persian and Peloponnesian wars as well as the descriptions of conquest and conflict in Tacitus' account. A pleasing number of candidates seemed to have been reading around the subject. The *Agricola* was mentioned when discussing Tacitus and there was evidence of candidates knowing books from Herodotus and Thucydides other than the set books. It is worth reminding candidates, in the light of a few scripts, that the film *300* does not count as a primary source for the Persian war. Also the comparison between Suetonius and *The Sun* newspaper occurred frequently. This may be a useful comparison in some contexts, but candidates are tending towards using it as a clichéd generalization.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) The majority of answers were more than up to the challenge of providing the requisite amount of detail to answer this question. However, there were some candidates who became confused as to which author wrote which details and so, managed to throw in details from Tacitus rather than Suetonius as requested.
 - (b) There was a lot of solid and valid analysis of the passage, although some candidates limited themselves to a description of the content at the expense of looking at the style of writing. The stronger answers showed that they knew in detail how this section fitted into Xerxes' campaign and were able to show how typical, or not, his character is here.
 - (c) Despite some answers not being certain on how to define 'villain', there were some very interesting and rewarding answers presented here in response to this question. Most found it hard to decide between the two, although the general feeling was that Nero was less plausible as a villain than Xerxes, as Xerxes seemed to be more developed as a character. Stronger answers were those that made a solid attempt to compare the two authors in detail, rather than relying on a brief character summary of the two men.
- A2**
- (a) Many candidates knew how to handle this question, although a few were not focused on it, relying instead on a brief summary of the first 75 sections of Thucydides. This question required a more detailed answer than that.
 - (b) There was a lot of strong response to this question from candidates who clearly had been prepared in how to answer to this kind of literary critical task. As with its A1b counterpart, however, there were some candidates who managed to focus on the content without going deeply into the psychology of the characters involved.

- (c)** Although most candidates managed to make a sensible account of the role of speeches in each author, there was a worrying trend towards writing a generalised account on the reliability of each writer. The stronger answers were those that focused tightly on a comparison of the two rather than a brief list of speeches in each.
- B3** Compared to the others, this essay was less popular but tended to be well-answered. Stronger responses were those that provided the examiner with detailed accounts of actual conflicts, rather than sweeping generalisations and vagaries. Candidates tended to be more confident in describing Thucydides than Tacitus, when it came to discussion of actual battle and military policies.
- B4** There was a concerning amount of candidates who seemed to interpret the question as being 'Which author is more fun to read?' Some interpreted it as 'Which author uses digressions more in his work?' Credit was given to answers that discussed narrative techniques and characterisation in detail, without presenting the examiner with a list of exciting stories from the works. Stronger answers tended to be those that focused on the stories that each author included in his work, and analysed the use and effectiveness of each.
- B5** This was, undoubtedly, the more popular of the essay question. It was evident that the general winner was Suetonius, although the examiners were pleased to see that Thucydides was a clear victor in several cases. There were some answers that championed a particular author without giving much evidence or reasoning as to why that author was particularly interesting. As per usual, more credit was given to answers that demonstrated detailed knowledge of the works rather than relying on generalisations.

2751 Greek Tragedy 3

General Comments

The overall performance of candidates was slightly better than in previous years. The marks ranged from 94 down to 16, with the majority of candidates scoring between 50-70. Although there were fewer very weak performances, there were also significantly fewer sustained outstanding performances at the top end of the mark range.

The vast majority of candidates had a good working knowledge of the six plays and were able to communicate this on paper. In particular, their knowledge and understanding of the *Agamemnon* seemed far better than in previous sessions. It was common for candidates to round off their answers with a synoptic comment, ranging from a single sentence to a brief paragraph, rather than incorporating it throughout their argument. Such answers cannot score high AO2 marks.

Examiners were divided on whether spelling was any better or worse than usual (though some words continue to cause some difficulties – Euripedes, Pheadra, Thesius, alot, thrown, infact, where as, and numerous variations of phrophit, profit etc.). They were in agreement, however, about the standard of punctuation and sentence structure, which were both more of a problem this year. More candidates are trying to use Greek words as English verbs:

- 'Clytemnestra commits *oikos*.'
- 'Medea behaves in this way towards Jason so that she can *kleos*.'

Only a handful of candidates experienced problems with timing and failed to finish the paper. Few rubric errors were noted (one candidate answered on the wrong passage for A1(b) and two candidates answered both contexts) beyond failing to start answers on a new page of the answer booklet and to number questions clearly.

Comments on Individual Questions

The context question on *Oedipus* and *Hippolytus* (answered by approximately two thirds of the candidature) was significantly more popular than the context on *Agamemnon* and *Medea*. There was, however, no disparity in candidates' achievement on these questions. There was also a better understanding of what should be included in the 'setting the scene' part of the context questions – most were able to judge this well. By contrast, the (b) questions were generally not well-answered, as in 2007, as many answers took the form of commentaries on the passages, and lacked real analysis.

