

# CLASSICAL STUDIES

---

**Paper 8283/01**  
**Greek Civilisation**

## General comments

The number of candidates was the highest to date: 269 (+46 on 2006). The marks covered almost the whole range, from 11 to 49, but the mean mark was the lowest ever: 30.35. Candidates seemed to have enjoyed studying the topics they were offering. This was particularly noticeable in the art topics, where candidates are beginning to offer critical analysis and appreciation of the works they have studied. There are, however, some for whom writing at length or in depth seems to present a challenge. Such candidates present their information briefly and without explanation. Often, they fail to address the question and so inevitably score badly. Essays were much more popular than previously, often achieving the higher range of marks. Examiners commented on the number of candidates with unbalanced papers, achieving higher marks on one section than the other. Gobbets proved problematic for many – they simply did not have the required level of detailed knowledge. For gobbets, candidates also need to write in sentences and explain their answers fully.

Examiners would appreciate it if candidates completed the front cover of the examination booklet carefully and accurately with their name, candidate number and the numbers of the questions answered. Presentation of scripts was often poor and gave examiners little room to mark the answers or write a sub-total for a particular question. The booklets contain sufficient pages for candidates to be able to start their answers to each question on a new page. There was a noticeable decrease in the number of rubric errors.

## **Greek Civilisation 8283/01**

### **Section 1: Alexander**

This topic continues to be popular, though this year there was a noticeable decline in the quality of the answers, particularly in the gobbet questions.

- 1(a)** This was a popular question.
- (i)** The date of the wedding presented few problems.
  - (ii)** There was some confusion over the exact identities of the figures involved in the wedding and their relationship.
  - (iii)** The location of the event was not known by about half of the candidates. Some could either name Aegae or refer to the theatre, but rarely both.
  - (iv)** This question suffered from the same confusion as **Question (ii)**, and candidates were unclear about the relationship between the various protagonists.
  - (v)** Most identified Pausanias as one of Philip's former lovers rather than as a bodyguard. There were lots of digressions about how he was treated.
  - (vi)** The *Medea* reference proved elusive for many candidates.
- (b)** This was the least popular of the Alexander gobbet questions.
- (i)** The date of Philotas's plot was well known.
  - (ii)/(iii)** The identities of Ptolemy and Aristobulus eluded many candidates.
  - (iv)/(v)** The fates of Philotas and Parmenio were generally known in outline, but not in detail.
  - (vi)** Most gave a good account of another plot: most commonly, the Pages' plot.

- (c) This was the most popular question in this section.
  - (i) Again, the date presented few problems.
  - (ii) Most candidates were able to discuss why Alexander felt so close to Achilles and gain good marks.
  - (iii) Very few could give an adequate account of who the Companions were and what they did. Some took the word literally and said they accompanied Alexander.
  - (iv) Many were able to name the friends of Achilles and Alexander. Some, however, seemed a little too influenced by recent films and cited stars such as Brad Pitt.
  - (v) Paris' lyre was correctly identified by virtually all candidates.
  - (vi) There were remarkably few candidates who could say that Alexander went to Arisbe after Troy.

2 The mini-essays were the most popular of all the equivalent questions on the Greek paper. There were some excellent responses, with lots of relevant detail cited, but there were also some very weak responses.

- (i) Although not the most popular mini-essay, the question about the sieges of Troy and Gaza did garner some strong responses with detailed accounts of the battles and military techniques. In general, Tyre was better known than Gaza. Few attempted meaningful comparison to enable an assessment of Alexander's military skill to be made.
- (ii) Most of the answers to this question were solid, although some could have usefully employed more detailed information. There was a lot of discussion of Philip and his role in Alexander's youth and his influence on Alexander's military skill. Few discussed the impact of the relationship between Olympias and Philip, and his estrangement from his father.
- (iii) Answers tended to rely on generic and vague information, but did not manage to include a detailed account of the political situation in the various Greek states after the death of Philip.

3 The essays were generally done well - the best of the three alternatives on this section. The two essays were equal in popularity.

