GCE

Classics

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics (H438)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics (H038)

Advanced GCE Classics: Latin (H439)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Latin H039)

Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)

Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H441)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H041)

Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Latin (H039)
Advanced GCE Classics: Latin (H439)

Chief Examiner's Report

This year saw a pleasing increase in entry numbers in both AS units, and a smaller but nonetheless welcome increase at A2. Over 500 candidates re-sat Unit F361; once the tighter marking standard on this unit is taken into account (see below), these resit candidates improved their performance on average by several marks.

The overall standard of attainment was again very high at both levels, reflecting the considerable efforts made by candidates to learn the prescribed material and to prepare themselves for these examinations.

Examiners are of the opinion that, while both AS units are securely within the grasp of a large majority of candidates, the same cannot be said of the A2 units. Many candidates are not showing evidence of a further year's language learning and practice; the disparity of their language and literature attainment suggests that perhaps too high a proportion of their time and energy had been devoted to the prescribed texts, at the expense of increasing their ability to handle unprepared Latin. Centres are reminded that in a further year of study after AS, it is not unreasonable to expect candidates to improve their vocabulary knowledge substantially beyond that required for AS. Since there is no prescribed vocabulary list for A2, attention should also be given to developing the skill of intelligently guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words. An important part of improving translation skills also involves reading substantial extracts from the works of the author prescribed for unprepared translation and comprehension: only thus can candidates become familiar with the appropriate subject-matter, literary style (including word-order), idiom and typical vocabulary. Another reasonable expectation is that, by the end of their advanced-level study, candidates should possess a thorough grasp of grammar, so that they can deploy rational analysis rather than unfocused guesswork to help them to access the meaning of a Latin sentence.

Performance on the literature was generally very good. Where candidates scored lower marks than they might have expected, it was usually because of their failure to decode the question rather than because of ignorance of the text. It is discouraging to read detailed, knowledgeable responses that do not fully address the question and so receive lower marks than the candidates are capable of achieving. The Principal Examiners offer cogent advice on this issue in their individual reports.

Centres are reminded that both A2 units are required to contain sufficiently testing questions to meet the criteria of 'stretch and challenge'. This is achieved, at least in part, by setting literature questions that require candidates to think carefully about the material they have studied and to plan an appropriate response, rather than relying on a prepared response of a generic nature which may be quite inappropriate to a particular question.

The above comments, focusing as they do on weaknesses, should be read alongside the more positive comments in the individual reports that follow. All have been impressed by the overall level of knowledge and ability shown by the candidature, and centres are to be congratulated on helping their students to reach this level.

F361 Latin Language

General comments

The overall standard of this year's entry was once again very high, with only a very small percentage of candidates showing a poor knowledge of the defined vocabulary, though there were some severe gaps in the knowledge of certain types of words and some constructions. Once again the percentage offering Question 3 instead of Question 2 was between 10 and 15 per cent.

In 2010 substantial numbers of candidates gained full marks on this unit and, while this was impressive, this year efforts were made to tighten the Mark Scheme a little, in order to improve differentiation. Whereas previously errors of number were always regarded as minor, this year, where the number was particularly important, such errors were regarded as major. All omissions of words, apart from basic conjunctions, were treated as major errors. Errors of tense were considered minor if they involved a wrong past tense; otherwise they were counted as major. Even despite this adjustment, there were a good few candidates who scored 100 marks. As in previous years, the length and complexity of each section were taken into account when judging the seriousness of errors and the proportion of sense.

The most obvious weakness in translations, apparent in at least two-thirds of the scripts, was general confusion over pronouns and related words. These included *hic, ille, is* and *iste* in particular, especially but not only in the oblique cases, and to a lesser extent *tot, qui, se* and *suus*. The frequency of appearance of these words in this year's unseens had a severe effect on many candidates' marks. Many candidates, as so often previously, had difficulty with the pairs *dico / duco, possum / pono, tandem / tamen, maior / melior, forte / fortis.* Similarly recurrent errors were common with the words *imperator* and *legatus.* Fortunately for over half the candidates, it was decided that they could not be expected to have any knowledge of ancient history, and so they had to be allowed to believe with little penalty that Alexander the Great and Hannibal were Roman emperors. There was much confusion over the various uses of *ut*, whereas indirect statements, unfulfilled conditions and fearing clauses were usually well handled.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

accidit ... esset: this was usually correctly translated, with the commonest error being ignorance of the locative case.

is ... caperetur: the pronoun *is* offered the first serious pitfall; very many candidates hedged their bets with 'Here, he...' It should be noted that the presence of an incorrect word along with the correct one will always count as a serious error; candidates should therefore be discouraged from adding words unnecessarily to their translations. Many did not recognise *tot*. The weakest candidates thought that *milia* was part of *miles*. A surprising number omitted *in bello*. The rest was handled well.

tandem ... vicit: this was done well, though *vix* was sometimes unknown.

forte ... Africanus: Africanus was often brave, and *legatos* were often commanders.

hic ... fuisse: the opening two pronouns wreaked havoc among all but the best candidates: 'here, when' were particularly common renderings. The predicative dative proved a good discriminator, with good candidates generally getting it the right way round, and weaker candidates attributing the hatred to the wrong person; pleasingly, however, nearly all handled the phrase *Hannibal ... erat* well enough to pick up no more than one major error. *Imperatorem* was usually 'emperor' (minor error), while *fuisse* was often treated as if *esse*.

Hannibal ... superavisset: *is exercitu parvo* was very frequently 'with his small army'. All but the very strongest candidates failed to render the superlative *plurimos*.

Africano ... poneret: to their credit, nearly all candidates did their best to bring out the oblique case of *Africano quaerenti*; most took it as an ablative absolute, which was accepted as close enough to the hoped-for indirect object. This section was usually handled well. Those who turned the dative participle into a main clause with only a comma to link it to the following one had this counted as a major error.

Hannibal ... conciliandi: the ablative absolute proved an excellent discriminator, with about half the candidates getting it fully correct; the commonest errors were 'many enemies having been defeated by his army/armies', which at least makes reasonable sense. *artem habebat homines conciliandi* was mostly handled well; the problem, however, was the addition of the pronoun *sibi*, which defeated at least half the candidates; 'his men' was the commonest version.

cum ... duceret: the first half caused few problems, but *quem tertium duceret* defeated three-quarters of the candidates, because many did not recognise *quem*, while the meaning 'consider' for *duco* (listed as such in the DVL) was unfamiliar to most. Nearly all knew *tertius*, however.

sine ... sum: the great majority of candidates translated this section correctly.

magno ... vicisses: many thought that *quid* could mean 'whom'. Many treated the past unfulfilled condition as if it had been present; had they done so they would have gained only a minor error, as the sense is little different here.

tum ... posuissem: half of the candidates tried 'I would have been able' for *me posuissem*, which generated further problems trying to fit the sense of the rest of the sentence around this. The polysyndeton troubled weaker candidates, who tried unsuccessfully to insert an inappropriate 'and' either before or after *me*.

hoc ... motus est: nearly all handled this very well. Treating *hoc responso* as an ablative absolute was accepted.

quod ... maiorem: the great majority grasped the sense of this, and only a few got it completely the wrong way round. Well over half thought that *maiorem* was the comparative of *bonus*; this counted as a minor error, as it made little difference to the sense. Many did not recognise the ablative of comparison, writing 'out of all' or similar.

Question 2

Verres ... auferendi: the frequent 'such' was accepted for *tanta*. A wide range of meanings was given for *incensus est*; provided they equated more or less to 'incited' these were all accepted; 'incensed' however was not (minor error). The gerunds were handled very well, with only a few insisting on the word 'must' appearing somewhere. The commonest error in this section was failure to recognise *vasa* as plural; this counted as a major error, because there was plenty of evidence that there were several vases. Any subsequent repetition of this error was ignored.

ut ... posceret: a surprising number of weaker candidates made *Diodorum* the subject; also there were a few who had no idea that English uses only the nominative forms of proper nouns. Nearly all identified the result clause, but only half could express this correctly in English: 'so that' counted as a minor error. *Ad se* caused some difficulties for weaker candidates.

ille ... reliquisse: *ille* was often guessed at: 'he replied to him' was not accepted. *Se vasa* was frequently 'his vases'. *Propinquum suum* was very often plural, probably because *apud* was thought of as belonging more naturally to a plural noun.

tum ... mittat: retention of the historic present was accepted; what was not accepted was switching from present to past or vice versa. Most recognised the accusative of goal of motion. 'Asked Diodorus so that...' was counted as a major error. The presence of *illum* and *suum* either side of *propinquum* defeated most candidates, who usually omitted one of them or, worse, took *suum* with *litteras*. 'Letters' (far more frequent than the correct singular) counted as a minor error, as being of little importance to the sense.

Diodorus ... scribit: only a handful of candidates recognised the causal use of *qui* with the subjunctive (the almost universal 'who wanted' counted as a minor error, because of the rarity of the construction). *Sua* was most often 'himself' (major error).

ut ... Lilybaeum: *iis qui* wreaked havoc among all but the very best candidates. The *ut* clause was usually mishandled: indirect command was looked for; purpose was accepted as well, but not result. The juxtaposition of *se* and *illud* also caused many difficulties. Although most recognised the indirect statement, most turned it into the passive: 'that silver had been sent'; here the omission of *se* counted as a major error (for omission of a word), as did the even worse 'his silver'.

Question 3

(a)   All knew one of the words for 'emperor'. It was pleasing to see a number of instances of *veritus est* alongside the more usual *timebat*. All knew the fearing construction. A few were unsure of the correct word for 'senate', and tried *senatores, patres* or even *curiam*, all of which were accepted. Most formed the imperfect subjunctive correctly; a few even gave a correct historic future subjunctive.

(b)   Half the candidates used *imperavit*, the other half *iussit*; the use of the latter with *ut* and the subjunctive, which appeared several times, was allowed, as being a Livian usage. Again most formed the imperfect subjunctive correctly, though a few thought *custodire* was a 1st conjugation verb.

(c)   Most used *igitur* and placed it first in the sentence, which was accepted. There was occasional confusion over the distinction between *tam* and *adeo*. Many pleasingly gave the perfect subjunctive in the result clause, though they sometimes misspelt the perfect stem of *discedere*. The commonest error in this sentence, surprisingly, was the handling of 'from the city', where half the candidates omitted the preposition and many of the rest gave *ex* with the accusative.

(d)   Various words were used for 'although', in nearly all cases followed by the correct mood. Most formed the superlative correctly. Many did not know the Latin word for 'no one' and had to try sometimes ingenious substitutes. A few tried *se* for 'them', which does not work. Many could not form a past indicative of *posse* correctly.

(e) Those who attempted an ablative absolute for 'since few had been killed' sometimes threw marks away because they could not form ablative cases of the relevant words correctly. The indirect statement was handled successfully by the best, but most failed to make 'safe' agree with the accusative pronoun; *eos* was accepted instead of *se* as being theoretically possible.

Conclusion

Every effort was made at Standardisation to ensure that the marking standards applied to Questions 2 and 3 kept the two alternatives closely correlated, so that no candidate was disadvantaged by offering one rather than the other. Those candidates who had time to spare and attempted all three questions showed that they were capable of scoring just as highly on Question 3 as on the alternative.

F362 Latin Verse and Prose Literature

General comments

The Examiners are satisfied that this unit provided its candidates with questions of suitable difficulty and appropriate challenge. This was the final 'outing' for the two set texts prescribed, Cicero's First Catiline Oration and Ovid's Metamorphoses VIII. Most candidates found the questions accessible and understandable, and have clearly enjoyed handling these fine pieces of literature.

There were almost no examples this year of whole centres making identical mistakes in the translation questions; this is very reassuring. In the translation questions there were the usual and perhaps inevitable errors of omitted words, which will be mentioned in more detail in the question specific remarks below, but there were more numerous examples of perfectly accurate translation.

Recall of the 'storyline' of the texts was clearly firm in this group of candidates, whose answers to the comprehension questions were consistently achieving high, indeed full marks. Very few examples appeared this year of candidates offering 'style' discussion in what were content-based comprehension questions, and it was reassuring that such advice in previous reports had been observed.

Not so many candidates produced unfinished scripts this year, though there were some scripts in which there were clear signs of acceleration in the last question. The Ovid essay was sometimes a little foreshortened; yet not always where there had been very lengthy, or very accurate, answers to the preceding questions. But generally there was not a great difference between the marks scored on each author.

Fewer candidates than last year, but still a measurable number, were 'overanswering' those questions which required discussion of both content and style points. As with last year, all acceptable points which candidates made were rewarded, and it is possible, ideally only *in extremis*, to pick up one mark for a point made only in English, but the Examiners would wish to repeat their warning that trying to discuss more than the three or four Latin references asked for can be prejudicial to time management. Of course an answer containing no Latin reference at all can only achieve half the marks on offer at best.

The Examiners were frequently impressed with candidates' approaches to discussion of the stylistic aspects of the Latin. There were fewer bravura displays cataloguing technical terms and more grasp of how the stylistic or rhetorical points actually worked. There was still some confusion between assonance and alliteration in verse discussion, and some candidates have some quite imaginative views of the emotional, erotic or tonal effects of repeated consonants, but Cicero's use of commas has *almost* entirely disappeared as an attempted focus for discussion.

Not so many examples of scansion of the lines being discussed appeared this year. This may have been due to the nature of the questions and lines chosen, but it was welcome when observed, as it almost always indicates a high quality of thinking on the part of a candidate. In places candidates were still going beyond the lines asked for in their answers, especially on those questions which began their references at the second line of the passage rather than the first.

There was some looseness in references to the Latin, with rather vague quotation of the 'first word- three dots- last word' variety, who did not gain the mark for the Latin reference if they then discussed a word or phrase they had not actually quoted. There was also a surprisingly large number whose answers indicated inaccurate grasp of the meaning of the Latin they quoted, or who gave no indication of the meaning at all, even implicitly. Less strong candidates might well be advised always to follow the 'quote- translate- discuss' formula to be 'on the safe side'. Failure to show clearly that a candidate knows the meaning of the Latin he or she is quoting is apt to lose them the mark for the reference.

The short essays were awarded quite a range of marks, but were often very well done indeed, with many candidates clearly knowing their texts well, and able to argue their points in a clear and well developed way. The standard errors of not going beyond the Latin printed in the passages on the paper and trying to re-shape other essays into the questions set did appear. A few candidates in the Ovid essay took their discussion into parts of Metamorphoses VIII not prescribed, sometimes at the expense of recall of important points from the parts which were. Centres might be advised to take care with this.