A1 (a) Explain the circumstances which led to the confrontation between Oedipus and Creon.

This was mostly well-answered, with many candidates achieving a good range of detail. Few mentioned that Tiresias was summoned on Creon's advice or could home in on the immediate context of the passage. Some candidates told the whole story of Oedipus and all the related background mythology.

(b) How does Euripides make the passage from *Hippolytus* dramatically effective?

Surprisingly, candidates did not do as well with this question as one might have expected. The passages were used well and there was a good deal of quotation of individual words or lines. What tended to be missing from these answers was analysis or discussion of the effect of the selected quotations. Many answers also focussed on the content of the passage rather than style and Euripides' use of Language.

(c) Who is more justified in his opinion, Oedipus or Theseus?

Most candidates were very thorough on Hippolytus, discussing Theseus' justifications in some detail, although few mentioned that Hippolytus was unable to produce a defense due to his oath, or that one element of Theseus' evidence was Phaedra's dead body, present on stage throughout this encounter. Better answers mentioned Artemis' appearance at the end of the play, stating that she explains Aphrodite's involvement and that Theseus could not have changed the outcome, thereby exonerating Theseus from any guilt. Hippolytus' forgiveness of his father also merited some mention.

In general, candidates had more to say on Theseus and struggled to find a range of points concerned with Oedipus' opinions. Better answers looked at Creon's behaviour at the end of the play to add to their analysis of whether Oedipus' assessment of Creon's character was justified or not. Some argued that Creon was very forgiving of Oedipus and this showed that Oedipus was wrong in his condemnation of Creon as an enemy; others argued that Creon seized the throne with alacrity at the end and that this shows that Oedipus' suspicion that Creon wanted power has some basis in fact. Few considered the personality of Creon and how that contributed to the injustice of the accusations.

One candidate discussed Hippolytus and Creon.

A2 (a) Explain the circumstances which led up to the messenger speech in *Medea*.

This was generally well-answered. Most candidates seemed to know the play very well and were able to offer some appropriate detail. Some went into too much detail, giving the background of the Golden Fleece and the daughters of Pelias, but often leaving out the encounter between Jason and Medea. Better answers recalled the fact that Medea sent her children to deliver the presents to Glauce.

(b) Comparison of Clytemnestra's portrayal in the passage and elsewhere in the play.

Many candidates concentrated on analysing Clytemnestra's behaviour in the passage without comparing/contrasting it to elsewhere in the play. Few commented on the fact that this is the first time Clytemnestra is able to speak openly of her true feelings. Some candidates offered an analysis of the passage rather than answering the question posed.

(c) Does Aeschylus or Euripides describe death more vividly?

There was some serious and worthy discussion of the deaths in the extracts from the plays but it was only the stronger answers which went beyond the passages. Most candidates concentrated on the deaths of Agamemnon and Glauce as detailed in the passages without looking at the other details or deaths in the plays. Very few candidates commented on the details on Cassandra's death (most said that the death of Cassandra was not mentioned at all) or the death of Iphigenia. More managed to comment on the deaths in *Medea* of Creon and the children. Many said that the death of the children was not at all effective as it was not visually described; the effect of hearing their screams offstage was often dismissed.

Examiners were generally impressed by the knowledge of the plays shown by candidates. Relevant material was often cited in some detail, and there was little evidence this year of candidates inventing their own storylines. However, the essays were generally lacking in depth of argument and synopticity. Those who planned their essays often fared better than those who did not. Many candidates are still not offering a conclusion or coming down on one side of an argument at the end of their essays.

B3 'Pride comes before a fall.' Is this statement better applied to Agamemnon or Pentheus?

This was a relatively popular question, with about a third of the candidature offering a response to this topic. Candidates who chose to answer this question knew the main details relevant to the question, though this often led them into retelling the stories of the two characters rather than analysing the idea of pride and how this contributed to the falls of Agamemnon and Pentheus. Candidates tended to write with greater authority on Agamemnon, though not always citing appropriate detail.

There were several common mistakes in candidates' approach to this question: some discussed the theme of pride within the two plays instead of in relation to Agamemnon and Pentheus, leading candidates to focus on Clytemnestra and Dionysus; some changed the focus of the question, moving from a discussion of pride to a discussion of who deserved their fate/downfall more; others went off the topic completely to discuss which was the more tragic play.

Examiners were surprised to read that many candidates felt that the most upsetting/sad thing about Pentheus' death was not the manner of his death at his mother's hands, but the fact that he died wearing women's clothing.

B4 'Hysterical and vindictive.' Is this a better description of Electra or Phaedra?