- (a) The answers on Alexander's attitude to mythology and religion varied from a list of generalities to some very detailed discussions of various aspects of Greek religion, Eastern belief and propaganda. Most were able to discuss both mythology, such as Achilles and Heracles, and Alexander's desire to emulate them. They were also able to discuss attitudes towards religion, especially the Siwah Oracle, and Alex's desire to be seen as the son of Zeus. Better answers used the propaganda value Alexander found in religion and mythology.
- (b) Most answers made a reasonable job of answering the question on whether it was a bad idea for Alexander to adopt Persian customs. Candidates could offer a good range of detail, covering the policy of Fusion, integrating Persians into the army, *proskynesis*, dress and even religion. They were able to provide a balanced discussion both of how these policies brought positive and negative aspects, especially the resentment of the Macedonians.

### **Section 2: Socrates**

The Alexander topic continues to be a popular one, though this year there was a noticeable decline in the quality of the answers, particularly in the gobbet questions.

- 1(a) This was the most popular of the gobbet questions on this section.
  - (i) The identity of who Euthyphro was prosecuting presented few problems.
  - (ii) Not too many were sure about the events leading to the dialogue, while various definitions of holiness were given, not all were relevant at this point in the dialogue. Some ignored the prompt [brief] and either included too much detail or went back too far.
  - (iii) The definition of sacrifice and prayer proved to be a little easier.

- (iv)/(v) Not all knew which definition followed.. This led to difficulties explaining why Socrates rejected it.
- (vi) This was well answered.
- (b) This was the least popular of the Socrates gobbet questions, and the answers from the Centres varied considerably in the accuracy of the information offered. On the whole it was poorly done.
  - (i)/(ii)/(iii) The names of Aristophanes, the three Sophists, and Evenus were absent from most answers.
  - (iv) Answers on the question of Socrates' defence against being a Sophist were more successful. Some candidates were able to express their own opinions admirably in their answers.
  - (v) There were no problems in identifying an aspect of the Socratic method in the passage. The aspect, usually questioning the interlocutor, was usually well-explained and analysed.
- (c) This was a popular question in this section, but on the whole it was not well done.
  - (i) The narrator and the person he was addressing were generally not known.
  - (ii) Most were able to offer part of the answer concerning why Crito tells Socrates not to hurry.
  - (iii) The poison hemlock was known by all but one candidate.
  - (iv) Few were able to provide details about how the poison worked.
  - (v) Comments about how Socrates' friends reacted were general and did not offer a full explanation.
  - (vi) Remarkably few candidates could remember Socrates' last request.

2 Mini essays were too general in discussion and lacked precise textual reference.

- (i) This was the most popular mini-essay. It elicited a good deal of listing of the different elements of the Socratic method rather than an analysis of its strengths and weaknesses. A major problem for some was applying knowledge of the Socratic method to a specific text.
- (ii) There were few answers to the question on religion. Again, the discussions were lacking in detail; Socrates' *daimon* was mentioned, but state religion and oracles were usually neglected.
- (iii) Very few of the answers dealt with the 'Laws of Athens', preferring to discuss 'laws' in general, which hampered candidates in producing an effective response. Even when the personification of the 'Laws of Athens' was identified, discussion of their use was limited. However, some answers did show understanding and knowledge of the issues raised in the set text. There was one answer which showed thorough knowledge and a mature understanding of the topic.

Both essays were equally popular. Some candidates had been thoroughly prepared for these topics and seemed to have pre-learnt essays at their finger tips. For the most part they were able to adapt their material to the exact question posed. This led to some impressive detail and some excellent argument in a number of essays for both topics.

- 3(a) Unfortunately, many candidates did not read this question carefully, and many essays answered a different question 'Why was Socrates put to death?', neglecting the 'good citizen' aspect of the question. Consequently, few answers discussed Socrates' view on citizenship.
- (b) Socrates' ideas on death were generally known, although there was some confusion over which ideas occurred in which dialogue. As mentioned above, there were some strong responses to the question, but even here more detailed reference to the text would have been welcome. The most impressive answers had a good sense of chronology, covering the whole of the trial and jail period as well as considering how his ideas and attitude towards death changed over time.

### **Section 3: Aristophanes**

The Aristophanes section received fewer answers than any other section on the paper. On the whole, however, the quality of the responses was far better than the other sections. Candidates had detailed knowledge and were able to offer a good range of opinion and argument, supported with textual evidence.