The Examiners would like to thank centres and candidates for all the fine teaching and learning that underpinned the work they have seen in these scripts.

Some points of Advice for Candidates:

These are much the same as they were for 2010, as the Examiners still feel that they will be useful to centres and candidates.

1.   Note whether the question requires a style comment or not.

2.   Try to focus quotations from the Latin. In a discussion of a vital style point, it is very important   to quote the exact Latin word or phrase being discussed, rather than a 'start' word, three dots and an 'end' word.

3.   Observe the number of points asked for in a question and try not to go too much over that number. Develop the habit of discussing only a few lines or sentences rather than a whole passage. Granted that 'If in doubt, don't miss it out' makes sense, do not prejudice the amount of time you allow yourself. The right number of references to Latin expressions, with an appropriate discussion of each, is better than too many discussion points not supported by Latin.

4.   Do observe the line numbers quoted in a question, and the Latin words printed in italics within the question to show where the Latin to be referred to begins and ends. References taken from outside those limits will not be awarded marks.

5.   In the essay questions, refer to as much of the story as you can, and do not restrict yourself to the Latin passage or passages printed on the paper. Always focus your discussion points on the question asked on the paper.

6.   Check your translation carefully for any word you might have missed out, often little conjunctions are overlooked, and they can be vital in indicating the connections within the author's argument or narrative.

Question Specific Remarks.

Section A Cicero

a.   This was generally well answered. *audacia* without *effrenata* was not thought to indicate sufficient excess and so received 1 mark out of 2. Some candidates erroneously discussed expressions in line 1 of the passage.

b.   Almost universally well and fully answered.

c.   Most candidates produced very complete and accurate translations of this passage; the loss of marks was chiefly for omission, as ever, and in dealing with prepared text such as this it is worth remembering that omission is effectively a major error.
Most common errors were: omission of *constrictam* or *teneri,* confusion of *coniurationem* with *consilia*, omission of *iam*, and *omnium*, imagining that *egeris, fueris* etc were imperfect rather than perfect, translation of *ubi fueris* as ' where you went to', and misconstruing *quem nostrum arbitraris.*

It was acceptable to translate the second and third sections in the more normal English order, with the main clause first.

Some Candidates treated the indirect questions as direct ones.

d.   This was generally well answered, with Candidates easily able to find sufficient Latin expressions to support their answers. There were many good expositions of the exclamation in *O tempora O mores* (Though 'tempura' battered its way onto a number of scripts.), and of the repetition of *vivit* with the shocked interrogative on the second time. The use of *immo vero* and the tricolon of outrageous things done by Catiline were also well understood. Some Candidates had not grasped the tone of *nos autem fortes viri*. Taking the phrase at its face value rather than ironically, they made harder work for themselves than they needed in arguing how it indicated Cicero's outrage.

e.   There were numerous fine answers here too. Again some candidates included discussion of line 1, which lay outside the question.

The anaphoras of *nemo* and *non* were well understood and discussed. A number of candidates lost marks in their answers to this question through not giving indications that they really knew the meaning of the Latin they quoted, however, merely stating that there were some rhetorical questions, sometimes giving the first and last words of the Latin. But there were also some fine discussions of *inusta*, *haeret* and *fama.*

 The best candidates also spotted the power of the tricolon of references to the body and understood it well.

Some candidates saw intriguing meanings in the alliteration of the 'qu- ' in the interrogative pronouns introducing the rhetorical questions. Discussion of the anaphora of those pronouns and the tricolon effects would have been more effective.

f.   This was generally well understood and answered. A paraphrase of lines 11-12, *nonne cumulasti* was deemed acceptable even without the hint of the murder of the son.

g. Many fine answers to this question appeared. Those that did not achieve the highest levels of marks tended either to confine their discussions to the Latin passages on the paper (in a few cases not dealing even with much material from those) or to provide a paraphrase of the speech with 'and so this is a brutal demolition of Catilline' inserted every so often. This was not a good way to be rewarded for the development of the argument.

Those who were awarded marks at the highest level showed that they understood the substructure of the question and discussed how Cicero showed:

- that Catiline's outward appearance of power and threat had been broken by Cicero's skilful intelligence work
- that Catiline was an appalling person and his fellow conspirators were no or little better,
- that Catiline was treacherous, unpatriotic and sacrilegious as well as murderous and criminal
- that he posed an even greater threat to the state than well known historical precedents (some Candidates even used the phrase *a fortiori* well in this part of their discussion.)

Some were also keen to show they could define 'brutal' and supported their argument well both with text reference and with the point that Cicero was working on flimsy evidence in places.

On the other hand, some took a perhaps too balanced approach and suggested that when Cicero offered to be kind and gentle to Catiline, he meant it, which rather misses the irony in some parts of the speech.

Section B Ovid

a. (i) Generally very well answered. There were some thoughtful explanations of what *sonus inhaesit* actually might have meant in reality.
    (ii) A surprising number of Candidates offered no mention of *illuc ascendere*

b. As ever, the chief errors were omissions, the commonest being:
    quoque, saepe, *ex illa* in the first section
    iam or *–que*, (or both), *procerum* and *quoque* in the second section
    etiam, nosse in the third section

There were more references than one might have wished to the 'European leader' in that section too, and in that couplet *faciem* was not infrequently read as *nomen*.

c. This was a question where Candidates proved oddly prone to omit mention of the meanings of the Latin expressions they used to support their answers. Minos was deemed handsome *seu caput abdiderat cristata casside pennis*, for instance without any reference to the meaning, or Scylla just admired his *torserat adductis hastilia lenta lacertis*.

The comparison to Phoebus was sometimes really too scantily discussed. '*Sic Phoebus*, she thinks he's a god' appearing at times.

The alliteration of 'l' in line 16 was given an erotic power without much discussion in some candidates' answers, though there was often sound discussion of the breathily passionate sibilance helping the meaning and context of line 18. Candidates might be encouraged to think about what tone they impute to alliteration and assonance a little more thoughtfully. It may be useful to encourage Candidates to include 'perhaps' in their assessments of the effects and tone of alliterations and other sound or rhythmic effects.

Nonetheless the best answers showed focussed grasp of the meaning en route to well thought out discussions of Scylla's infatuation and some included the adverb 'humorously' in dealing with the 'how' of the question, and supported that idea sensibly too.

d.   Here too there were more examples than the Examiners would have liked, of Latin references without much indication of knowledge of what they meant, and of rather loose focus in quotation.

The repetition of '*quo fugis*?' was usually very well discussed, but some candidates gave perhaps a little too much space to discussion of *exclamat* when there were more useful points to be made.

There were fine discussions of the word order and alliteration of line 2, the use of *immitis* (though again quite often quoted as a vital word but without a statement, or at least an accurate statement, of what it meant), and the use of *et scelus et meritum*.

Some of the most unfocused quotation came in discussion of lines 5-6. Admittedly there is a lot that could be said about this sentence in terms of its anaphora of *nec*, the tricolon of things which failed to move Minos and the effectively intertwined word order of *spes omnis in unum te mea congesta est*, but those points were made best when individual Latin phrases were commented on (rather than offering *nec te.....est* or just references to line numbers), and when sound indications of meaning were given too.

e.   This was very well answered indeed, with Candidates easily finding their 3 points. As in last year's essay question, however, there were a number of candidates who thought that Scylla had killed her father.

f.   Candidates who were not awarded the highest marks on this question tended to focus only on the passages printed, an admittedly fair quarry for points but not fair enough for the highest levels, or they paraphrased the storyline and inserted 'so here Ovid keeps his readers' interests' at intervals.

Better answers here tended to be 'thematic' discussing

- the setting of scenes to arouse interest
- the depiction and development of character
- the evoking of emotions, especially in the story of Daedalus and Icarus
- the use of suspense to encourage the reader to go on
- the intriguing threads that bound the stories together. This theme appeared in rather fewer answers than the Examiners might have anticipated
- use of style and rhetoric, and so on.

Candidates with this approach were often well able to point out *why* each of those ideas would keep a reader interested.

There were many candidates who clearly knew the texts in considerable detail and alluded to several moments in the text for each discussion point they made.

F363 Latin Verse

General comments

Examiners generally felt that the paper was of an appropriate level of difficulty which succeeded in stretching the very best ('stretch and challenge') while remaining sufficiently accessible to less strong candidates. The performance of candidates was good on the whole, with relatively few really outstanding or really weak scores. The average mark for each section was very closely in line with the 2010 paper.

As last year, Virgil was marginally the preferred set text author over Catullus - the questions on the set authors, though different in demand, produced comparable scores.

The Ovid unseen passage proved a stiff test, though very few candidates failed to make any sense of it at all. On the more complex couplets, only those with a wide vocabulary and secure grammar knowledge scored highly. Many chose to answer the Ovid section before the set texts, a sensible way of managing the time available for the set text questions.

Comments on individual questions

There was some outstanding work on the set texts. The best answers on the commentary questions shared the following:

- accurate knowledge of the text (all too often a phrase like *alta theatris fundamenta* was incorrectly taken by less strong candidates as 'foundations for high theatres')
- the use of quotation to show that the candidate knew what the text means
- accurate use of technical terms - though these are not always necessary, if candidates are going to use technical terms then they should use them correctly (i.e. spelt correctly). At this level it is surprising to encounter the word 'similie' (sic) so often
- the ability to discuss the *point* of a rhetorical feature - weaker answers are often mere lists of rhetorical features without being related to the wording of the question (alliteration of 't' does not necessarily make a line 'vivid' or 'memorable'!), thus scoring well on Assessment Objective 1 (AO1) but less well on Objective 2 (AO2).

Answers on the essay questions were generally less strong. The best spent perhaps little more than three quarters of a side of A4 discussing the printed passage before moving on to discuss the prescription as a whole, on which they maintained a sharp focus on the question. Many candidates, however, maintained the age-old tradition of trying to weave one of their prepared essays into an essay with a different title. Virgilians were more often the offenders in this respect - many found their way onto the *pietas* of Aeneas or, perhaps with greater relevance, the role of Fate. On the plus side, this year's essays showed a better balance between discussion of the passage and the rest of the prescription.

Section A: Virgil

1(a)   Candidates were almost always well-prepared on this passage and were able to make plenty of points to show how Virgil makes the picture of Carthage a vivid one. The usual method of answering was to go through the passage line by line, but some candidates focused on each of the three parts of the question separately and produced some excellent answers. Discussion of the bee simile was often disappointing, however, as many concentrated on its literary features (e.g. the wonderful alliteration in lines 12-13) without relating it to the question ('the activity of the Carthaginians'). When teaching

Virgilian similes it is all too easy to explore the poetry without leaving students with a clear idea of the basic point of comparison. In this case, relatively few candidates talked about the frenzied activity of the Carthaginians/bees (*exercet sub sole labor … fervet opus*).

1(b)   At this level, candidates are expected to pause for thought before launching into their essay. Those who failed to do so tended to concentrate on anything to do with the greatness of Rome and scored less well than more thoughtful candidates who tackled the half of the question relating to the degree of optimism in Aeneid 1 as a whole. Though it was possible to win full marks by arguing that the tone is optimistic throughout (e.g. that there is no doubt that Aeneas will succeed because the events predicted by Jupiter were mostly already history to Virgil's audience) but the best answers explored some of the darker moments of the book: Aeneas' suffering, his despair during the storm, his private feelings of despair when making his encouraging speech to his men, the opposition of Juno, *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* etc.). On the essay, limited quotation in Latin is welcome but not required; certainly required is detailed reference to the events of the rest of the book. Centres are reminded that knowledge of the *whole* of the book is prescribed (i.e. lines not set for study in Latin should be studied in English translation). Comments on the printed passage were largely strong, though the sloppy misidentification of the tenses of *pono* and *dedi* was common and tended to distort the candidates' point (the perfect tense of *dedi* is significant - Austin has a good note on it).

Section A: Catullus

2(a)   There were some excellent answers to the question on this intriguing poem. Most were able to discuss in detail the lively personification of the boat and many were also able to pick out how Catullus brings life to the places it had visited through the use of names, adjectives and apostrophe. The best also discussed the structure of the poem (retirement - earlier life - birth - later life - retirement), the relationship between the boat and its master, and the lively use of iambic metre.

2(b)   Candidates were mostly well able to discuss the humour of Poem 13 and other poems, but were less impressive when responding to the prompt-word 'sophistication' in the title. Some talked of Catullus himself rather than his poetry. Some, reasonably enough given the title ('to what extent ...'), argued that many of his poems are *not* humorous or sophisticated before reproducing what read like prepared essays on Catullus as a love poet. Some were clearly disappointed not to have a question on the Attis poem but wrote about it anyway (unconvincingly) as a poem with some funny moments in it. The best candidates who understood better what makes Catullus a sophisticated poet were able to relate the Attis poem more directly to the wording of the question. Background knowledge about Catullus as a poet was sometimes relevant, though occasionally candidates were so desperate to write everything they knew about the neoterics and the fact that Catullus was a *novi poetae* (sic) that they did not leave themselves time for much else.

Section B: Ovid unseen translation, comprehension and appreciation

As expected, candidates scored more highly on the section set for comprehension and appreciation than on the translation. On the translation, those who lacked knowledge of terminations struggled to construe the more difficult couplets and resorted to using their vocabulary knowledge to put together a basic paraphrase of what seemed to be going on in the story.

(a)(i)   Most answered this correctly, although some were confused by the meaning of the word *tellus* or the word order *quae nescit Ariona tellus* (or both). Despite the clear guidance of the introduction, some thought that no one had heard of Arion.

(a)(ii) This should have been a straightforward sentence with an easy main verb, an obvious accusative (*aquas*) with a participle (*currentes*) clearly agreeing with it, and a noun in the ablative (*carmine*). Many, however, described his poetry as being like running water or did not grasp what Ovid means by saying that Arion 'held' (i.e. controlled) the waters. A couple of charioteers cropped up too.

(b)(i)   Problems were caused here by the dislocation of *est* from *retentus* and the verb *restitit*, which was often taken as 'resisted', usually with fatal consequences for the sense. The best answers not only translated the lines correctly but gave a brief overall comment on Arion's ability to alter the normal course of nature.

(b)(ii) Candidates who have read a fair amount of Ovid in preparation for this paper should be used to the sort of balance and contrast in these lines. Many commented intelligently on the anaphora of *saepe,* the chiasmus of case endings in *agnam lupus … agna lupum* and the contrast of the participle *sequens* and *fugiens.*

(c)   The question required discussion of Ovid's <u>choice</u> of words. Some chose instead to discuss the position of *captaque erat* without showing what it meant or why *capere* was an effective choice of word. Many sensibly picked out *impleverat* and translated it correctly, though there was a fair amount of confusion from candidates who knew what an *impluvium* was and thought that Arion's poems were raining down on the cities of Sicily.