This was not a popular question; but for those candidates who did choose it, it often proved to be a good choice. They were able to break down the quotation and structure their essay accordingly, enabling them to write a decent essay. Weaker responses were unsure of the meanings of 'hysterical' and 'vindictive', and tried to tie them together rather than deal with them as separate issues. Thus, the way Phaedra appears on stage towards the beginning of *Hippolytus* was thought to be more indicative of her hysterical and vindictive behaviour, than her words and actions later in the play. Not all candidates securely connected their arguments to evidence, but in general a pleasingly wide range of information was displayed. Surprisingly few mentioned Electra's cries of '*strike her again*' (while Orestes was killing Clytemnestra) as a sign of her vindictiveness.

B5 Which playwright deals most effectively with the theme of hatred?

This was by far the most popular of the three essays but elicited the least strong responses. There were very few very good answers, with many approaching it in a simplistic way. Whilst candidates were able to gain good AO1 marks by offering a range of appropriate details from the texts, most resorted to long lists of who hated whom and why, or by recording all the deaths in the plays and saying these were caused by hatred. This meant that there was little or no synoptic argument, and resulted in lower AO2 marks. Some tried to cover all six plays which meant that the essays were rather superficial, lacking depth of discussion and detail from the plays. Examiners felt that *Oedipus the King*, about which candidates wrote at great length, was usually not a good choice for the majority of candidates.

2752 Roman Satire and Society 3

General Comments

Candidates were well prepared and this year it was clear that candidates had a wider range of material on which to draw. Only one candidate this year felt that Pliny was a satirist!

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Candidates were asked for details about Lucilius. The passage was drawn from Satire 1.10 and it was acknowledged that there is some repetition from Satire 1.4 as Horace is answering his critics. A limited amount of credit was given to details offered from 1.4.
 - (b) This question was answered well with plenty of references to literary techniques even at the lowest level. The differentiation was determined on how the references were analysed. The simile (often spelled incorrectly) was identified *like a herd of pigs in a panic*; candidates also appreciated the effect of *writer's itch*; *sick obsession* and the mock epic reference *to ploughing a dusty furrow*. The lines at the top of the following page were not ignored as many referred to *Rejoice*.
 - (c) In this paper a level of synopticity is expected although with such differing styles and authors it is recognised that this can be difficult to achieve. The question here was the basic *angry satirist* versus the *smiling satirist*. Candidates needed to guard against general responses with focus on the part of the question- *author's approach to satire-* and *use both passages as a starting point*.
- A2**
- (a) A few candidates offered no response to this question. Those who did were not thrown by being asked to continue with what is said of Aristo after the passage.
 - (b) Most agreed that the events were *absolutely sickening*. The topic of death along with references to the shroud and nard were felt unsuitable for a dinner party. Many felt that disgusting drunkenness had something to do with the proceedings. A few candidates thought that Encolpius should have known by now what Trimalchio was like as plenty of previous escapades had also been in similar bad taste.
 - (c) Many answers kept focus on Trimalchio and used the passage as a starting point. Some talked of Pliny and his good deeds such as the statue in Corinthian bronze and the school teacher. Better answers picked up on the fact that Pliny tells us about others such as Aristo and could give further examples. Some felt that Pliny only writes about Aristo because he wants to give a good impression of himself. More candidates this year appreciated that Pliny did revise his letters for publication.
- B3** *The virtues of plain living* is a common theme in literature. Answers were good with a wide range of examples offered. Some comment could have been made that Horace is writing satire and Pliny is not and there should be some balance in the argument.

- B4** Another familiar topic in satire. Most felt that life for freedmen and clients was portrayed as harsher in Juvenal. It was expected that Satire 5 would be discussed with the poor treatment of Trebius. There were also passing references in Juvenal Satire 1 and 3. In *Dinner with Trimalchio* the section with the freedmen should have been discussed and care was needed to prevent the focus of the argument drifting into a discussion of slaves.
- B5** This type of question should be familiar to candidates and it was clear that many centres had discussed modern satirical equivalents. Television programmes discussed included: Mock the Week; Have I got News for you; South Park; Headcases. Some centres still have access to Spitting Image programmes. Suggested presenters of any supposed television programmes ranged from Dan Cruickshank to Stephen Fry. Some answers tended to be carried along on discussion of the production side of the programmes but the main thrust of the answer should have been the content – themes such as dinner parties, patronage. Reference to the satirical authors set for this paper was expected from good answers.