- 1(a)(i)** This question was well answered.
- (ii)** This question was well answered.
- (iii)** The factual details escaped some candidates. Not everyone got the idea of embezzlement and many failed to mention Sicily.
- (iv)** There were no problems in identifying references to Cleon and, this year, candidates were much better at explaining the references.
- (v)** Most were fine on use of the passage, but needed more depth of reference on the 'how typical' aspect. Direct comparisons were infrequent. It was surprising that no-one went beyond Act 1.
- (b)(i)** This question was well answered.
- (ii)** This question was well answered.
- (iii)** Candidates knew what Cerberus was but few were able to recall the incident involving Herakles.
- (iv)** This question was well answered, with good use of the passage evident.
- (v)** Nearly all got the negative portrayal, but very few mentioned the positives or the absurd elements in Aristophanes' portrayal of the Underworld.
- (vi)** This was exceptionally well done with particular focus on the passage. Candidates are improving in their ability to make points with close reference to the passage.
- (c)** This was not a popular question, but those who completed it did so extremely well, displaying a particularly fine understanding and appreciation of the events which form the backdrop to the play. It was pleasing to read that many candidates took the clothes swapping scene as an allegory for the topsy-turvy state of Athens at the time. The individual questions presented no problems.

**2** There were no attempts at the mini-essays for this section.

Candidates were well prepared for the essay section. The essays were a popular option and there were many excellent answers awarded very high marks.

- 3(a)** There were many shopping lists of humour here but these lists were also comprehensive with exceedingly good reference to the text. Many direct quotations were used and an appreciation of how it appealed to both the ancient as well as the modern audiences was offered. Again, the contemporary background and understanding of it, underpinned not a few strong responses.
- (b)** Very few saw the two parts to the question and failed to discuss the escapist element to the question but this was more than made up for by the quality and strength of the personal opinion which shone through. There was very thorough knowledge of the play and the historical background, and some very focussed and analytical discussion of the *agon*. It was pleasing to read many essays discussing Alcibiades, who has often been overlooked in the past.

#### **Section 4: Greek Vase-painting**

The vase-painting section received more answers than any other this year, toppling the Socrates section from its position as the most popular topic. The gobbet questions were by far the most popular on this section, with only five candidates tackling the mini-essays and eight candidates attempting the long essays.

- 1(a)** This was the most popular of the three gobbet questions.
- (i)** Most candidates identified the painter as Lydos.
- (ii)/(iii)** The factual details of date, type of pot and its use were generally well-known.
- (iv)** Many did not understand the term 'Grand Style' and could not answer the question effectively.
- (v)** The depiction was usually identified correctly (together with extensive retelling of the story).

- (vi) Many simply repeated elements of their answer from (iv) without making their points relevant to the question and/or without making reference to specific details from the pot. Consequently, answers were too general and did not pick up the top marks.
- (b) Of the three gobbet questions this was the least popular.
- (i) Candidates were able to identify the potter.
  - (ii) Candidates tended to be less secure on the shape of the pot and its use.
  - (iii) This question was well answered.
  - (iv) Some candidates were unable to identify the black-figure technique; even more had difficulty with explain the different elements of the technique.
  - (v) The scene was usually identified, but the pot depicting the women weaving was rarely mentioned.
  - (vi) Although many were able to list ways of making a scene come to life, the majority of candidates were unable to make specific reference to the scene on the pot to illustrate their answers.
- (c) This was a popular gobbet question and was, on the whole, well answered.
- (i) Candidates could usually identify the Penthesilea Painter, if not explain why he is given this name.
  - (ii) The date was often cited accurately.
  - (iii) This question was well done.
  - (iv) The scene was not always correctly identified, but when it was, lengthy descriptions followed.
  - (v) The iconography of Hermes was often explained in some detail.
  - (vi) As with the black and red figure techniques, the characteristics of white figure were rarely known and even when they were correctly identified, there was a lack of reference to them on the pot.
- 2** The mini-essays were the least popular questions in this Section, with only 5 candidates attempting them. The level of knowledge displayed was generally weaker than in other alternatives.
- (i) Two of the candidates who attempted this question had no knowledge at all of the Kleophrades Painter's hydria. The other responses recounted the various scenes but needed more detail about the composition and more analysis.
  - (ii) This question gave candidates the opportunity to select scenes involving Achilles from the pots they have studied, and analyse the different ways he is portrayed by the painters. Candidates could usually describe one or two pots but were unable to tackle the analysis and select which painter depicts him in the most effective manner. One candidate concluded the Achilles Painter must have painted the best pictures of Achilles because he is called the Achilles Painter.
  - (iii) There was little relevant knowledge shown in the few answers on the Pioneer Painters.
- 3(a)** The answers were on the whole rather disappointing because there was too much description and not enough on how Exekias uses the different aspects or elements of the black-figure technique.
- (b) Again, knowledge of red-figure technique and the effects which could be achieved proved to be inadequate. The rubric asked candidates to use a range of 'specific pots and painters', several candidates made use of the pots depicted on the insert, although they were not red figure.