(d)   As last year, the scansion question was answered well and there was some evidence that centres' teaching of scansion allows candidates to make informed comments on metre elsewhere on the paper. For example, the correct identification of the long syllables of *infelix* coming after the first foot dactyl *forsitan* allowed candidates to refer to it in their answer to (e) by saying that not only is the word emphatic but its meaning is emphasised by the movement of the line. This is exactly what the paper setter had hoped.

(e)   Most commented on *infelix* but many struggled to find a second point. The best commented on Ovid's use of apostrophe and realised that we do not pity Arion because he was afraid of the sea, but because he did not realise that it was in fact safer than his own ship.

(f)   It had been hoped that the phrases *destricto ense*, *cetera turba* and *armata manu* would give candidates easy marks here, but not all succeeded.

(g)   The unseen translation of Latin verse is admittedly hard - this passage was no different from others in requiring thorough analysis of word terminations (e.g. the ability to match adjectives with nouns).

         In the first sentence, *pavidus* was often not known but Examiners allowed a wide variety of methods of showing how scared Arion was ('shaking with fear' was the best). There were good translations of *liceat* (e.g. 'but may I be allowed …?') but *sumpta* was often omitted or translated over-literally as 'with my having been taken up lyre'. What Examiners wanted was something like 'but let me take up my lyre and play a few songs'. This is the sort of thing that wins the two bonus marks for improvement on a literal translation.

In the next sentence, *veniam* was often not known, *moram* was taken as 'death' or 'custom' and *tuos* was taken as 'you' rather than with *crines.* Translations such as 'they gave him what he asked for' were accepted for *dant veniam*.

The next two couplets defeated all but the best:

protinus in medias ornatus desilit undas: *ornatus* (here = 'having put on his crown/wreath') is admittedly difficult (it might have been glossed, perhaps) but it was surprising to see so many struggle with the meaning of *desilit*, particularly when the context was relatively clear.

spargitur impulsa caerula puppis aqua: it had been hoped that candidates who scored full marks on the scansion question (most did) would have been able to analyse this sentence correctly. Scansion of the first half of the line shows that *impulsa* must have a long final 'a' and so must presumably agree with *aqua* (which could be ablative) not *puppis* (which can't)*.* The final 'a' of *caerula* is short and so it must agree with *puppis*. The bare bones of the line now become clear: the dark boat was scattered (splashed, perhaps?) by water which had been *impulsa. impulsa* is the last remaining difficulty, solved by the rare candidates who wrote something like 'by water which had been churned up/forced upwards'.

inde (fide maius) tergo delphina recurvo / se memorant oneri supposuisse novo: the word order needs reconstructing here to put adjectives with nouns; *memorant delphina tergo recurvo se supposuisse oneri* novo: 'they tell that a dolphin with a curved back placed itself beneath its new burden'. The phrase *fide maius* was not unlike last year's *vera loquar, veri vix habitura fidem*. It was translated acceptably by very few candidates indeed, who either thought instinctively that it must mean something like 'you are hardly going to believe this' or who analysed the grammar: *maius* - comparative of *magnus* and therefore presumably 'greater'; *fide* - ablative of *fides* and perhaps ablative of comparison; 'greater than faith/trust' i.e. something that cannot be trusted or believed.

Even the weakest candidates scored well on the two sections of Latin contained in the last couplet, though many lost a mark by not seeing that *pretium vehendi cantat* means something like 'he sang the price of his fare'. In the last sentence, candidates were allowed a fair bit of leeway on *aequoreas* - the best took it as something to do with *aequor* rather than *aequus* and translated it as 'the waters of the sea', vel sim.

Summary

The paper is designed to be accessible to all candidates whilst incorporating elements of 'stretch and challenge'. It is hoped that all candidates felt they had chance to show what they knew and could do, and that the very best students felt suitably extended, especially on the Ovid. The fact that the mean mark for the paper was once again high is a reflection of their success. Despite some disappointment with responses to the Ovid, Examiners once again emerged from their marking of the set text questions feeling that their appreciation of the Virgil and Catullus passages selected had been heightened by some of the things candidates had to say about them. Candidates and their teachers are therefore to be congratulated.

F364 Latin Prose

General comments

Tacitus was again by far the most popular prose text, offered by over 90% of candidates. For Section B, approximately two thirds of candidates selected the Comprehension/Unseen Translation, and there was inevitably a much wider range of performance here than amongst the Prose Composition candidates - though examiners were delighted to record a clutch of top-notch scores for both options.

The time allowed seemed about right for the majority of candidates, except for those who became so engrossed in answering Question 1 or 2 that they left themselves insufficient time to explore the Language section thoroughly. Perhaps those who tackled the paper in reverse had the right idea as, with Q3 or Q4 in the bank, they were then free to devote whatever time they had left to their two literary essays.

Comments on individual questions

Section A: general comments

The paramount aim for any A Level candidate should, of course, be to address the specific question set. For each author this year's paper posed a contrasting pair of questions - one largely to do with overall thrust and content, the other focusing more on the author's approach and style in the passage. The most successful candidates were those who sensed the difference between the two and adapted their approach accordingly. Those who regarded both questions as wholly about style laboriously collected small-scale examples from Q1a or Q2a which contributed little or nothing towards answering the bigger question, Conversely for Q1b or Q2b, those who cited no more than the occasional word from the Latin were guilty of summarising what the passage is saying rather than exemplifying the author's literary technique.

Approaches actually to constructing answers swung between working methodically through the passage item-by-item and picking out material according to type. Both could work successfully, given a strict enough focus on the target of the question itself and a satisfactory range over the passage as a whole. There was a regrettable tendency generally to aim for excessive length, sometimes including a large amount of scene-setting (which scored no marks) before reaching the issue raised in the question. The average length for an essay was perhaps 2-3 sides of average-size handwriting: some of the best were wonderfully succinct, totally focused essays of around one side and a half. At the other extreme Examiners were occasionally treated to exceedingly brief answers of less than one side, which inevitably could do justice neither to the question nor to the large amount of material available in the passage.

In general candidates who base the majority of their points on the actual Latin text are more likely to achieve the desired result for any question than those who work almost exclusively via English translation or paraphrase. As mentioned in last year's report on this unit, there is a tendency for candidates to pick on isolated scraps of Latin, rather than to give quotations in full which properly match the comments being made about them. Simply appending the occasional Latin word or sentence in a bracket is not the same thing as choosing a quotation out of which an observation or comment is then developed. Making reference to the text by quoting first and last words or by using line numbers is an acceptable method if the section quoted is lengthy, but full quotation of the Latin is generally preferable - and essential if the candidate is trying to discuss features of an author's style.

Question 1: Tacitus

(a) *Show how Tacitus portrays Poppaea as cunning and manipulative in this passage.*

Most candidates seemed very familiar with this passage and found little difficulty in finding plenty of nasty references to Poppaea. Too many, however, allowed their discussion to drift onto a general consideration of the passage, cataloguing stylistic details instead of keeping the focus on Tacitus' portrayal of Poppaea as cunning and manipulative. This was particularly the case with points taken from the beginning and end of the passage, such as Nero's growing love for Poppaea and the 'long contemplated crime' of doing away with Agrippina, both of which certainly could be made relevant but it was not sufficient simply to mention them and leave it at that. Poppaea's taunting of Nero as a *pupillum* or her threat (bluff?) to leave him and return to Otho were also regularly mentioned without showing any real appreciation of their significance. Conversely, fairly minor features such as the mention of *sibi matrimonium* before *discidium Octaviae* were often given enormous significance regardless of whether they had any bearing on the initial question. An occasional shortcoming was to report Poppaea's words in the passage as if they are genuine quotation, instead of commenting on Tacitus' sly trick of insinuating his own opinions in his narrative.

(b) *How does Tacitus' language convey his strong disapproval of Nero's excesses in this passage?*

Here the best candidates analysed the whole passage in detail and with a high degree of sophistication, linking points about content to those about stylistic features, making apt use of rhetorical terms and quoting to support each point, alongside a translation or at least a clear indication of meaning. Again, however, there was a frequent tendency to highlight phenomena such as polysyndeton or alliteration without any explanation regarding how these features relate to the original title. Many, for example, could spot a tricolon such as *conventicula et cauponae et ... inritamenta* but only the better candidates went on to say something about its impact, thus actually linking the device to the question. Another fault was to become so engrossed with selecting *minutiae* of the author's style that important parts of the bigger picture (e.g. the contrast between Augustus and Nero's use of the area round the lake, or the whole of the final sentence) went unmentioned - and it is worth noting that Examiners expect candidates to select the best available material across the whole passage, not just from the first half of it or wherever the candidate has managed to get to in the time available.

Question 2: Livy

The small cohort of candidates who answered on Livy generally produced answers of a very sound standard, though showing a lesser degree of sophistication than their Tacitus equivalents simply because there was not so much that could sensibly be highlighted by way of stylistic comment.

(a) *Show how Livy portrays Pacuvius Calavius as ambitious and cunning in this passage.*

Most candidates fared pretty well here, showing a clear overview of the situation and background, providing details/dates by way of context. The main problem (again) was with those who did not focus on the terms of the question. Some candidates became rather muddled when trying to explain the niceties of PC's plan, or - perhaps themselves swept along by his rhetoric - did not make enough of the fact that PC is all the time deceiving the senate for his own ends. The references to PC's family links with Rome were also sometimes either misinterpreted or overlooked. Some of the stronger answers analysed the various stages of PC's rhetoric in the passage - first making the senators afraid, then

gaining their trust by appearing to be on their side, finally offering them an instant means of salvation. Whilst the focus of this question was not essentially on stylistic analysis, candidates often supported their argument appropriately with well-chosen stylistic details.

(b)   *What makes this passage a good example of vivid historical narrative?*

Many candidates sensibly tackled the question thematically, picking out instances of Livy's style for comment and analysis, rather than working through the passage in order, A wide variety of dramatic aspects was identified in the story, such as the difficult relationship between father and son, the build-up to the banquet, the tension between Hannibal and PC, young PC's awkwardness at dinner followed by his startling proposal in the garden. The strongest candidates took care to make comments about the style of presentation in the passage, rather than just cataloguing items which make it a good story. Similar problems occurred here as for Q1b regarding the use/abuse of rhetorical features. Surprisingly few candidates commented on the change to direct speech at the end of the passage - and indeed there were some disconcerting errors in the translation of these lines, including confusion about the tense of *fuimus*.

Section B:

Question 3: Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

There was inevitably an enormous spectrum of performance on this option. The best candidates scored almost full marks, making the passage look quite straightforward in the process, but the general level of success was disappointing as the culmination of several years of Latin study. The crux of the problem was not candidates' vocabulary, which in most cases seemed quite serviceable, but grammar. Not only did the grammar questions themselves frequently reveal a staggering lack of expertise regarding what might look to some teachers very undemanding points, but the translation section often lost all coherence because of some extremely basic errors and a tendency simply to shift the words around at random in an effort to find some kind of sense, rather than fitting them together on linguistic principles.

(a)   Usually fine, though many candidates missed out one of the 4 mini-elements required (time/opportunity/trickery/deceit) and *fraudis* was commonly rendered inappropriately as 'fraud'.

(b)   Most candidates had no problem finding two out of the various points available.

(c)   There were some excellent answers here. Some candidates, however, did not give this question quite the thought it deserved producing hasty responses (e.g. Caesar's use of the historic present) which did not really focus on the question. Careful candidates quoted precisely and related their choices specifically to the 'trigger' word 'speed'.

(d)   There was a tendency among weaker candidates not to check the context in which these isolated nouns appear. Many correctly wrote 'Ablative' twice - and then again for *arma*, which then required some ingenuity to explain!

(e)   Most candidates failed this question by mechanically supplying 'from' which was not regarded as an idiomatic translation in context. A secondary issue was *diutino*, which was not always correctly deduced from *diu*.

(f)   Surprisingly many wrote simply 'infinitive' or suggested all sorts of types, such as perfect or some kind of passive. Again, consideration of the word in its context might have helped to steer the unsure in the right direction.

(g)   The use of the subjunctive after *cum* (whether temporal or causal) was generally recognised. Perhaps predictably, the appearance of *ut* led immediately to a rash of purpose clauses, regardless of the preceding 'signpost' *sic.* While not unusual at GCSE level, this is exactly the kind of mistake which examiners were distressed to find cropping up so frequently on an A2 paper.

(h)   A testing piece perhaps - particularly the second half - but quite typical of Caesar's style and range of vocabulary.   Words such *as tormenta, perfidia, tempestas, fiducia, alteram,* and *admonere* ought to have come fairly readily, also common Caesarean idioms such as the use of *nostri* for 'our men' and even *infecta re*, which virtually no candidate was able to render convincingly. Many versions descended almost immediately into a meaningless stream of vocabulary, with just the occasional phrase (e.g. 'in a very short time' or 'on the following day') rescuing them from complete incoherence. The short middle sentence (*temptaverunt ... die*) was a lifesaver for many, even those who insisted on writing 'tempted'. Case endings often went overboard, and the logic of the storyline was not taken into consideration nearly enough. As an example, in the final sentence, whilst many candidates could handle the ablative absolute convincingly, they would then frequently disregard the accusative ending of *reliquos*, turn the verb from active to passive, and end the story with everything happening the wrong way round! In general, sheer incomprehension of the passage meant that few candidates were able to gain the two marks available for good English, though many did enough to deserve one. Examiners are looking here, not for totally polished English, but simply for a few indications of conscious searching for appropriate English idiom, such as selecting an apt rendering of a few individual words (e.g. *tempestas* as 'weather conditions') or doing something cleverer with ablative absolutes than the 'having been somethinged' approach.

Q4: Prose Composition

Candidates for this option generally seemed to know the grammatical principles well, even if they couldn't always produce word-formations accurately. Although examiners saw few completely accurate versions, there were also very few poor attempts and almost everyone was able to introduce sufficient touches of good Latin idiom to earn a decent proportion of the 10 bonus marks available.

Conspicuous syntactical faults included:

- cases for time phrases ('for a few days'),
- use of *post* for *postquam* (and vice versa),
- overuse of ablative absolutes, even when technically impossible (e.g. *longo proelio pugnato*),
- the use of present participles when past would be better (e.g. 'urging his men ...'),
- forgetting to use the subjunctive after various constructions (notably after *cum*, and for the indirect command 'urging his men to stand firm').