2753 Archaeology 3

General Comments

This year, answers seemed, in general, to be more confident in identifying the pictures shown on the paper, although there was a worrying trend, in some cases, to ignore the first 10 mark question entirely and go straight onto the others. It is worth reminding candidates that they should, at least, attempt it. Several candidates showed much knowledge and understanding in other questions, only to score 0/10 for a non-existent A1a or A2a. There were also a large number of candidates who started with the Section B essay. Although this approach was successful in many cases, some candidates found that they wrote a very impressive essay, but then did not have time to answer Section A in appropriate detail, leading to some seriously unbalanced papers. However, in general, it was felt by the examiners that successful teaching was encouraging candidates to feel much enthusiasm for and interest in the Greek Bronze Age and its archaeology.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Most candidates responded well to the question, and it was only a very few that could not recognise the provenance of the object depicted. Most answers regurgitated the caption from the book, although a pleasing number demonstrated alternative explanations for the depictions. The animal at the bottom was variously interpreted as possibly being a deer, a lion, a dog, etc. These were credited although hippopotamus was not accepted, as the animal depicted is yellow.
 - (b)** Most candidates started by describing this picture then moving onto a comparison to other frescoes such as the Saffron gatherers and artifacts such as the Great Goddess ring. Weaker responses were those that tended only to describe the picture or to trot out a preconceived essay plan on Mycenaean religion.
 - (c)** Although most answers focused successfully on Mycenaean art, the examiners were pleased to see images from Pompeii and Romano-British mosaics, among others, being brought in for discussion. Evidence from field trips was used, as was discussion of several pictures with which the candidates were familiar. As ever, higher marks were given to answers that could demonstrate confidence with discussing actual artifacts.
- A2**
- (a)** The vast majority were able to identify this site with ease, with only a very few candidates misidentifying it as Mycenae. Most knew the appropriate amount of detail. Those who misidentified the site were given some credit in (b), allowing for consequential error.
 - (b)** Several candidates decided to answer this question by writing about buildings in general. Higher scores were gained by those that wrote about the finds at Pylos and the layout of the building which helps us to piece together potential layouts for other sites.

- (c) Fewer candidates championed Homer as major primary source here than in previous years, although many successfully used him, while showing awareness of the limitations in such evidence. Linear B was described in great detail by many candidates. Several answers showed sufficient familiarity to be able to draw specific ideograms and pictograms. In general, this question was confidently answered.
- B3** Although not the most popular question, this elicited some very strong personal responses. Most were indignant that Tiryns had been dismissed in such a cavalier fashion and were very eager to extol its usefulness to archaeologists. In the end, most candidates came to the conclusion that Mycenae was useful. The question achieved its desired function by allowing candidates to demonstrate synoptic knowledge and to express opinions.
- B4** The most popular choice, this question saw a wide range of answers. Although many, successfully, dealt only with the Mycenaean world, a number brought in discussion of other sites such as Pompeii and Romano-British graves. Although it was inappropriate to discuss dating techniques at Pompeii, they were usefully discussed in reference to other sites. This question allowed candidates to show that they had learnt and understood much about archaeology from the Mycenaean case study.
- B5** This relatively unpopular question allowed candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the Mycenaean period. Although most responses focused on this period, others successfully made use of the Minoans, the twilight of the Roman occupation of Britain and the end of the Roman empire. As ever, credit was given for knowledge and understanding of archaeological techniques and their use in interpreting the Classical world.

2754 Greek Comedy 2

General Comments

Although there were relatively few outstanding papers this session, most candidates showed a sound knowledge of the material. However, as in previous years, some answers made such tangential references to the actual details of the plays that AO1 marks were hard to award. There were more attempts at A1 than A2 and, in Section B, as is usual when this kind of question occurs, B4 attracted a minority of responses that were either excellent or weak. In Section A, both (a) questions demanded precise detail from a limited scenario; most candidates found this difficult.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a)** Most candidates were able to explain at least the concept of a sex strike leading to peace talks and to mention the unsatisfactory nature of unresponsive sex. There were very few references to Lampito's example of Menelaus and Helen or to the 'sex toy' solution.
- (b)** Candidates often made reference here to how humorous the original Athenian audience would have found this scene, sometimes with the added bonus of a digression on the gender distribution of the audience. However, the question specifically asks for the candidate's own view. Most answers successfully identified the stereotyping of women as sexual obsessives (although few mentioned the reference to drink in lines 15-16) and made something of how their earnest commitments to peace do not survive Lysistrata's revelation. The 'Big Red One' attracted little comment, although one candidate (no doubt to Aristophanes' delight) informed us that this is the name of her local bus company! There has always been a tendency for candidates, being asked to evaluate the humour of a passage, to be reluctant to contend that there are any lapses. The Mark Scheme suggests that here the first nine lines of the passage fail to raise a smile. Candidates are urged to try for some sort of balance in 'how humorous' questions: there are AO2 marks on offer for a personal response (see, for example, the Band 2 descriptor) even if the Examiners do not concur with the opinion.
- (c)** Some were unable to rein in the temptation to unload the prepared character sketch of Lysistrata and leave it at that. But better answers pointed out that other (named) women shared her resolute nature to some extent (Lampito, Myrrhine in her seduction scene and Stratyllis), as well as cataloguing the weaknesses of the escapees from the Acropolis and of Calonice and Myrrhine in the passage as contrasts.
- A2**
- (a)** The answers here were in general less detailed than in the equivalent A1(a). In particular there were few references to Gorgias' criticisms of Sostratos.
- (b)** However this lack of detail in A2(a) was balanced by the invitation to recount Knemon's characteristics and lifestyle. AO1 marks were relatively easy to gain here, although few referred to Sostratos' more positive manner in the betrothal scene at the end of the play. It proved more difficult to categorise Sostratos' personality: some contented themselves with saying he was madly in love.