# CLASSICAL STUDIES

---

**Paper 8283/02**  
**Roman Civilisation**

## General comments

The Roman paper performed rather differently from the Greek paper. Gobbet questions remained popular, but there was a significant increase in the number of candidates tackling essays. The question on Commodus and the Patrician alone received 70 responses. The overall quality of answers was higher than in paper 1, but here too the mean mark was the lowest ever: 31.59. The mark range varied from 8 up to 47.

### **Section 1: Augustus**

- 1(a)** This was the most popular of the three gobbet questions.
- (i)** Candidates generally knew in some detail the reasons why Antony's will 'so enraged the people'. Some, however, made only one point.
  - (ii)** The names of the Antony and Cleopatra's children eluded most candidates.
  - (iii)** There were some excellent explanations.
  - (iv)** Most candidates were able to give an adequate definition of *fetialis*.
  - (v)** Agrippa and Actium were well-known but the date cited was often incorrect.
  - (vi)** More detail was needed about what happened to Antony and Cleopatra, rather than a simple statement saying they committed suicide.
  - (vii)** Apollo of Actium was known by only a handful. The most common answer was Mars Ultor.
- (b)(i)** This question was well answered.
- (ii)** The year was generally known.
  - (iii)** Most were able to give some explanation of how and why Octavian divided up the provinces. Few were able to give a full explanation of why Octavian thought this was necessary.
  - (iv)** The majority knew who Romulus was.
  - (v)** Julius Caesar was mentioned in most answers. Few went on to mention the Romans hatred of kings and Tarquinius Superbus.
  - (vi)** Usually two rather than three honours were cited.
  - (vii)** Candidates managed to imply at least one motive for Octavian's settlement. Those who were more explicit in their answers tended to fare a little better.
- (c)** This was the least popular of the three gobbet questions.
- (i)** Many had difficulty explaining significance beyond the fact that Mars Ultor was god of vengeance.
  - (ii)** The names of Julia and Agrippa were usually known. Few could name Tiberius.
  - (iii)** This question was well done, but the spelling of Caesar was beyond the majority of candidates.

- (iv) Most knew Vesta as a household god but not her significance to Rome as a whole.
- (v) Most knew that the Secular Games were to mark the end of one era and the beginning of a new era, but were unable to give further details.
- (vi) The date of the Secular Games was not often known. This had an effect on the event mentioned.
- (vii) Many thought the *Res Gestae* were Augustus' private diaries and letters.

**3(a)** There were more responses to this question than (b). Answers tended to score good marks because candidates possessed a good range of detailed knowledge. Sometimes the answers were a too factual, merely narrating the sequence of events rather than making the facts fit the question of propaganda. Knowledge of the political and military events tended to be better than other issues concerning his building programme, his use of coinage, his use of poetry and religious elements. Few made any mention of Maecenas.

**(b)** This essay was surprisingly unpopular but was, on the whole, well done. Candidates employed a good range of factual material on the early relationship between Octavian and Mark Antony. Details about the breakdown of the relationship in the later stages were rather more sketchy.

### **Section 2: Virgil**

The answers for the gobbet questions in this section were rather weak. Examiners would advise candidates who do not possess a detailed knowledge of the specified books to opt for the mini-essays or essays.