Candidates' working knowledge of vocabulary was generally good and, where it failed, gave rise to some ingenious solutions which might just about pass muster for a Roman reader!   If in a corner, it is generally better to think about the underlying sense and make up a plausible periphrasis than to stick rigidly to the English. For example, *captores* is a word that barely exists in Latin, certainly not in the sense required here: a reasonable substitute was *custodes*, but a periphrasis such as *ei qui eos ceperant* really does the job best.

Specific vocabulary problems included:

- rest: *dormire* was adequate, *se quieti dare* merited a bonus mark,
- advanced: too many just used something like *iit*
- go past: some knew *praeterire*, others used *praeter* correctly, adequate substitutes were *per* or *vitare* or something like *transgredi*
- menacing: an impressive number of candidates knew *minax*, (though many of these were not aware of its correct ablative formation) and quite a few came up with an attractive alternative (e.g. *magna voce* or *vehementer*)
- attack: impressive to see *impetum facere* so often used
- took heart: this appeared to puzzle many, but there were lots of good suggestions (e.g. *incitati*, *animo refecto*)
- imprisoned: there is no verb *incarcero*, though many tried to use it: the best solution is therefore to make up a periphrasis (e.g. *in vincula iacere* or *in carcere tenere*)
- rescued: surprisingly few thought of *servare*, and many incorrectly substituted the late ecclesiastical verb *salvare* ('saved' in a rather different sense!). As always, *in extremis* a periphrasis is the intelligent way out (e.g. *e carcere trahere*).

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)
Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)

Chief Examiner's Report

Many candidates did outstandingly well this year, as always. On each of the four units, there were candidates who gained full marks (raw marks, not UMS adjusted marks). Three of the components are demanding in terms of time: last year, most candidates coped with this, but there was evidence of haste. This year, teachers and candidates seem to have thought out strategies by which to make the best of the time available, and there was less indication of rush.

Many candidates did outstandingly well and very few did seriously badly, but there were those who could have served themselves better, and have bettered their marks, if they had paid a little more attention to detail, in various forms. In all the components that involve literature, for example, some are insufficiently precise in the way they cite the Greek: ten or a dozen words may indeed contain the ones the candidate wishes to identify for special mention, but the examiners need to know *exactly* which ones they are, and also to know that the candidate knows what they mean and is not simply relying on an English translation and settling for approximation rather than accuracy. In the same vein, when citing Greek in literary questions, candidates should use breathings, which they show they are perfectly capable of doing when they write Greek sentences or prose composition.

F371 Classical Greek Language

General

This year's paper proved to be accessible to most candidates, many getting very high marks, and in not a few cases full marks, not only on the Section A unseen, but also on the Lysias and on the sentences, in the case of those who did them.

Section A – Question 1

Most candidates had no problems with the beginning: a few were unsure of the meaning of προθυμοῦντα, but generally managed to arrive at a reasonable conjecture. Less careful ones took πολεμεῖν as a noun. The indirect statement in the first sentence was usually successfully negotiated, but fewer saw that it was continued in the ἔχοντα of the second clause. ἄσμενος was the first (and perhaps really the only) word in the passage to be unfamiliar to a considerable proportion of candidates: those who did know it found it best to treat it as if an adverb. ἤκουσαν was sometimes taken as part of ἤκω. A considerable number failed to identify the imperfect in μετεπέμπετο and translated it as 'had sent for...' ὑπισχνούμενος was occasionally unfamiliar, and some thought it was a future participle expressing purpose. The overall sense of ὁ μεταπεμψάμενος was generally right: but some had 'the one who had been sent for', or 'having been sent for', which caused considerable problems subsequently as to who was doing what; and omission of the article, even amongst those who correctly identified the aorist middle, was common. Many translated ἀπέδωκε (too) literally as 'gave away'; for once, the compounding preposition was unhelpful, but this was not penalised. Those who could not work out what ἐξαπατηθείς came from generally knew that it was an aorist passive participle, and came up with something appropriate if not wholly right. There was, as usual, confusion between βούλομαι and βουλεύομαι, and some, especially those who thought ἐβουλεύετο came from the former, had τί δεῖ ποιεῖν the wrong way round ('wanted to do what was necessary'). ἐκ τούτου was not well known (idioms with οὗτος in general caused problems this year). ἀφίστανται was pleasingly well done; in the next section there was a little more over-translation in ἀπέλιπον: 'they left [the king] behind' suggests a basic misunderstanding of what the Egyptians did. καί in this section was frequently omitted. In the following sentence, δύο was often misplaced ('two factions...') or used twice; αἱροῦνται was sometimes confused with αἴρω. γνούς, though by no means always perfect, was by and large sensibly done, and usually given a sense at least of 'thought', if not actually 'knowledge'. μισθός was sometimes taken as μῖσος. μετὰ τούτου, like ἐκ τούτου above, caused some trouble: 'after him/this' was common. Not all separated ἕτερον and βασιλέα, producing 'he set up another king', but καθίστημι was encouragingly well done. In the last sentence, μέσου was sometimes unfamiliar; and Agesilaos frequently went home 'in a storm'.

Section B – Question 2

Candidates were much happier with this year's piece of Lysias, with its more familiar forensic setting, than last year's, and a good number of versions were wholly correct.

It was not necessary to translate both οὗτος and δή at the beginning, but some element of emphasis was needed: some candidates used both; 'in fact, this man here...' etc. Not all knew καταφρονέω; less forgivable was ὑμῶν as 'us'. Not all got ἠδέσατο as from αἰδέομαι; οἶδα was a fairly common, and not a bad, suggestion. The ἐμέλησεν section was well negotiated, except that αὐτῷ was sometimes done twice: 'he did not care at all about these dangers to him'. This was not penalised, but 'the dangers of these men' was; 'not' was just about enough for οὐδέν, though 'none of these dangers' was quite common. The βούλομαι/βουλεύομαι

confusion appeared again; and some had problems with English syntax in rendering the aorist passive infinitive in δημευθῆναι. Some seemed to think that πάσαις ... ζημίαις was some kind of absolute construction with part of πάσχω ('having suffered all penalties'). The first sentence of the second paragraph caused most candidates little trouble, though some made a double mistake in ἐπιστάμενος in both meaning and form: 'having been trusted'. Candidates seemed either to see the point of the last sentence, or not: quite a number, having found the rest, apparently, plain sailing, lost the sense completely, usually through taking ἐξεῖναι as 'go out', and not linking δίκην and λαμβάνειν.

Section B – Question 3

A very respectable number of candidates did this option; almost all who did, did it very well and again some gained full marks. The examiners allow candidates a fair degree of licence (for example, ἄνθρωπος is not really the right word in sentence (a), but was accepted with the right accidence), but the syntax and accidence must be correct.

(a) Some produced a conflation of the two comparative structures; a small number used the superlative instead of the comparative.

(b) Not everyone knew a word for courage; the spelling of εἰρήνη caused trouble.

(c) 'Called' caused some problems: aorist passive participles were fine, of course, if right, but hard work compared with ὀνόματι. Some were doubtful as to what case Admetus should be in. 'Whom', though, was well done, as was the aorist/imperfect of τιμάω.

(d) Very well done, with whatever indirect construction; almost all remembered that δεῖ must be present; one or two even got it in the optative, and correct. Infinitives of ἀποθνήσκω were usually correct in form, though not everyone can spell it ("ἀποθνεσκω" etc).

(e) No word for 'her' was needed, of course; those who put a wrong one in were therefore not penalised. 'So much' was not very well done, and sometimes over-complicated, though εἰς τοσοῦτο(ν) was welcome.

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General comments

The majority of candidates were clearly very well prepared for this paper, and had an excellent grasp of the two set texts studied. In a relatively few cases, candidates had a significantly better understanding of one of the texts, but as a rule most candidates coped very well with both sections of the paper. The best responses demonstrated an excellent recall of detail, and there were some well focused discussions of style, particularly in Section B.

The context questions in both sections of the paper proved a little more demanding than last year, though arguably the translations, particularly the Homer translation, were a little easier. Some weaker responses to the translation questions relied very heavily on a learned translation, which was not itself entirely accurate in some cases, and one or two candidates continued beyond the end of the set section; this was particularly noticeable on the Lysias option, where the last section of the passage formed the translation. Candidates who struggled with the translation section in many cases found those questions requiring precise reference to the Greek very demanding; it cannot be stressed too highly how important it is for candidates to know the set texts extremely well.

Candidates should also remember that the presentation of their work on the page is an important matter. Examiners are always pleased to see work which is well laid out and clearly structured. This is particularly important in questions inviting a number of specific points to be made; it is very helpful if candidates separate out the points they are making into separate paragraphs, rather than producing a rather jumbled answer where it is not clear where one point ends and another begins. Examiners will try to disentangle an answer that has become confused, but are pleased to see well structured responses that are straightforward to credit. Many candidates leave empty lines between paragraphs and at the end of questions, and this was also commented on favourably. In some cases, candidates with challenging handwriting made marking significantly easier by double spacing their work.

In this specification, a number of questions demand close reference to the Greek text. The best answers demonstrated a fluent grasp of the Greek by selecting exactly those words which were relevant to the point being made. Some other candidates wrote out excessive amounts of Greek, even where this was not called for in the question; so, for example, Question 1(c) does not require the relevant Greek words for each point made, though a significant number of candidates included them. While this in no way affects the marks for the individual question, it can impact the amount of time a candidate has for more open-ended questions, such as the essays for both sections, and perhaps particularly the Homer essay, which was the final question for the majority of candidates.

Although it does not affect the mark, candidates should be aware that examiners expect the Greek text to be recorded accurately and with appropriate breathings (there is no need to include accents). Omitting breathings creates a negative impression.

Where a question requires close reference to the Greek, candidates should ensure that they include those words that are relevant to the point they are making. Examiners are unimpressed by excessively lengthy quotations from the Greek, particularly if the breathings are missing, and find it difficult to credit answers that rely on an unhelpful ellipse, where the beginning and end of a phrase are given, but neither of the words included in the answer book have any relevance to the point being made. The aim should be to make a point clearly and succinctly, using the Greek text (and translation, often very helpful in confirming understanding) to support the discussion. Clarity of communication should be the priority.

As was noted last year, some candidates too readily fall back on excessive use of technical vocabulary, which can in some cases render their answers opaque, especially if it is unclear how it should be applied. For example, as mentioned below in relation to Question 1(d), writing "polysyndeton of καί" without any further comment is unlikely to be very helpful, though a more developed discussion explaining the relevance in context will achieve full credit. Examiners are happy to reward clear discussion of the significant details of the Greek text without recourse to technical terms.

As last year, the final mark of a very few candidates was reduced because of the omission of a question. It is very important that candidates always check that they have worked through the paper in full, and this is much easier where the questions have been answered in order and the answers have been set out clearly. A small number of candidates do tackle the questions out of order, generally without any problem; but this is an issue of which all candidates should be aware.

Section A: Prescribed Prose Literature

1(a) This question proved more difficult than anticipated. Some leeway was agreed at standardisation, but candidates do need to be reminded of the importance of a clear grasp of the text. There were, as last year, a very few very long answers.

1(b) This question was generally answered effectively. There was no requirement to include the Greek text, and adding it in could affect the time candidates had for more open-ended questions such as the essays.

1(c) The vast majority of candidates got this right: a very few translated τοῖς παισὶν as 'family'.

1(d) This question was generally answered well, though some candidates wrote at excessive length, and did not always choose appropriate examples from the Greek text. Some wrote 'polysyndeton of καί' without explaining the significance of this here; better answers drew attention to the emphasis on what Peison removed from the chest, and linked it with his greed. The majority also picked up on his heartlessness at the end of the section. 'ὡμολόγησα' was often mistranslated.

1(e) This was generally translated very effectively, though a few candidates were relying too much on memory, and unfortunately carried on beyond the end of the passage. There were some awkward translations of 'ὅποι βαδίζοιμεν', and in the final line 'καί' was often omitted. Candidates did not always follow the Greek structure, and some leniency was allowed where this did not affect the sense of the passage.

1(f) Most candidates identified the superlative (not always recognised as such) 'ὦ σχετλιώτατε' and generally used it well. Some candidates struggled to find more examples from the passage, and there were some unconvincing references to rhetorical questions. Some were given credit for using 'ἐπὶ σοὶ μόνῳ' effectively, though only the best answers linked this with 'τὸ πλῆθος'. A few used 'ὡς φής' effectively, and there were some good accounts of the antitheses in the passage. However the difficulty of the passage made this a testing question that effectively discriminated between candidates. Good answers stood out, but it was possible to get full marks with less good responses.

1(g) The essay question was generally done acceptably, but there were relatively few very strong answers which focused on the specific demands of the question. The better essays spent longer on individual points with fuller discussion and clear references to the text; weaker answers covered a range of issues, though often without any sense of structure. Many candidates were able to use the beginning of the speech to good effect, and showed a good understanding of the various ways Lysias tries to involve the jury in his account. The better

answers were very clear on the contrast Lysias develops between himself and his family and the 30 as a group. All candidates mentioned the earrings removed from Polemarchus' wife's ears, and the majority the lack of respect shown to Polemarchus' body after his death. However the long narrative section (4-22) was not well used. Many mentioned the punishment of the generals after Arginousai, but only a few used it convincingly to answer the question. Better answers showed a good understanding of the way Lysias endeavours to implicate Eratosthenes in the general actions of the 30 and ensure that his guilt by association is clear to the jury. Some used the passages on the paper effectively to illustrate some aspects of Lysias' control of language, and no candidates focused solely on them to the exclusion of the rest of the prescription.

Section B: Prescribed Verse Literature

2(a) This question proved more demanding than expected. Many used the Sarpedon 'burial' scene but Apollo was not directly involved in it. The majority of candidates did include Hector in their answer.

2(b) This proved a little too easy, as there were so many proper names in the passage. Most candidates were able to deal with it effectively, though there were some who translated 'οἱ φρονέοντι' as if it referred to Apollo, and 'παρίστατο' was not always well done.

2(c) A significant number of candidates did not identify a tone here, and some of the answers revealed a limited understanding of the Greek. The best answers were able to identify the different tones employed by Apollo in disguise, and were able to link these clearly to the Greek. Some were able to use 'τίπτε μάχης ἀποπαυέαι;' to good effect, though fewer were convincing with 'οὐδέ τί σε χρή'. The tone of lines 8-9 was generally not convincingly discussed, but most candidates were better on lines 10-11.