(c) Particularly impressive were those candidates who argued along the lines that Gorgias was a mere catalyst for action whereas Knemon and Sostratos were 'personalities' – interesting and thus more important. Few had anything to say about Gorgias' moralising function. The two candidates who devoted the bulk of their answers to Getas and Sikon were, it is suspected, tweaking a prepared answer rather than asserting a deeply-held conviction.

B3 There were some very thoughtful answers to this question. Most candidates successfully identified the two areas of Praxagora's plans that are seen to be contentious – the sex laws and the handing-in of private property – and, prompted by the questions raised by Blepyrus and Chremes, went on to discuss the improbability of the success of other aspects.

Differentiation here came largely from the amount of detail given of the communistic proposals and the happy ending. It was encouraging to read a fair number of answers that cited the traditional *komos* ending of an Aristophanes play and argued that this proved an awkward fit with the 'failure' scenes that preceded it.

B4 Sadly, a sizeable minority of candidates were determined to redefine this question as 'can television put on modern productions of these plays'. They were able to pick up some AO1 marks but, as they were conspicuously not addressing the question (see Band 5 descriptor) AO2 marks were inevitably low.

Of the rest, most identified aspects of the writers' styles (with widely differing degrees of illustrative detail, too often excessively skimpy) and discussed their appropriateness for television audiences. The political nature of Aristophanes' work was usually overlooked. There was a perhaps surprising consensus that Aristophanes would be too rude for television, an observation not supported by the examiners' research into the more *recherche* regions of the digital spectrum.

One candidate, having energetically discussed Aristophanes' penchant for the obscene, for attacks on contemporary figures and for spectacle, rather bafflingly claimed that he would most comfortably fit the writing teams for *Friends* and *Last of the Summer Wine*. Are we missing something?

2755 Greek Art and Architecture 2

General Comments

Examiners were particularly struck by the enthusiasm of candidates this year. They had obviously enjoyed their study of Greek sculpture and knew a wide range of particular examples, although their answers were often expressed in very idiosyncratic or colloquial English.

The overall performance was very much in line with the performance of last year's candidates. The paper produced good differentiation between candidates, though there were fewer outstanding scripts and fewer very weak scripts than in previous sessions. A pleasing number of candidates showed the ability to think about the visual material creatively, producing their own observations but keeping within the discipline of Classical art history and of what is relevant. The majority of candidates knew the relevant pages of Woodford, in varying degrees of detail, and were acquainted with a range of technical terms. Some could obviously apply this knowledge in an acceptable fashion, but often without giving much sense of direct personal observation. Use of technical terms proved more of a challenge, with many not knowing or understanding how to use them correctly. Terms concerning drapery were often misused – catenary folds, motion lines and modelling lines were all used indiscriminately for the horizontal, parallel folds on the skirt of the Delphic Charioteer's chiton.

After the more balanced approach to the two areas of the subject matter for this unit in last year's scripts, it was disappointing to find that more than 90% of candidates answered A2 and B3 on free-standing sculpture. It is difficult to understand the reasons for this. Candidates tackling architectural sculpture often produce more analytical responses and a better quality of argument.

Timing is still an issue for many candidates. Often the essay got short shrift after a candidate spent too long on individual parts of the context question. It was common for either (b) or (c) to be longer than the essay. Several candidates opted to tackle the essay first and this proved to be a successful tactic for them.

There was a marked deterioration in the overall presentation of scripts this year. Perhaps this is to be expected when candidates routinely offer 16+ sides in answer to this paper. It does mean, however, that there were more scripts which were difficult to read because of poor legibility. Apart from failing to start answers on a new sheet of the answer booklet, there were very few rubric errors noted this year.

Spelling of technical words seemed much the same as last year, with only words concerning drapery giving more problems than usual: 'pelops' for peplos, and 'centenary', 'catenary', 'cartainery' 'catatonic' for catenary folds. Fairly common English words still pose a problem. In addition to the usual suspects (such as verticle, horizontale. geyometric etc.), there were words such as stomache, abdominal, atomy, vien and variety of muscles - mussels, muscels.

Comments on Individual Questions

A1 (a) Identification of the reclining figures from the temple of Aphaia and the Parthenon.

Most candidates could identify the figures, though few gave the name Ilissos to Sculpture B. The temple of Aphaia was known as the location for the Dying Warrior but the temple of Zeus at Olympia was usually given as the location for Ilissos. Very few recognised him as the River God from the west pediment of the Parthenon.