- 1(a)**
  - (i) Surprisingly few candidates were able to identify both Anchises as the speaker and his house as the location.
  - (ii) Candidates generally knew that Anchises was addressing Aeneas, Cresusa, and Ascanius but the household slaves were often overlooked.
  - (iii) This question required a fairly straightforward response for one mark but many over-complicated their answers and failed to score the mark.
  - (iv) There were some very imaginative and woolly responses, but only one candidate knew that Hercules had sacked Rome in the past.
  - (v) Again, few knew why Anchises had been blasted by Jupiter.
  - (vi) Whilst the majority correctly identified three instances from the passage which highlighted the mood of Anchises, not all could explain the effect. Close reference to the text would have raised the quality of many answers rather than a simple statement saying they committed suicide.
  - (vii) Almost every candidate got the signs required.
- (b)**
  - (i) Most knew that Mercury visited Aeneas to tell him to leave Carthage.
  - (ii) Not all remembered Rumour but said instead that she 'looked out of the window in the morning.'
  - (iii) This was well done and most candidates paid heed to the word 'briefly'. Juno and the symbolism of the cave could have been mentioned more.
  - (iv)/(v) These questions were quite well answered.
  - (vi) Knowledge of what Iarbas had given Dido was scant.
  - (vii) More candidates managed to find the appropriate devices in the passage than in previous years, but there is still room to develop the second half of the question on the effect of the devices.
- (c)**
  - (i) Many misplaced the immediate context so marks tended to be rather low.
  - (ii) Palinurus was a popular response in answer to who Aeneas had just met.

- (ii) The majority thought that Aeneas was near the river Styx.
- (iii) Many knew that Virgil had compared the Carthaginians to bees earlier in the Aeneid.
- (iv) The simile was better discussed than in previous years but there are still too many who do not address the 'scene it is intended to illustrate' part of the question.
- (v) Few knew the significance of the River Lethe.
- (vii) Most were able to discuss the pageant of heroes, but it was disappointing that Only a few mentioned that Aeneas could also review their destinies.

**2** The mini-essays were the least popular questions in this Section, but were significantly more popular than the equivalent questions on other Sections on this paper.

- (i) There was much good comment about how Aeneas' character develops in Book 2. Candidates were able to trace the change in Aeneas from a Homeric hero to a (proto) Roman hero during Book 2, with varying degrees of evidence. In particular, Aeneas' battle between *furor* and *pietas* aroused a good deal of interest. It is worth candidates making more direct reference to the text. The second half of Book 2 was often overlooked or dealt with very quickly.
  - (ii) Many different types of love were discussed. Dido and Aeneas's love was the most frequently mentioned type, as well as Aeneas love for his wife, Creusa. Family relationships (Venus/Aeneas, Aeneas/Ascanius) were also discussed. More sophisticated answers looked at Aeneas' love of his people/country and his devotion to the gods. The amount of textual support varied.
  - (iii) Five candidates only tackled this, concentrating on Book VI and the future Romans, especially how Augustus was portrayed. Many compared Aeneas to Augustus, with varying degrees of accuracy.
- 3(a)** This was popular. Juno and Venus evoked the greatest discussion, with many references to their machinations. More might have been said about Jupiter and his relationship with his family and fate/destiny. It was pleasing to see how many referred to Neptune and Aeolus in Book 1, but little was made of Apollo or Rumour or other minor deities. Many answers tended to be narratives describing the gods' actions rather than analyses of their behaviour.
- (b)** Very few attempted this. Answers either gave a good discussion of various books, with sound comparison of what made the selected Book enjoyable [Book 4 was the popular choice], or gave a resume of several books with a comment about each one but no argument to specify a preference.

### **Section 3: Juvenal**

This was the least popular section on the Roman paper and it also contained some of the weakest answers.

- 1(a)(i)** A worrying number did not know what a legacy is.
- (ii) Most missed the overt sexual references in these lines and thus could not do the second half of the question.
  - (iii)/(iv)/(v) The answers here were poor. Candidates are advised to consult the background given in the footnotes of Green's edition of *Satires*.
  - (vi) Some candidates were able to pick up on the point that Priscus was exiled.
  - (vii) Few achieved full marks because the comments were too general.
- (b)(i)** Umbricius was well-known.
- (ii) Most knew who the Sibyl was.
  - (iii) Most picked up on the idea of heat but some thought August was wintertime in Italy.
  - (iv)/(v) These questions were generally well answered.



- (vi) Very few got the idea that an aqueduct, which leaked, passed overhead.
  - (vii) Virtually no-one knew that the 'Sabbath haybox' was used to keep food hot when cooking was forbidden.
  - (viii) There were some useful and relevant guesses about why the Jews were forced to live on the edge of Rome.
  - (ix) How the passage serves as an introduction to Satire 3 was pleasingly answered, with many candidates showing a good understanding of the themes present in Satire 3 as a whole, as well as good focus on the passage.
- (c) (i)/(ii) Candidates were generally able to provide the names of Trebius and Agrippina but there were many unrecognisable attempts at these names.
- (iii) There was a lack of precise knowledge about Phaeacia and the Hesperides but there were many useful attempts.
  - (iv) No-one could explain what the Embankment was.
  - (v) Candidates have always been able to identify examples of Juvenal's satiric technique but this year there was a significant improvement in explained the effect of the selected examples.
  - (vi) Candidates were able to write to good effect about the patron-client system.
- 2 There were very few attempts at the Juvenal mini-essays.