2(d) This was generally very well done. However several candidates did miss this question out, presumably because they were rushing through the paper. As there were 6 marks at stake, this was a significant mistake to make. Candidates need to be reminded that setting out their work clearly, with appropriate spacing between answers, while helpful to the examiners, can also be advantageous to themselves.

2(e) This fine passage elicited an excellent range of responses. The best were confident and articulate, and separated their answers out into paragraphs clearly. Even weaker candidates could find some good points to make, though there were also some very unconvincing references to alliteration and word placement. Many used 'ὀλιγοδρανέων' well, and there were some good discussions of the use of apostrophe here. There were also some excellent discussions of 'ῥηιδίως' and the use of enjambment. Many candidates also focused on Patroclus' spirited response to Hector, though they didn't always link together the different elements. There were some good assessments of the significance of 'τοι ἤδη | ἄγχι παρέστηκεν θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή' and there were some very effective discussions of the reference to Achilles at the end of the speech.

2(f) The essay was generally of a higher standard than the essay in Section A, and there were some excellent discussions of similes in the prescription that showed a very good grasp of their effect on the audience, though weaker answers made little reference to the context of specific examples. Not all answers kept the focus on the 'combat scenes' throughout, though most candidates managed to bring in the gruesome death of Cebriones. By no means all candidates discussed the use of speeches in battle scenes, but the majority had a clear understanding of the importance of the gods, and were able to give good examples; not all dealt effectively with Patroclus' contest with Apollo at the walls of Troy. The best responses were clearly structured and used the prescription throughout. Weaker answers could become a list of unconnected points, especially when the pressure of time began to tell; often such candidates had over-developed answers earlier in the paper.

F373 Classical Greek Verse

As the new specification beds in, candidates seem to be increasingly comfortable with the way in which literature and language elements are now combined in the two A2 papers, and to be more skilful in executing answers which will maximise the numbers of marks they achieve. There were very few, if any, indications that time had been a problem: many wrote at great length on the set text questions and did good work on the language sections. Approximately five-eighths of the candidature decided to do the Unprepared Translation and Comprehension section first, and this approach seems to have served well those who did it. As one would expect, there was generally a good correlation between performances on the two sections of the paper, though there were of course those whose literary skills or interests outweighed their linguistic ones, and *vice versa*.

Examiners were slightly disappointed that those candidates opting for Euripides again vastly outnumbered those who chose to answer on Aristophanes, so much so that there are not really enough Aristophanes scripts to pinpoint any recurring trends or problems. Outcomes on the two texts were broadly comparable, although there was, given the larger entry, a much greater variation in quality in the Euripides answers, and a higher proportion of the Aristophanes scripts were of high quality. Perhaps centres which have previously been shy about reading Aristophanes might be thus encouraged to give him a try next year. It is the Examiners' impression that one of the factors which might discourage centres from teaching Aristophanes is a perception that their candidates would be perplexed by all the topical references or literary jokes. These centres should be assured that the level of background knowledge required for the exam is only enough to explain the jokes in their very broadest terms, something which most of the Aristophanes candidates hitherto have manifestly enjoyed doing, and have done very successfully.

Comments on specific questions and sections will be found below, and should be read in conjunction with the Mark Scheme for the component.

Section A: Prescribed Literature

Some general points about approaches to literary questions:

- Greek *must* be quoted and translated (or its meaning made clear). Some candidates, who may be well-informed and able, fail to do themselves justice because they do not make clear that they understand fully the examples they quote. Candidates are not specifically asked to translate the texts in the examination papers; but those who rely on a knowledge of the text in English and a vague awareness of what the Greek says never do particularly well.
- Care must be taken with the way in which the Greek text is cited: other than direct mistranslation, there are two main things candidates do which reduce the effectiveness of their answers. One is 'bitty citation', the other is failing to match 'collar and cuffs'. With the former, candidates tend to cite and then spin a comment around familiar words and short phrases, without giving a clear sense that they know what the words actually mean in their context. They are far more likely to make convincing points if they base their discussion on whole phrases, clauses or sentences (see below on Q.1(a), lines 2 and 4). The worst kind of 'bitty citation' is a comment that starts like this, 'The author uses words like …', and then quotes a number of tenuously linked words from different parts of the passage which give no sense of context or overall meaning whatsoever. This year, candidates tended to write a lot about 'all the "alas" words' used by Hippolytus and Theseus' in Q.1(a) – not irrelevant, but unlikely to garner many marks. The second vice is to quote some Greek but fail to translate all of the words quoted, or translate more words than are quoted, or to otherwise mismatch quote and comment in such a way that it is obvious the candidate is not absolutely precise on the meaning of the Greek text.

- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates, unless very adept, tend to write better structured answers this way and to avoid missing important points. They are also in a better position to trace the sequence of thought through a passage or demonstrate their knowledge of the context of their citations than those who look – for example – for instances of 'emphatic positioning' of words throughout the passage, and then start again to look for something else. This year, a number of candidates chose on Q.1(a) to deal with all of Hippolytus' lines together, then all of Theseus' lines. This was in all probability an attempt to impress the Examiners by avoiding the obvious line-by-line structure, but those who did this (apart from the very sharpest) did not give full value on the way in which each character's lines pick up on what was said by the other character in the previous lines.

- Coverage of the whole passage (which is not the same as 'making every possible point the Examiners thought of in their Mark Scheme') is important. Making brief notes on points to refer to in an answer, or highlighting important points on the question paper, might well be helpful. Some candidates start well, write very fully on the first half of a passage, and then run out of steam, or time. What happens at the end of a passage may be at least as important as what happens at the beginning. The Examiners do not expect absolutely every line or sentence to be commented upon, but they will look for coverage of most of the passage and the majority of its most salient points or examples when deciding how many marks to give, and the shorter the passage involved the more important this will be.

- A list of points shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures (for example) do not just happen to be there; they are supporting some important point, which should be mentioned as the reason for their use.

- Unless otherwise specified, answers should make reference to both content and style. Although some like to make out that Greek and Latin are directly comparable in every respect, Greek on the whole tends to be less 'rhetorically dense' than Latin on a line-by-line basis, and even within Greek some passages, necessarily, will contain fewer potential 'style points' than others, but nevertheless answers which concentrate wholly on the one to the exclusion of the other will not reach the top level. (See the Marking Grids in Mark Scheme: 'Characteristics of Performance'.)

- Technical terms should be used with care. Examiners have (regrettably) come to acknowledge that 'alliteration' and 'assonance' are apparently indistinguishable from one another, and that nearly every vocative provides an example of 'apostrophe'; but the wrong use of a technical term may spoil an answer which is otherwise going in the right direction. If a candidate notices that several clauses begin with the same word, thinks it is significant, and quotes them and says so in straightforward English, this is better than calling it by the wrong name.

- Candidates should make sure that the literary devices they discover in passages actually work. A plural genitive absolute, for example, is quite likely to have several words ending in -$\omega\nu$, because that is the only way in which it can be done, so it is very unlikely to mean very much, in literary terms. A special favourite is always 'emphatic position', which (apparently) can be either (1) the beginning of a line, or (2) the middle of a line, or (3) the end of a line. Not everyone can be right: the fact is that a word in 'emphatic position' is a word where one wouldn't expect it to be – which may be by no means easy for the average A-level candidate to spot; so this, like all other 'rhetorical devices', has to be handled with care.

Note that specific examples of textual points expected to be referred to in answers are in general not listed in the remarks below, but may be found in the Mark Scheme for the component.

Q.1(a)/2(a)

Some candidates felt obliged to start their answers with unasked for 'The Story So Far' paragraphs, thereby delaying the earning of marks!

By and large, candidates understood the point and the humour of Q.2(a) very well. Most candidates got at least the broad gist of Q.1(a), although there were some misunderstandings which kept coming up:
2 οὕς σέβω was often – particularly by the 'bitty citers' referred to above – taken to refer to Theseus rather than the gods, which the context makes clear is not the case.
4 μάτην was often ignored. Many candidates waxed lyrical about Hippolytus' piety but failed to realise that this was a somewhat different (more practical) point, 'I wouldn't persuade those whom I needed to persuade in any case, and would (therefore) break my oaths *in vain*.' Instead, translations like 'I wouldn't break my oaths' were seen.
6 Some candidates seemed not to realise that although this line is expressed in the form of a question, it is not straightforwardly thus but really a strong command in disguise.

Q.1(b)/2(b)

Essays were generally competently done, though there was a higher concentration of 'virtuoso performances' on Aristophanes rather than Euripides. Candidates answering Q.1(b) had relatively few problems judging how much to write on the printed passage and how much on the rest of the play. The most salient points in the passage were in line 2 – love's being simultaneously very pleasurable and also painful – and lines 12-15. Incidentally, more than half the candidates who discussed line 2 carelessly translated ἀλγεινόν as 'very/most painful', as if it were a superlative like ἥδιστον. A number of candidates spent a disproportionate amount of time on the Nurse's reaction (or 'rant', as many cheekily called it) in lines 7-11 to Phaedra's revelation, probably because the Greek in those lines is fairly simple and very memorable; while not completely irrelevant, they contributed less to a discussion of the nature of love than the other lines mentioned above, and such answers sometimes lapsed into commentary-type lists of style points instead, ignoring the question completely.

As for discussion of the rest of the play, nearly all the answers would have benefited from the inclusion of more (or, in some cases, any at all) direct textual reference, ie, quotation in English or Greek, or explicit referencing of lines/sections of the text. There were a lot of bald statements about the various characters and themes of the play which really should have been given supporting evidence. While accurate quotation in Greek is of course impressive, the inclusion of odd Greek words (unless in themselves significant) is completely pointless, eg 'he wants to wash out his ears (ὦτα)'.

Those answering Q.2(b) generally provided well-referenced answers, although some could have made their job easier by thinking a little more about the question: all commented, often in great detail, on the scenes which spoof other scenes from the plays of Euripides, but some left it there, forgetting that the basic premise of *Thesmophoriazusae*, Euripides' alleged misogyny, is itself a literary caricature. The Agathon scene was also a rich source of material for those who thought to use it.

Section B: Language

Q.3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) (*Numbers refer to lines of the passage.*)

1 The prefix of ἄπειμι was often taken as privative, 'I am not', or confused with Latin *aperio*, 'I am open'. Others knew the basic meaning of the verb but thought that here it applied figuratively, 'I'm not with you', ie 'I don't understand'. Despite the masculine ending, μῶρος ἦν was often translated as 'it was stupid' ('it was stupid of me' being a more acceptable variant). πάλαι was sometimes mixed up with πάλιν. κλύων was occasionally thought to be from κρύπτω.
2 οὗ was sometimes translated as 'where' or where to'. πρίν was not infrequently treated as an adverb: 'you would have spoken before'. βραχύ, 'briefly' also became 'heavily' (as if βραδύ) and 'deeply' (as if βαθύ).
3 Some did not know σιγηλὸς, and λέγ' was not infrequently translated as 'I speak'.
4 This line did not seem to pose too many problems.
5 'Do you know where ...?' was a common translation of κάτοισθα δήπου.
6 ἀγνοῶν was often taken as 'recognising' rather than its opposite, presumably thanks to the influence of Latin *agnosco*. ἥνπερ was sometimes rendered 'if'. When, in addition to that, ἀγνοῶν was confused with ἀγών, translations such as 'you see the possibility of conflicts' were the result.
7 The tense of ἔφασκες was the only recurring error on this line.
8 πόθεν was sometimes confused with ποτέ: 'who on Earth?' Very occasionally μολὼν was confounded with μαλθακῶς or, more likely, Latin *molliter*: 'whence did she softly go?' 'To you alone' was an occasional mistranslation of μολὼν σοὶ.
9 μαρτυρήσει was commonly taken to be from ἀμαρτάνω, κλύειν to be part of κλείω, or παρών to be part of Latin *paro* or *pareo*.

Overall, though, the translation was well done, perhaps even exceeding the Examiners' expectations, with a good number of correct or almost correct versions. On the other hand, the Examiners often found it hard to award both of the 'fluency of English' marks, as many translations tended to be stilted and over-literal, or just not hang together as passages of understandable English in their own right.

(b) (i) Very few candidates failed to achieve both marks on this question, despite the occasional 'in the middle of the Trachinian *field*'.

(b) (ii) Candidates also scored well on this question. The Examiners suspect that the number of marks available, 2, often encouraged candidates to provide two examples, not just one, and the second example was often a saving grace if the first point was tenuous or underdeveloped. A not insignificant number of candidates thought that εἰσήκουσ' was an aorist *participle*.

(c) Despite the help of three glossary items, a large number of candidates did not properly understand the main idea of lines 12-13.

(d) Most candidates scored full marks. There one or two only who looked as if they had never attempted scansion before. The most common error was to scan the last syllable of ἐπώμοτος as short rather than long (double consonant rule). From the outset, allowance was made that candidates might not be familiar with the 'mute + liquid' exception, and both short and long were accepted for the middle syllable of Ἡρακλεῖ.

(e) This question was generally well done by candidates. Occasionally there was an answer where a mistake in the interpretation of the Greek led to a point not being fully developed.

(f) Again, this was generally well done. δαμείη was occasionally translated as 'would be conquered' rather than 'was conquered'.

F374 Classical Greek Prose

As usual, the general standard of work on this component was very high. Few candidates seemed to encounter time problems, though again some did the language section first to give themselves more time for the set texts, which appeared to be a sound strategy. Again, far more offered Thucydides than Plato: the average mark on Plato was a little higher than the average for Thucydides, perhaps because it is easier to see how Plato's use of language supports what he is saying, and also because many candidates had evidently engaged fully with the *Republic* as philosophy as well as literature. A considerable number took the Prose Composition option, and the average mark here was higher than that on the alternative, where most found the unseen translation within their compass, but the grammatical questions less so. The examiners felt that some candidates on the Translation and Comprehension section had assumed that they could get through by making a decent fist of the translation, and hoping for the best on the rest: some will clearly have been disappointed; the grammatical questions are not intended to probe the *minutiae* of the grammar book, but we do expect candidates to have a working knowledge of the prescribed syntax, and of such things as formation of parts of verbs.

Section A: Prescribed Literature

Teachers and candidates are referred to the general points made in this section in the Report on the 2010 sitting; and to the Mark Scheme for the component for more detailed information on the set passages.

Plato: 1(a)

In both questions, some candidates sometimes did not indicate carefully enough the Greek they were referring to (for example, simply writing ἡδύς ... ἀργύριον rather than citing the exact words under discussion), which in some cases seemed to be because they were essentially remembering a translation which they were not able accurately to relate to the Greek. Here, many accepted at face value the notion of Thrasymachus as a money-grabbing sophist as contrasted with good guy Socrates. They could, and did, get a long way by taking this approach, if they backed it up with effective textual reference; but more subtle accounts saw that Thrasymachus' criticisms of Socrates' methods are justifiable, and that Socrates is not as innocent as he appears.