(b) Comparison of the reclining figures. Which is more aesthetically pleasing?

Candidates could generally explain the merits of the Archaic style Dying Warrior, and there were some nice appreciations of the River God and good comparisons between the two statues. This question was often well answered and candidates showed sensitivity in appreciating both statues.

(c) The development of reclining figures from the 6th century to the end of the 5th century.

Candidates were able to identify a range of other reclining figures to discuss in their responses, from the other Dying Warrior on the temple of Aphaia to the muscular Cladeus and Alphaios from the temple of Zeus, and from the dramatic Seer from the temple of Zeus to the sensuous Aphrodite on the Parthenon. A wide interpretation of the word 'reclining' was allowed. A few candidates ignored the question and gave an account of the development of pedimental design.

A2 (a) Identification of the Diskobolos and the Delphic Charioteer.

The Diskobolos (often the Discus Thrower) was better known than the Delphic Charioteer. Dates were surprisingly not known as well as in previous sessions. A good number of candidates thought that both statues were originally made from marble.

(b) How successfully has the sculptor of Statue B made use of bronze?

Although many candidates could give an overall description of the Delphic Charioteer and some could give an account of lost-wax bronze casting, it was disappointing that candidates seemed unaware of the physical details of the statue such as the construction in separate parts, the use of other metals, the detail of added hair, eyes and eyelashes. Everyone however could mention tensile strength whether they thought it was marble or bronze. Some credit was given for the consequential error for those who had identified the material as marble. A handful of candidates answered the question with reference to the Diskobolos rather than the Delphic Charioteer.

(c) Comparison of the two statues. Which is the more aesthetically pleasing?

Most candidates preferred the Diskobolos. There were many appreciations of the statue that worked well, exploring his pose and anatomy. The Delphic Charioteer was greatly criticised for not being in motion, for being dull, for being out of proportion, for being dressed. Only the most thoughtful responses attempted to make sense of him in context: dressed as a charioteer, in a calm (non-racing) pose, presented as part of a chariot group, recognisable as such to the ancient viewer. Some appreciated the beauty of his drapery. This was the only question where diagrams were regularly used, usually to show the contrast of the sweeping curve of the arms and the zig-zag of the body and the legs of the Diskobolos.

In line with the examiners' findings on the context questions, it was the essay on drapery which was significantly more popular than the essay on friezes. This is a pity because, in general, the latter essay generated a better quality of response. Candidates could conjure up a range of appropriate examples to support their answers but there was a tendency to offer a development of sculpture essay, especially in B3, without focusing on the particular requirements of the question. The essays on friezes tended to be more analytical.

B3 The changes in the depiction of drapery from the Archaic period to the end of the late Classical period.

This question was tackled with a good deal of enthusiasm and with a variety of different approaches. Some ignored the examples on the paper and offered examples of their own; others offered no examples at all but simply discussed drapery in very general terms, or with some generic examples. Many were able to identify and date A, B and C correctly, analysing their drapery well, and making good use of them in their discussion. Examiners were pleased to note a good number of candidates who put their analytical skills to good use when discussing Antenor's kore, even though they had not seen the figure before. The best responses showed an ability to evaluate Archaic figures and explain how the drapery was expressive within the terms of its own style, and then to show and contrast the development of the later styles, and even make interesting cross-reference between periods. It was pleasing to read answers which had a variety of different types of sculpture by employing relief sculpture such as grave stelai, the Parthenon frieze, the Nike balustrade and pedimental sculpture such as the figures of Hebe, Iris and Aphrodite.

The main areas of concern thrown up by this question include:

- vague references to 'Aphrodite' or 'Athena' without any indication of which statue was being used;
- digression into feminist or women issues at the expense of discussion of the sculpture;
- the list-like approach of some candidates;
- the use of technical terms (especially concerning drapery) without really understanding what is meant by them.

B4 The problems presented by Doric and Ionic friezes and the solutions offered in the Archaic and Classical periods.

Although this question proved to be unpopular, there were a quite a number of high quality answers, with candidates being able to offer a range of examples for both types of frieze from both the Archaic and Classical periods. The analysis of the examples was often very good indeed, showing obvious familiarity with the detail of individual pieces of sculpture. Some answers, however, tackled friezes with little knowledge or visual recollection of their examples, muddling Doric and Ionic, and remembering sections of friezes as though they were metopes. Most candidates expressed the challenges of visibility and recognition, and some remembered that colour would have helped. Some candidates fabricated problems or generalised or were critical in anachronistic ways. Sadly, there were a few candidates who started off really well with Ionic friezes but never got onto Doric friezes – or vice versa. Only one candidate failed to understand the term 'frieze' and wrote about pedimental sculpture.