- (ii) There were only two responses to this question and they offered only general comment, with little in the way of detailed reference to the text.
  - (iii) The question was well done. Candidates could recall the arguments for living in the country in Satire 3 as well as provide useful resumes of Satire 10.
- 3(a) This attracted a pleasing number who expressed their ideas in depth and detail, well supported by a good range of reference from all of the Satires studied and pleasing recall of specific detail.
- (b) No responses were received to this question.

#### **Section 4: Roman Art and Architecture**

In this section, candidates were tempted to answer briefly and not in sentence form. This often meant that candidates did not provide enough relevant material to achieve good marks.

- (a) This was the most popular of the three gobbet questions.
- (i) Almost identified the site as Baalbek, with varying degrees of accuracy in the spelling.
  - (ii) Technical names caused a few problems, especially the peripteral colonnade.
  - (iii) Virtually all candidates identified Bacchus/Dionysus but not all were able to discuss the sculptural elements which suggest to which god the temple is dedicated.
  - (iv)/(v) Many candidates confused these questions and the information required to answer them. Some repeated the same information in answer to both questions.
  - (vi) In this type of question, candidates need use of the word in the question [impressive], not merely list points [sometimes just bullet points] without any attempt to make them relevant.
- (b) Of the three gobbets this one varied more in popularity across the Centres. Relevant factual detail often eluded many.
- (i) Candidates were able to identify the monument, but often gave the date of its construction rather than the date of the dedication.

- (ii) Most could locate the monument accurately. Several felt the need to locate it a little too accurately: Trajan's forum, Rome, Italy, the world, the universe.
  - (iii) This question was well answered.
  - (iv) Some had difficulties. Many mentioned various materials [tufa, limestone, concrete] from a variety of locations [Crete, Paros, Athens, France] and gave detailed description of the use of scaffolding.
  - (v) Some concentrated on the physical difficulties of carving on the monument. Some credit was given to such answers. There were some excellent answers which discussed the spiral design and the refinements to make the design at the top more visible.
  - (vi) Most referred to the replacement of the statue of Trajan with one of St Peter. Two candidates asserted that the current statue is of Pope John Paul II.
- (c) This was a popular gobbet question and was, on the whole, well answered.
- (i) Candidates could identify Hadrian's villa. Many forgot to mention Tivoli in their answers.
  - (ii) The date was often cited accurately.
  - (iii)/(iv) These questions were well done.
  - (v) There were some excellent detailed descriptions which gained full marks. Others were vague in the explanation of how the different elements fitted together. Spelling of technical words was poor: e.g. 'collums', 'corinttan', 'lentils'.
  - (vi) Most were able to discuss the use of the Serapaeum and provide some extra detail.
- 2 The mini-essays were the least popular questions in this Section, with fewer than 10 candidates attempting them. The standard of responses was generally weaker than in other sections.
- (i) To achieve good marks candidates had to tackle both parts of the question. Those who tackled the question tended to have good knowledge of the mosaic but were not able to discuss how the mosaics were crafted or the stylistic techniques employed.
  - (ii) This was popular. Answers fell in to two categories: those who were able to describe the theatre, but unable to analyse how typical it is and those which presented detailed analysis and were able to offer comparison throughout [described as a 'pleasure to mark' by the Examiner].
  - (iii) Only two tackled this and both answers lacked detailed knowledge of typical features.
- 3(a) Very few answered this question and most gave poor responses. Details of how to make concrete were known, but specific uses were little known.
- (b) Seventy attempted this question, making it the second most popular in the Section. Candidates showed good knowledge of both statues, providing an impressive range of detail. What distinguished answers was the ability to make the comparison between the two statues and the ability to explain in detail the preference for one statue over the other. There was evidence of a mature level of personal response. Several presented the statue of Commodus as a parody because the statue shows him as a weakling 'playing at being Herakles'.