Plato: 1(b)

This question required analysis of the argument, rather than simply literary analysis, and some candidates concentrated mostly on the philosophical aspects, which, if they did it well, was rewarded. Those who did make more extensive comments on the language correctly identified the rhetorical techniques by which Thrasymachus reinforces his arguments and disguises his sleight-of-hand. The best recognised that this is what he is doing, noting rightly that he slips from discussing everyday examples of doctors or craftsmen to 'wise men' and rulers without considering whether they really do do the same things; and they further pointed out that his rhetoric does look persuasive until one takes it apart.

Thucydides: 2(a)

Well prepared candidates who know the text thoroughly did well on this piece, and many recorded very high marks. Of those who got lower marks, most were able to pick out the main points of the passage in terms of content, and some linguistic features, but the latter were sometimes not analysed in sufficient detail or with sufficient accuracy: for example, in lines 11 – 13 most identified the contrast between the expedition's initial hopes and its present state, but far fewer pointed out how Thucydides' use (amongst other things) of οἵας ... οἵαν serves to

reinforce this, and in a fairly obvious way. There was also some misunderstanding and mistranslation: ἐκπεπολιορκημένη, for example, does *not* just mean 'besieged', it means 'taken by siege', and knowing this is necessary for full understanding of the simile. The section from καὶ μήν to ἐδοξάζετο was not well understood, many suggesting that Thucydides is saying that sharing the burden offered some comfort, which is not the case. Some seemed to run out of steam towards the end, and the last sentence was sometimes not commented on.

Thucydides: 2(b)

This was answered less well than 2(a), some candidates seeming to know the passage less well, so that their answers covered only some of the possible points and had little to say on details, or concentrated on the wrong points. For example, in lines 6 – 8, Thucydides is hammering home the point that Demosthenes and his men are surrounded: ἀνειληθέντες ... κύκλῳ ... τείχιον περιῆν ... ὁδὸς ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν ... ἐλάας οὐκ ὀλίγας ... ἐβάλλοντο περισταδόν; some scarcely registered that they are encircled, or said things like 'the passive verbs show that Demosthenes is in difficulties', which may be true but is far from the whole story, especially when verbs such as βάλλοντες are cited in support of the idea. On the other hand, some expended a lot of energy on the last sentence and read more into the repeated negatives than is really there, no doubt because they are readily visible. There was also sometimes an unwise tendency to comment on the complexity of some of the sentences as an index of the confusion Thucydides is attributing to Demosthenes' men, and more evidence of the tendency commented on last year to suggest that a word or phrase is 'emphasised' because it is first/last/in the middle of a sentence: comments on word order that go beyond the obvious and basic are frequently unsuccessful, and should be used with care. There were, of course, many excellent answers, but the examiners had a feeling that the passage was less well known than other parts of the text because it is not one of the obvious 'purple passages' of Book 7. This is true, but there was no lack of things to say about it, and candidates who revise their texts selectively are playing a dangerous game.

3: Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) *The section numbers given here refer to the divisions of the passage indicated in the Mark Scheme.*

1 ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπεπόνθει caused problems, but candidates could gain half the marks for the section even if they got it wrong; it should in any case have been evident that ἐπεπόνθει is not the main verb.
2 περί ... ἐποιεῖτο was also troublesome; in this case, misunderstanding sometimes led to problems with the following syntax, which were regarded sympathetically by the examiners. Translation of τιμωρήσασθαι as 'fear', however, was not. ὅ τι δύναιτο was often well done.
3 Many had 'at dawn' for ἅμα ... ἔαρι and thought that συμπληρώσας meant 'sailed', which made ἔπλευσεν hard to do. Most, though, had the sentence largely correct.
4 Again, there were many good versions: τὴν παραθαλαττίαν ἐκακούργει was regarded as something of a test of ingenuity, and candidates generally either did it imaginatively and well or got it wholly wrong.
5 An easy section: but παρακελεύομαι does not just mean 'order'.
6 Mostly correctly done.
7 Sometimes καταλιπών was given the wrong sense of 'leave'; for the somewhat pleonastic ᾤχετο ... ἀποπλέων 'he sailed off home' was considered sufficient, but ἐπ' οἴκου caused trouble.

(b) Mostly well done, but some did not read the gloss on Πειραιεύς and said that Konon was going to use them to build a wall 'around the Persians'.

(c) Most got at least the contrast between the two participles, but did not always understand what they meant (but received some credit anyway); as last year, μέν ... δέ need some explication, not simple notice. βαρύτερον led some to suggest that the weight of the wall would be inimical to the Spartans.

(d) (i) Usually right.
    (ii) Surprisingly, often not: in some cases thought to be accusative.

(e) (i) Generally correctly spotted as optative, but more often stated to be optative because of the conditional clause rather than the indirect speech.
    (ii) Generally identified as in indirect statement.

(f) (i) Mostly well done.
    (ii) Mostly not, with many unlikely variations.

(g) Usually well done, sometimes confusion as to whom Konon was paying.

Many candidates, as stated above, did the unseen pretty well, gaining marks in the mid 20s, and then got very few more on the questions: the examiners felt that in some cases they believed that they could answer the questions without really working out what the Greek meant; almost every A Level candidate, if specifically asked 'what does πολὺ τοῦ τείχους mean?' would probably get it right, and therefore be identifying what case τείχους is, and why; if those who guessed at the answers to the shorter questions made a greater effort to *translate* the relevant bits, many would do much better.

4: Prose Composition

The section numbers given here refer to the divisions of the passage indicated in the Mark Scheme.

1 There were some complicated Genitive Absolutes with passive verbs for 'when he heard this'; they were not penalised, but candidates might remember that Greek is easier than Latin when it comes to such things. There were some good versions of 'the authorities'.
2 Some linked this to the first section by 'saying that...' or 'in which he said that...'which, like all appropriate subordination, gained them a style mark. 'Betray' was encouragingly well done. Some had more 'hims' than Greek would use, making for a pedestrian, though not wrong, version. Almost everyone simply, and of course correctly, used ἀποκτείνω for 'put to death'. Some good subordination, again, was used: 'that it was necessary for them, having seized him to put [him] to death', though those who did this sometimes confused themselves over the case of 'seized' in the process.
3 'To try to save' was difficult, and good attempts duly rewarded. μωρότατόν τι was good, and got a style mark, as did 'alarmed' as a participle.
4 'Keep secret' was one of the very few vocabulary problems in the piece, and made for some periphrases, some of which worked better than others. τά was simple and effective for 'the contents', and encouragingly common.
5 Many used εἶπε(ν) with the direct speech, but were not penalised.
6 The future conditional was well done.
7 Most knew a word for 'show', but not many realised that it needed to be followed by a dative, and some attempted to do 'can be captured' by an optative, rather than δύναμαι or οἷός τ' εἰμί.
8 Not many knew ἐπεὶ πρῶτον or ἐπεὶ τάχιστα for 'as soon as', but if they said 'when Astyochus received it, he *immediately* passed it...' this was considered satisfactory.

There were some really excellent versions (some gaining full marks), and very few less than competent ones. Connecting words were generally well used (style marks were given for using ones more adventurous than δέ, where these were appropriate), very few breathings left off, and there was much convincing and effective Greek.

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H041)
Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Civilisation (H441)

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

At the end of the second full cycle of the new specification, it is pleasing to report that all the units seem to have bedded in well and that candidates have a good sense of what is expected of them. It was common to read in examiners' reports how much they had enjoyed marking their allocation for a particular Unit, and how much pleasure they had taken in reading the lively and interesting personal opinions and reactions of candidates. It was felt that candidates generally showed more engagement with the texts and the material evidence this year. They evidently enjoyed their studies and knew a good range of detail. The Unit reports provide specific feedback on significant issues and trends for the individual Units.

Whilst candidates had clearly revised well and could provide detailed information in their responses, sometimes the information was not always well employed. For example, there were many instances of candidates using material from last year's questions or trying to reproduce prepared essays or topics without making the material or argument relevant to the question selected. In commentary questions, the command phrase '*Using this passage as a starting point*' means that for a successful response there **must** be some consideration of material from the stimulus passage in addition to material from elsewhere in the play, book or other evidence. References to other material, or modern parallels, can be helpful but it is unwise for the discussion of such material to be longer than the relevant point about the Classical material.

On the whole, candidates made good use of the time allocation. There are still occasions, however, when candidates devote too much time to the commentary question and give short shrift to the essay. At AS, there is an increasing trend to do the paper in 'reverse order' – essay, (c), (b) and (a) – the jury is still out as to whether this is a successful technique. Targeting the higher marked questions does seem to help with timing, but not with the effective answering of the commentary question. The commentary questions are designed to take the candidate through the whole question in a logical manner so that they gain momentum as they complete each part of the question. There was evidence of some effective planning this year at both levels. Planned responses were generally better organised and produced more thoughtful, considered arguments. In particular, planning can help with the synoptic comparisons required at A2. Candidates need to be aware, however, that spending more than five minutes on the plan and making it too detailed can have a detrimental effect on the final piece of work.

A few other issues highlighted in examiners' feedback reports were:
*   The quality of written communication was worse than last year.
*   There were far fewer rubric errors at AS but a significant number at A2.
*   The starting of a new page for each question was significantly worse than in previous years.
*   Legibility is still a big issue for many candidates and illegible scripts create a lot of extra work for examiners (and the Chief Examiner!).

Principal Examiners felt that there was a marked difference in the performance of the candidates at AS and A2 this year, with the AS candidates generally out-performing the A2 candidates. At

AS examiners reported an encouraging improvement in the overall standard in most units, particularly in the E-C grades. At the top end of the mark range, there were some superb answers to both commentary questions and essays in all the Units. At the lower end of the mark range there were far fewer very poor papers. As a result the overall percentage of A grades has remained fairly static, but there has been an increase in the percentages of other grades. At A2, however, candidates performed in a much less even manner: there appeared to be fewer candidates who produced outstanding performances across their two units or sometimes even across a complete paper; there were also some extremely weak performances with some candidates scoring in single figures. These issues had the effect of making the percentages for individual grades very similar to 2010.

F381 Archaeology: Mycenae and the classical world

General Comments

As ever, it is the sheer enthusiasm and enjoyment for the subject displayed in candidates' answers that continues to delight the examiners. Teachers are still encouraging candidates well in their study of Classical Archaeology. Most answers were pleasing, although examiners felt that there was a decrease in actual knowledge shown. A lot of answers made very valid points and discussed techniques well, but were let down by a lack of supporting evidence. In both essays and part (c) commentary questions, brief plans tended to produce stronger answers.

There were few rubric errors. Examiners felt that time management by candidates had improved. Most candidates make a good attempt at both sections and allocated an appropriate amount of space to each. In addition, there was an improvement in students reading the 'two societies' part of the question and trying to include non-Mycenaean examples.

On the negative side, candidates still struggle to spell Mycenaean or archaeology, despite both words appearing on the question paper. Mycenaean in particular was misspelt on perhaps 95% of scripts. There was also an increasing problem with using irrelevant examples, despite the plea made in the examiner's report last year. These examples included Egypt, the Aztecs, Mesopotamia, Petra and even the Tudors. Unfortunately, this led to loss of valuable marks in a number of cases, where half the answer was irrelevant to the question.

A final small note – there seemed to be a noticeable minority completely misunderstanding the interpretation of Grave Circle B. It was contrasted with Grave Circle A by candidates who thought these were the only graves at Mycenae and, because Grave Circle B is less rich overall, it was therefore where the lower classes were buried. One extreme example believed the slaves were buried there and, from this, assumed that amber and rock crystal were prevalent amongst the poorer people in society!

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

Question 1 was slightly more popular than Question 2.

1   (a)   Most were able to discuss the 'Temple' well. However, many candidates described either the room or the artefacts, but not both. The figurine was recognised by most candidates so everyone had something to say on this question. The Temple Complex was also known by all, and there was a good range of both artefacts and features of the layout. The only factual misunderstandings came from amalgamating the 'Temple' with the Room with the Fresco Complex. The second half of the question proved harder and the discriminating factor. Most could not think of anything beyond the circular argument of 'they worshipped gods here so it was a temple'. Stronger responses brought up arguments such as meaning of the snakes and the fact that it didn't correspond to domestic dwellings.

(b) The topic of 'daily life' elicited some surprising responses, with marriage, death, riots and earthquakes apparently forming the daily routine for many in the ancient world. Some answers tried to twist the topic to discuss the life of the kings, but many gained high marks by using Linear B, archaeological evidence and the ruins at Pompeii. The biggest stumbling block encountered for this question was when candidates stopped reading the question after 'teaching us', and so they missed out the link to daily life/ordinary people. There were certainly some quite tenuous links with the question at times. However, those who did read it properly generally had a decent range of examples to talk about. Linear B proved very popular, often with some impressive recall of detail and some thoughtful comments about how the Mycenaean world was organised. Interestingly, those who used Pompeii as a comparative example often seemed to fall short, perhaps because the wealth of material led to unfocussed answers.

(c) The focus of many answers here was the architectural remains of tombs, rather than grave goods. Stronger answers used grave goods in detail. This was generally answered better than 1(b), as recall of tombs and graves was better. Most people could talk about the size/craftsmanship of tholoi and make a valid point. The stronger answers brought up some highly thoughtful points, including the difference between the recently dead and long dead (bones being pushed aside) and discriminating between respect for the dead and showing off the family's status. As mentioned above, Grave Circle B caused a stumbling block for a significant minority of candidates, plus there was some confusion between the shaft graves and the *tholoi*, with some seeing them as contemporaneous and hence the Grave Circles as 'middle class'.

2 **(a)** All candidates knew the particular dagger shown in the photo. Unfortunately, many answers dwelt in detail on this particular artefact, rather than doing as the question asked. In general knowledge of small artefacts and metal working techniques was not as good as in question 1(a). There was regular confusion between techniques, or a name given without any indication of the type of decoration the technique produced. Most could mention at least one other metal object, sometimes a good range, although the word 'small' was sometimes conveniently overlooked.

(b) Many tried to twist this question in a different direction, but most managed to provide appropriate material to answer the question and show off their knowledge. This question discriminated clearly between the stronger and weaker answers. The stronger used it as a chance to show that they could employ an artefact and analyse it sensibly, whereas the weaker ones couldn't think of anything to say and hence talked about the rich instead. Slaves were invariably popular (both Mycenaean and Roman), but there were also those who looked beyond these to poorer classes in general. A pleasing number used skeletal evidence to infer details of the life of the poor.