2756 Roman Britain 2

General Comments

Once again, candidates performed well this year, where there was plenty of evidence of effective teaching and thorough learning to have taken place, especially in the knowledge of Hill and Ireland which was on show. Tips and advice which had been given at INSET were regularly seen in scripts from a range of centres, especially in response to the part (a) of the contexts and the need to cite specific examples from the archaeological record. Clearly much effort had gone into preparing for this year's examination. By far the most common combination of questions tackled was A1 and B3. However the not insignificant number of candidates who tackled B4 generally pulled together the many aspects of the unit required to answer the question in a mature, perceptive and analytical way.

Comments on Individual Questions

- A1**
- (a) Good knowledge was shown and candidates had clearly learnt the relevant diagrams well, especially in citing the type of villa demonstrated and its location.
 - (b) This question posed few problems and many candidates were able to talk about the influence of Romanisation and fertile land in the South to explain the preponderance of villas in this part of the country and the hostility of the terrain and Celts to explain their paucity in the North. Only the very good mentioned the influence of Imperial estates or towns.
 - (c) There was a wide range of marks scored here. Nearly all managed to refer to Lockley's villa but with varying degrees of detail about how and when it exactly developed. It was pleasing to note how many candidates remembered to discuss the courtyard villa. Better candidates were those who were able to cite a range of other specific villas to support their answer. Not all candidates noticed the second part of the question and therefore limited the mark they achieved. Of those who did answer it, not all were aware that the decline of towns was a factor which explained the increase in numbers of villas in the latter half of the Roman occupation.
- A2**
- (a) This question posed few problems for those with knowledge of the relevant diagrams in Hill and Ireland. There were many high marks to this question although the gilt was often omitted from the bronze.
 - (b) Although there were a surprising number of Celtic influences seen in the head of Minerva, candidates generally discussed the Gorgon's Head in a detailed way and were often well versed in what was Celtic and Classical influences. Once again, there were a number of candidates who omitted part of a question and failed to discuss how the site at Bath shows a fusion of Celtic and Roman cultures.
 - (c) There was a broad interpretation of what defined a 'masterpiece' with many candidates arguing that it was a piece of art which displayed a fusion of Celtic and Roman influence. The best candidates discussed the aesthetic values of a range of specific examples and made direct comparisons to the Gorgon's Head.

- B3** There were unfortunately many uneven responses to this question. Often candidates were strong on either the 'how' or 'why' part of the question but very few on both. Most commonly candidates talked in general terms about how urbanisation fitted into the policy of Romanisation and talked about the allure of baths, market places, theatres and the general improvement of the Celtic way of life. Better responses made reference to specific examples and sites and also considered other reasons for urbanisation such as defence, taxation, justice etc.
- B4** Given the breadth of this question, there were many very good essays covering a breadth of relevant points (e.g. art, religion, administration, agriculture etc.) as well as evaluation considering how much of a positive or negative 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. Most tended to see the Romans as offering a civilising influence to Britain although stronger responses highlighted that at times the Romans acted in a barbaric fashion in a land which was perhaps not as barbaric as the Romans believed.

2757 and 2799 Individual Study

General Comments on Both Levels

Course work continues to be a popular alternative within the specification at both AS and Advanced level and has more entries than several of the minor modules such as Historians, Satire and Archaeology. More Centres seemed to have taken advantage of the vetting service for proposed titles. It is important to provide all the information required, and not just a list of titles, if a decision is to be provided promptly.

Almost all Centres used the current documentation this year, with only two Centres using the old documentation. This can lead to some difficulties and misunderstandings, such as marking out of the wrong number or at the wrong level. All of the current documentation can be downloaded from the OCR website or is available at INSET in the Autumn term. Some Centres are still failing to provide the Centre Authentication Form [CCS160]; this is an important document, failure to provide the completed document delays the final results for a Centre.

Administration was a grave source of concern to moderators for both levels of coursework. It was not just that a significant number of Centres did not meet the 15th May deadline, the problems were far more wide-reaching than that. Centres entered their candidates for the wrong level, made addition errors, marked out of the wrong numbers [104/120] or gave more marks than were available for a particular assessment objective [51/44]. Sometimes the paperwork with the required amendments contained further errors. All these administrative problems severely hampered the moderation process and meant that none of the moderators were able to meet the Board's deadlines for completion of the work. Moderators appreciate that this is a busy time of the year but they are keen to do their job properly and thoroughly in order to be fair to all candidates. If Centres need advice about marking or the documentation then advice can be sought by contacting the Subject Officer.

Moderators would like to highlight points made in the reports from 2006 and 2007:

- copies of the MS1, or a Centre's list of marks if they have been submitted by EDI must be included in the first communication with the moderator;
- the Centre Authentication Form must be also be sent in the first communication with the moderator;
- the Teacher Assessment Sheet **must** have a word count and the examined unit boxes **must** be completed;
- Individual Studies must be sent to the moderator assigned to their Centre;
- Centres which operate as consortia must inform the moderator assigned to their Centres, especially if two different moderators are assigned.