(c) There were some very strong responses to this. Pleasingly, many answers went beyond weapons and armour and discussed fortification. The stronger answers looked at a whole range of topics beyond the obvious weapons and armour, including Mycenaean preparedness for war (Cyclopean walls, 'rowers'), fighting tactics, and Roman martial organisation (similar layouts of forts). There was also generally a good range of artefacts given as examples, although there was a temptation to use literature. Several candidates got distracted by gladiators and hunting to the exclusion of military activity.

Essay Questions

3 and 4 were equally popular, but those who went for 5 tended to do better, as long as they provided evidence.

3   This question was by a small margin the most popular one this year. Weaker answers rambled around a few points without providing evidence from sites, but stronger answers could refer to actual sites and projects. The biggest stumbling block by far was to fall into the 'shopping list' of either trench types or surveying techniques and to forget the question until the conclusion rolled around. Those who did actually grapple with the question tended to look at a good range of points, including rescue archaeology, keeping accurate records, presenting to the public, and underwater archaeology. Some were quite passionate about the validity of archaeology and how the benefits outweighed the destruction. Those who remembered to give examples of archaeological sites gave a good range, although Schliemann and Fiorelli were by far the most popular. However, those who went down the 'shopping list' approach often forgot to refer to examples. As a side note, there was a distinct tendency for candidates to forget that the verb of destruction is destroy and not 'destruct'/'destructed'!

4   This question was popular and enabled the candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of dating techniques. Some clearly understood the various techniques available to archaeologists but were not able to attribute the techniques to specific artefacts and sites. Again, there was a danger of giving a 'shopping list' essay and many candidates fell into this. When examples were given they were of a decent range, but there were also many candidates who become fixated on the details of dating techniques and forgot to provide any examples. Candidates displayed a satisfactory knowledge of the various dating techniques, as few got confused between them, and some showed surprising levels of technical detail. However, there were only a few candidates who rose to the challenge of the actual question. Some candidates gave careful analyses of absolute and relative dating and how these played out with real examples and techniques, but these were few and far between.

5   This essay was less popular than the rest, but it was handled well by those who tackled it. There was a range of analytical points within this small sample and it would have been interesting to see more candidates tackle this type of question, as they discussed such things as funding applications, meticulous record keeping, the advance of new recording technology, and presentation afterwards. Answers that referred to specific sites and projects gained the higher marks.

F382 Homer's *Odyssey* and Society

General Comments

Examiners were pleased by the overall standard of the answers and delighted by some individual responses. The level of engagement and personal response shown by candidates of all abilities was impressive and it was evident that students had enjoyed studying the *Odyssey*.   In particular, candidates are demonstrating a greater awareness and appreciation of Homeric society and are including a significant range of examples in their responses.

Unfortunately, there were some rubric errors, with candidates attempting both context questions, and timing was also a problem for some. It is worth stressing to candidates not to write pages for the part (a) of the commentary questions.

The most common combination was question 1 and 4 with very few candidates attempting questions 2 and 5.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1 (a)   This question was generally well answered. Most candidates included the storm and Ino's intervention. The more detailed answers mentioned Odysseus' hesitation in abandoning his raft and his appeal to the river god. There was some confusion about the sequence of events in the water. Some candidates included detail of Athene's visit to Nausicaa and her journey to the river, although the question asked 'what happened to Odysseus'.

   (b)   This was another question that was well attempted by candidates. The majority were able to discuss competently Odysseus' use of flattery as well as his ability to gain sympathy by alluding to his own sufferings. Many also referred to his use of supplication and references to the time he once led a fine army. Some were able to comment on Odysseus' ability to acknowledge Nausicaa as of marrying age and therefore appeal to her desire for marriage and a husband. However, only a small number of candidates demonstrated a more sophisticated analysis – why Odysseus had chosen to compare Nausicaa to Artemis or the fact that by referring to his misfortune at the hands of the gods, Odysseus is actually showing Nausicaa that he is worthy of their interference.

   (c)   There were some very full answers to part (c) and some candidates wrote so much that they were short of time for Section B. Others ignored the part of the question which limited responses to Odysseus' 'travels' and brought in material from the second half of the epic, especially to do with Athene. Most candidates covered Poseidon, Zeus, Calypso and Circe. Many suggested that Calypso and Circe both hindered and helped Odysseus. Candidates sometimes dismissed Athene as totally helpful; better answers gave detail and questioned her support. More circumspect responses considered how the gods had helped as well as hindered Odysseus. They then analysed whether Odysseus himself or even his men were to blame for the trouble encountered.

2   **(a)**   There were very few detailed responses to this question. Some misread the question and summarised events since Odysseus landed in Ithaca, being disguised as a beggar and reunited with Telemachus in Eumaeus' hut. They then related all events up until the contest itself. Most candidates could correctly describe the practical details of the contest e.g. string the bow and shoot an arrow through the 12 axe heads. They also correctly stated how Telemachus tried on three occasions to string the bow and would have succeeded on the fourth were it not for a nod from Odysseus. However, recall of the Suitors' attempts to string the bow was variable.

   (b)   Despite the standard 'vivid' in the question, many responses struggled to make more than a couple of well-supported points. The similes, although mentioned by nearly all, proved resistant to analysis. Most picked out the ominous nature of the thunderclap and there were reasonable attempts at commenting on the mortification of the Suitors. Some candidates made a good job of exploring the proleptic qualities and the sardonic ironies in "get their supper ready" and passing on to "further pleasures".

   (c)   Answers to this question were generally focussed on the characterisation of Telemachus rather than on his contribution to the epic poem. Most answers were able to discuss how Telemachus changes throughout the poem, from a young and inexperienced speaker at the Ithacan assembly in Book 2 to his harsh punishments of the disloyal maids in Book 22. They discussed his journey to manhood and his own mini Odyssey to Sparta and Pylos. More perceptive answers discussed how Telemachus allows us to realise the urgent situation in Ithaca prior to meeting Odysseus in Book 5 and understood that Telemachus is necessary for Odysseus to carry out his punishment of the Suitors, as well as providing the reader with an initial concept of the correct xenia etiquette in Book 1.

Essay Questions

3   This question proved to be not as popular as question 4. Most candidates were able to offer some definition of a hero, from a fairly crude macho type to far more sophisticated analyses of the significance of *kleos* and *time*. As in previous sessions, there were probably more modern than ancient Greek definitions of the hero. Generally this was well done, with most able to provide examples of heroic and non-heroic behaviour.

4   The most popular of the three questions for Section B and generally very well attempted with a good range of women discussed. The stronger answers included Odysseus' conversation with Agamemnon in Book 11 and the comparison between Penelope and Clytemnestra, as well as Demodocus' song of the adultery of Aphrodite and Ares. More telling responses made a clear distinction between a woman being deceptive and untrustworthy – for example Penelope is deceptive with her shroud trick to the Suitors, as well as with the bed trick to her husband Odysseus. However, her motives are commendable as she is trying to maintain her loyalty to her husband and is therefore trustworthy.

5   Very few candidates attempted Question 5 and, in general, the answers were of poorer quality with candidates struggling to identify more obvious examples of unreal elements such as Polyphemus, Scylla etc.   There was even more difficulty in providing evidence of reality.

F383 Roman Society and Thought

General Comments

Examiners derive much enjoyment from reading the wide range of responses to questions in the unit and this year was no exception. In addition, candidates clearly had a sounder understanding of social context.

It was felt that essays could be further improved with more careful planning and by offering more specific details from texts.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1 (a) Candidates were able to list a range of entertainments although some restricted their selection to different types of food. Better answers were those which were able to provide a wide-ranging selection with supporting detail.

   (b) This question was well-answered. The most successful responses were based on sensory aspects, from sounds 'shrill', to colours 'black/white olives', to materials 'Corinthian Bronze'. Some only discussed the use of detail to create a vivid image and therefore only provided a limited range of material. A few candidates appeared unsure of the meaning of 'vivid'.

   (c) While almost all candidates could cite examples of food and dinner parties in the prescribed works, analysis of why they were a popular topic was less well done. Answers which demonstrated a clear understanding of the nature and purpose of satire were the most successful. Some made clear distinctions between the ways in which the three different writers delivered their criticism. Candidates were asked to discuss three authors; some only discussed two – most commonly omitting Juvenal.

2 (a) All but a few candidates could provide at least a basic knowledge of slavery. Some candidates were less sure of the process for freeing a slave. Some answers provided a full and detailed account of all three aspects of the questions and scored highly.

   (b) This question was well-answered with candidates providing a wide range of textual references to demonstrate Pliny's horror. Less successful answers merely paraphrased Pliny's words to explain his horror rather than analysing technique and effects. Better answers noted the change of perspective towards the end of the passage as Pliny considers the implications of such an act for himself.

   (c) Some responses assessed how much letter space was devoted to Pliny himself rather than to others. Some answers considered the purpose of Pliny's letters and the effect of publication. The best answers showed real insight, considering how letters could work for both sides of the argument. These answers also showed detailed knowledge of each letter used.

Essay Questions

3   This question was popular. Almost all candidates could name the relevant emperors with detailed background knowledge and why they might or might not be respected. Others gave detailed analysis of references in the prescribed texts to emperors. Most chose to compare Juvenal's disrespectful attitude towards Domitian with Pliny's respectful attitude towards Trajan. Some were able to pick out examples in Dinner with Trimalchio where Trimalchio is described in terms that might also fit Nero. The decision to have Horace in the list of authors enabled candidates to discuss how he 'fought for the wrong side' and to explore Maecenas' role. Also commonly mentioned was Claudius. Better answers combined very good society knowledge with a balanced answer.

4   A few responses were able to provide a clear and detailed explanation of both philosophies. Several candidates equated Epicureanism with hedonism. Knowledge and understanding of Stoicism was better than for Epicureanism, with evidence being supplied in general terms from Pliny's letters and from Horace. Details may have improved responses further. The question also required a personal response in the form of a choice between the two philosophies; most candidates reserved this choice for their conclusion, supporting their choice with brief reasons. A better approach might have been to provide a running analysis of the benefits/enjoyable aspects of each philosophy throughout the essay.

5   This question was also a popular choice. However, some candidates took the meaning of 'cruelty' literally and merely listed instances within the writers of physical cruelty. This made for a less successful answer. Better answers demonstrated a full understanding of the nature of satire and contrasted the use of cruelty by the different authors, providing detailed evidence for their views. Effective comparisons were made between Juvenal (the 'angry' satirist) and Horace (the 'smiling' satirist). Some candidates were able to provide a sophisticated answer based on argument rather than author.

F384 Greek Tragedy in its context

General Comments

Examiners were pleased by the rise in the number of candidates taking this unit. The enjoyment and appreciation of the plays by the students was evident in their answers. The wide ranging detail of responses, and varying opinions elicited by the questions indicate that the candidates had thought about the plays, and were able to discuss their ideas effectively. It was also pleasing to see references to productions, which reinforced the idea of the set texts as drama.

Candidates were able to write fluently, and express their ideas in well-structured and thought out arguments. There were still some issues of English; Question 1 added shepard to the usual spelling suspects (Euripedes, Aegitus, a multitude of versions of *stichomythia* and manoeuvres). 'Empathy' and 'Sympathy' were interchangeable in use and meaning. Of the questions, Question 2 on Euripides' *Medea* proved to be marginally the more popular of the Commentary Questions, while of the essay questions, Question 4 on the *Bacchae* was answered by most candidates, with Question 3 (*Agamemnon*) the next most popular, and Question 5 (The role of the Chorus) a distant third.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1 (a) Candidates generally knew the most important and relevant details. Most were able to give an account of the events which occurred. A few still considered 'since' to mean 'before', although this was significantly less than in previous years. There was a certain amount of confusion over the roles of the Theban Shepherd, and the Messenger from Corinth, as well as the information sought from him. Quite a few candidates placed the departure of Jocasta after the arrival of the Theban Shepherd, rather than before. The fact that Oedipus' self-blinding was described by a messenger was also often omitted, and at times, details of the events after Oedipus' emergence from the palace were blurred.

(b) This question produced a full range of answers. Many candidates treated the question as simply 'how does Sophocles make this passage dramatically effective' and did not discuss the idea of an effective ending. There were also quite a few answers which did not analyse the staging of the scene, despite the directions in the question. Better answers did look at the emotions raised by the appearance of Oedipus, and the loss of his daughters. They were also able to consider fully the final speech of the Chorus, and its nuances. Too many answers did not deal with this aspect in detail.

(c) Most candidates had knowledge of the three occasions on which Oedipus and Creon were on stage together. They were able to discuss the idea of role reversal from the beginning of the play, and the accusations Oedipus made against Creon and Teiresias. There was a range of interpretations of their relationship in the passage, ranging from Creon being sympathetic to Oedipus' plight, to Creon cruelly getting revenge on Oedipus for his treatment earlier in the play. Some answers concentrated on a character study of Creon, rather than the relationship between the two characters.

2 **(a)** *Medea* is a very popular play which allows the candidates to express a range of views. The majority of candidates were aware of the main details, although, as in previous years, a number spent too much time describing the events which occurred before the play started, at the expense of what actually happened in the play. Many did not mention the appearance of the Tutor, or Medea's 'feminist' speech to the Chorus. Some even neglected to describe the scene between Medea and Creon, or attributed Medea's exile to Jason.

(b) This question produced a wide range of ideas. Most answers discussed Jason's reasons as given in the passage, and were able to express an opinion. Candidates were often able to discuss his reasons with reference to contemporary standards, such as Medea's position in Greece as a foreigner, and Jason's search for *kleos.* Many candidates also used the facts that Jason had not mentioned his potential marriage to Medea, and that he made no attempt, until prompted, to prevent his sons being exiled, as reasons for Jason being selfish and not justified in his reasons. The question, as often happens with the characters of Medea and Jason, polarized opinions amongst the candidates.

(c) The amount of detail given in Part (c) varied considerably. Most candidates were able to use Medea's appearance in a number of scenes as evidence for their opinions. Better answers discussed her anger at Jason, her manipulation of the male characters and her desire for revenge, as well as her pride. They also used her wavering before killing her sons to show that there were times when her portrayal was inconsistent. Often, the use of the second half of the play was weaker, with some answers not even discussing the killing of the children, or the final confrontation between Jason and Medea. Some candidates also regarded her pleas to Creon and Aegeus, and her supplicating of Jason, as signs that she was weak and helpless, rather than seeing that this was how she portrayed herself to achieve her revenge.