Teachers' annotation of the Individual Studies and the summary comments on the Teacher Assessment Sheet were generally more detailed and helpful this year. A series of ticks and underlining does not really help a moderator understand why a particular mark has been given. Virgin pages and Assessment sheets, with only a final mark, are not at all helpful and usually result in such pieces having to be re-assessed either by the Centre or the moderator.

Module 2799 – AS Level

The number submitting the AS Individual Study continued to increase this year, with over 300 candidates entering for this unit instead of the three examined units in this band. The full range of topics available was utilised by candidates doing AS Individual Studies this summer. The most popular subject was Art, closely followed by Roman Britain. Only a few centres produced Studies on Aristophanes. The titles chosen ranged, as in past years, from standard essays, selected from previous exam papers, to individual choices based on areas which interested the candidates. Most Studies were of acceptable length, although there were several which pushed the word count to the limit, especially through excessive use of footnotes. Most of the Studies were well written, with several being very articulate, with good vocabulary and expression. However, there were far too many Studies which exhibited a lack of proof reading, shown by poor English and incorrect spelling, including on many occasions proper names and Classical terms.

Moderating the Studies proved to be a varied and interesting experience. There were a number of titles which showed that individual candidates had a range of topics and areas which they found to be of interest. This was especially true of studies on the theme of Art. The obvious enjoyment many candidates got from researching and writing their studies was evident from the work they produced, with many original ideas and interpretations seen. The standard of candidates' work was variable, with Studies ranging from the exceptional to the mundane and weak.

Module 2757 – A2 Level

At around 550, there were slightly fewer Individual Studies than last year. A2 Coursework is still a more popular option than at AS, and more popular than two of the alternative units, Greek Comedy 2 and Roman Britain 2.

Moderators very much enjoyed reading most candidates' Individual Studies. The work was generally beautifully presented with pertinent, clearly labelled illustrations. The enthusiasm and excitement with which many candidates had undertaken their research and investigations could be sensed. Some Centres allowed their candidates the freedom and scope to choose any topic from architecture, art, archaeology, history, literature, philosophy, religion or society – in fact, just about anything which falls within the subject criteria. Other Centres continue to confine their candidates' coursework to just one area e.g. Plato or Greek sculpture, or even to a single question. Moderators noted that candidates tended to perform better when given freer rein. The challenging nature of a topic chosen by an individual affords the candidate an opportunity to explore interesting aspects of the classical world, to offer personal insights into the material, and to present strong personal argument and response. Some candidates presented an excellent range of primary sources and material evidence, all well-referenced, whilst others struggle to use even secondary sources.

Candidates continued to offer Studies on a range of tried and tested topics. Whilst there were probably too many Studies on the Olympic Games, women, the development of the male figure in sculpture and aspects of the Parthenon, there was much that was new and interesting. In this session moderators particularly enjoyed reading Individual Studies on:

- Brutus
- Oratory in the Roman world
- War and peace in the Roman world
- Underwater archaeology
- The use of gesture in Greek sculpture
- Aspects of Medicine in the ancient world
- The influence of Stoicism on Marcus Aurelius
- Factors in the development of the Graeco-Roman settlement of Empuries
- The portrayal of hybris in Ovid's metamorphoses.

Marking seemed more accurate, or at least closer to tolerance, than in previous sessions, though there was a general tendency to be too generous with AO3 marks. Many candidates were awarded 10/10 too easily. This mark should be reserved for articulate, elegant work which is impeccably presented, and has perfect spelling and punctuation. Some Centres were a little lax in providing word counts, or on insisting that candidates provide a word count. Lack of a word count or a word count just shy of the extended word counts arouses the suspicions of the moderator and leads to a word count being undertaken. The extended word count is still being breached by a large number of candidates but there was more evidence this year of markers dealing with this rubric error in the appropriate manner. Candidates should be reminded that the word count **includes** quotations, and that footnotes should **not** be used as a way of getting round the word count.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Classical Civilisation (3816/7816)
June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2736	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2737	Raw	100	76	68	60	53	46	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2738	Raw	100	70	62	55	48	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2739	Raw	100	71	64	57	51	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2740	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2741	Raw	100	75	67	59	52	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2742	Raw	100	71	64	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2743	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2744	Raw	100	73	65	57	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2745	Raw	100	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2746	Raw	100	72	64	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2747	Raw	100	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2748	Raw	100	79	70	61	53	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2749	Raw	100	75	67	59	51	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2750	Raw	100	72	64	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2751	Raw	100	75	67	59	51	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2752	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2753	Raw	100	75	67	59	51	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

2754	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2755	Raw	100	72	64	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2756	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2757	Raw	100	85	75	65	55	46	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2799	Raw	100	86	75	64	53	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie 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	25.3	51.0	74.7	89.1	96.4	100.0	2318
7816	25.5	58.9	85.9	97.0	99.5	100.0	2231

4547 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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