Essay Questions

3 Candidates who answered this question showed a sound knowledge and use of the text, with good appreciation of the play. The question offered plenty of opportunity for structured responses with a good range of answers. Candidates were able to use a variety of angles to initiate their discussion. Most answers tended to concentrate on only the main characters and the Chorus, with some not even mentioning Cassandra. More in depth answers discussed the other characters, such as Aegisthus and the Watchman, showing how his opening speech introduced an atmosphere of fear within Argos. A few answers even analysed the Herald's speech, saying his description of conditions in war induced pity in the Chorus and the audience. The vast majority of answers disagreed with the quotation, citing Cassandra and the sacrifice of Iphigeneia amongst, others, as reasons for the play creating pity. Although the majority of answers cited Clytaemnestra as merely being a fearful figure, some did state that pity was created for her loss of her daughter. Agamemnon was pitied for his fate. Cassandra was seen as the most pitiable figure because of her fate at the hands of Apollo and Clytaemnestra. Few candidates discussed the emotions created by her visions of the history of the House of Atreus. Some candidates saw Aegisthus as a figure who created neither fear nor pity. Many answers concentrated on the characters or the audience, although some answers were able to discuss each aspect separately.

4   Candidates who answered this question tended to show a good degree of textual knowledge. A common approach which tended not to gain a higher range of marks under AO2 was to narrate events within the play and then attempt an answer to the question at the end. Most answers concluded that Pentheus did deserve to be punished, but that Dionysus went too far in how he punished Pentheus. Some argued that he did deserve to be punished, but did not tackle the "how far" aspect of the question. There were many interesting approaches to the question. A number of candidates brought up the problems faced by Pentheus as a young king trying to restore order to his kingdom; they also mentioned that it was not his fault that he did not believe in Dionysus, because that was how he had been brought up. Some answers produced an extended psychoanalysis of Pentheus with very little textual support, or argued that Dionysus should simply have revealed his divine power to Pentheus, ignoring the textual evidence that he does precisely that. There was also an occasional mention of the threats posed by Pentheus to the women of his city as a reason for him to deserve his punishment.

5   Although this question was rarely tackled, it produced a full range of responses. Some candidates knew the texts very well and were able to argue with finesse both for and against the statement. Some analysed the role of the Chorus in different plays, and argued that the contribution they make, and its importance, varies from play to play. Mention was made of the wider role of the Chorus, not just as a character in the play, but of its importance in informing the audience of past events and commenting on the action, and even occasionally, its visual impact. Weaker answers tended to simply narrate what the Chorus does within each of the plays, without much attempt to tackle the question. They produced one-dimensional approaches to the question with a glib agreement with the stimulus quotation 'I agree, the Chorus is boring and confusing'. Most answers used all four plays, although some were more selective in their choice of material.

F385 Greek Historians

General Comments

The majority of candidates took the opportunity to answer questions solely on Herodotus by answering Questions 1 and 3. Question 5 was barely touched. Plutarch was not popular this year. Although a few answered the Thucydides context question, all those that did so chose the Herodotus essay.

One major concern this year was the film *300*. Many answers were seen which incorporated details from the film that were not in Herodotus.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

Most candidates chose Question 1, with only a few going for Question 2.

1 **(a)** In general, this was not answered well. Many tried to describe the prophecy about empires toppling, which was not appropriate. Stronger answers went into the oracles and the death of his son in some depth.

(b) There were some very good and interesting responses to this question. Stronger answers focussed on style, although some of those that focussed on content were able to score highly.

(c) Several candidates had prepared answers on this topic and were able to produce some strong answers. Higher marks were given to those that were able to use the passage as a starting point.

2 **(a)** Few answered this question, but those that did were able to provide enough information to gain high marks.

(b) There was some strong response to this. Most used the passage well to illustrate their answers and show understanding.

(c) Although few answers were seen, the examiners were pleased by the strong personal response to this question. As always, stronger answers were the ones that were able to do more than wheel out a prepared answer, but managed to incorporate the passage into the answer.

Essay Questions

3 was the by far the most popular option. Only a few chose 4, and hardly anyone chose 5.

3   This was the most popular answer by far. Most answers relied on generalised points about Herodotus' skills, but the ones that gained higher marks were those that could refer closely to events described by Herodotus. Detail, not reliance on films or generalised comments, was what the examiners were looking for. Some answers chose to describe why he was a bad historian and then go on to say why he was a good storyteller, but the stronger answers tended to be the ones that took a synoptic approach to the question. Many answers relied on retelling the narrative, without attempting to analyse; such answers scored highly under AO1, but not AO2.

4   Very few answered this question, but the ones that did tended to be strong with a lot of detail from the text. Thucydides has clearly impressed many candidates with his factual and unemotional style of writing. It was the reference to the text, rather than generic points that gained the extra marks. Many had clearly prepared essays on this topic, and there were some that tried to twist the question to fit the essay that they had prepared.

5   There were too few essays seen to be able to make any general comments on this essay.

F386 City Life in Roman Italy

General Comments

The enjoyment that candidates derive from this unit is clear, particularly in questions requiring personal response. Most communicate a genuine interest in what they have studied and have developed a cultural understanding of what life was like in cities of Roman Italy. Answers on the whole showed a detailed knowledge of all the prescribed material, including literary references, although this year a few focussed on Pompeii alone resulting in a lack of sufficient supporting material. As always, candidates offering relevant details from outside the prescription were awarded the appropriate credit.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1 (a) Most knew general details about Eumachia and the building, with some making reference to inscriptions and statues. It was felt that candidates could have made greater use of the plan printed on the paper and discussed the layout and size. Almost all candidates were aware of the location of the building.

   (b) Specific details from source material vary for Eumachia's tomb and examiners expected discussion of a range of the detail available. Most compared Eumachia's tomb with Naevolia Tyche's, where factual knowledge was detailed; better answers included details about others. A few answers made no comparison and no reference to the issue of 'impressive'.

   (c) Most answers were able to draw on information from both Pompeii and Herculaneum. There were many straightforward comparisons of the rich valuing their private homes whereas the poor valued public facilities. The most popular houses mentioned were the House of Menander, House of Octavius Quartio and the House of the Stags. Most understood the value of the rich paying for public facilities in order to gain status and support in elections. In this case the amphitheatre at Pompeii was the most frequently cited. A few did not understand the distinction between domestic and public buildings.

2 (a) Candidates could identify features and some activities but not all answers made use of the photograph or described the actual appearance of the Piazza. Almost all answers made reference to the mosaics and offered a long list of the different images. Again a range of detail was included in the better answers, for example, the temple of Ceres could be discussed together with associated religious activities and some mentioned the close proximity to the theatre.

   (b) Candidates knew a lot about the development of Portus and could put it in terms of problems and solutions. There was some confusion over the emperors involved in the construction of the two harbours. More perceptive answers followed the development from silting to harbour constructions analysing the success throughout.

(c) Many answers described a range of buildings within Ostia but with limited relationship to the interests of a sailor. Some candidates thought hard about the scenario and made interesting points with great success.

Essay Questions

Examiners felt that answers to Section B could be improved further with more careful planning. A general introduction on a topic followed by a range of detail, with analysis for each point is a suggested approach. Bullet points are included as guidance for candidates and other relevant material will always be given credit.

3 This was a question which allowed for a range of answers. There were several answers which just described houses and gardens with little analysis. Other answers discussed how much space the rich had and how much they used it. A substantial number considered large houses and gardens to be a waste of space particularly the slave quarters of the House of Menander and the garden of Octavius Quartio. Surprisingly, there was little discussion of the use of individual rooms. The general layout of houses in particular cities might have made a suitable introduction for candidates to approach this question.

Many answers described the changes in use of space at the Samnite House; a few considered Vitruvius's description of the public man's need for an atrium; a few understood the importance of axial vistas, though some could have given explanations to develop their argument.

4 An introduction to this question might have been to consider the location and layout of the towns. Answers which focussed on the houses of the rich and the houses of the poor missed opportunities to include a wider range information. Most contrasted the lavish homes of the rich in Pompeii with the two examples of houses showing more cramped space in Herculaneum and added the public facilities available to all. Some referred to the 'working class' often assuming that they did not have homes and lived in the streets. Other answers understood that slaves could be freed and freedmen could prosper but were still treated as examples of the 'poor'. Credit was given for references to Trimalchio.

5 Most answers compared literary evidence with building remains but could make little more than the obvious comparison that archaeological evidence can be seen whereas literary evidence may not be reliable. There were some fine answers which made use of the information from the discovery of Pompeii and Herculaneum, Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius and inscriptions. A few candidates did not understand the difference between archaeological evidence and literary evidence.

F387 Roman Britain: life in the outpost of the Empire

General Comments

In its second year, F387 seems to have performed well. Examiners greatly enjoyed the experience of marking candidates' responses but noticed a lot of differentiation between well supported, secure and confident answers and those which were short, generalised and lacking in focus.

A number of teaching points may be picked out as particularly important if candidates are going to go into this exam with the tools to achieve the higher levels on the assessment grid.

1   Candidates should read the question carefully. Failure to note precisely what was asked sometimes led to a frustrating lack of focus, and underdeveloped or poorly structured answers.

2   Planning: it was noted that essays and even commentary questions were far more structured and effective when students had taken the time to plan an argument or even simply list the examples and sites they could use in their response.

3   The use of specific and detailed examples from Roman Britain to support an argument.

4   The concept of 'change over time': it was common to find answers which seem to assume that 'Roman Britain' was an undifferentiated period in our history. The Roman occupation of Britain lasted for 360 years but candidates often seemed unaware of when towns and villas were established during that period and that there might be different factors affecting their establishment and use at different times during those 360 years.

5   Geographical location of sites: a better appreciation of the geography and topography of Britain would help to dispel misapprehensions or generalities, often stereotypical (for example, it was apparently too hostile / dangerous / cold / wet / hard to find decent farmland / difficult to persuade the natives to be welcoming 'up north').

There were no rubric errors noted this year.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

Question 1 using inscriptions was the less popular choice, but those who attempted it seemed to find it easier to dig out the information and comment on it, than the diagram in Question 2.

1   **(a)**   Though less popular than Question 2 the question was generally done quite well by those who attempted it. Many candidates would also have gained more marks if they had made a systematic use of the sources, making use of all the information, including the ascriptions with locations and dates. They were free to set these towns in context and mention others, too!

(b) This question required some kind of understanding of 'urban life', which was generally well understood and supported, and some consideration of 'widespread', which was less commonly done well.

2 (a) This question posed some problems because of geography and timescales; responses varied greatly in quality, with the best being secure and well-developed, while others could only see a 'north-south divide', though the Fosse Way was well used as a possible delineator. General references to 'villas on the coast' or 'near towns' needed specific comment to gain candidates more marks. There was not much comment about what was meant by 'Romanisation.'

(b) This question opened up the discussion; candidates whose answers had been limited in (a) often found it much easier to develop answers with specific examples and a good range of repeated material in this answer. There was a good spread of knowledge about specific villas – those mentioned in the specification and a good range of others – with a focus on mosaics, bath suites, agricultural complexes, dining rooms, and a good understanding of *how* and *why* villas developed.

Essay Questions

Examiners found the lack of plans frustrating. This is particularly important because the way questions are worded calls for some in-depth evaluation and discussion of more than one aspect of Roman Britain.

3 The better responses were marked out by a good range of detailed specific examples, though there were very few which took what the examiners thought an obvious route, looking at Pre Roman Iron Age art (e.g. Battersea shield, Birdlip mirror, La Tène style), then Roman art from the early period (Claudius head, Marcus Favonius Facilis), and then the later pieces. There was a tendency to plunge in with something like the Gorgon from Bath first, then consider other pieces, and possibly only then to consider Celtic styles. There were a number of candidates who brought in discussion of *interpretatio Romana* – a concept of *religion* – rather than *style*. There was also a tendency to try to apply Hill and Ireland's summary of what makes up 'Celtic style' in any piece discussed, including the Mercury from Uley and Marcus Favonius Facilis.

4 Like Question 3 there were multiple things to discuss in this question: first, 'how far', then 'development', then attribution or not to the Roman army. Of all the questions on the paper, this led to the most differentiation. There were some very fine detailed and supported answers, which set the army in context, discussed what it possibly was and was not responsible for; other causes of economic development; growth and possible decline. Less secure responses included less detail and less range, and further down the mark range, the army was held responsible for any and every innovation in industry and agriculture, and was held to account for building villas, bringing ploughs, and introducing tastes for wine and olives. A lack of awareness of temporal contexts or change over time was most evident here. Likewise, many candidates could have improved their performance by incorporating more considered material, or even specific numbers so that statements such as 'the Roman army had a massive impact' could be quantified somewhat.

F388 Art and Architecture in the Greek World

General Comments

Examiners continue to be delighted by the enthusiasm shown by candidates for the subject matter of this Unit. At all levels they write with such interest and personal insight that it is clear that the vast majority have enjoyed their studies. This year the marks covered virtually the whole of the mark range, with many candidates showing a good knowledge of the prescribed material and a few showing knowledge of examples beyond those required by the specification, for example the Westmacott Athlete, the Apollo Sauroktonos, and the Centauromachy friezes from the Hephaistion and the Bassai temple. Whilst many candidates offered a range of detailed examples, others could offer few specific details to support their arguments. Examples need to be recognisable to examiners, for example, it is not enough to mention the Ajax and Achilles pot without some detail to identify which one is meant.

Many candidates had clearly attempted the questions from 2010 during the course of the year, and it was disappointing to see that some were trying to answer the same questions on different material, or were attempting to change the question to one they felt equipped to answer. For example, 1(a) sometimes became 'to what extent is this pot a decorative delight?' and 1(b) became either 'painters were only interested in depicting war' or a development of vase-painting question. A small number of candidates believed that pots were sculpted rather than painted and incised.

There was a significant minority of rubric errors this year: some candidates attempted both commentary questions; some answered one part of Question 1 and one part of Question 2; others spent so long on the commentary question that they were unable to attempt an essay. Careful allocation of the time is essential if candidates are to do themselves justice. The spelling of technical terms was no worse than last year (except for Contra pesto for contrapposto and Polykleitos's treat size for treatise) but there was some confusion of such terms, for example Contrapposto, symmetry and repetition were assumed to be the same thing, and Doric and Ionic features were mixed up.

One aspect which did concern examiners was the work of a few candidates; they simply criticised all the art they discussed in a very negative manner, without a proper context, or supporting argument and evidence. The legs are too short, the feet too long, the arms are wrong, the faces are expressionless, and architecture is not art and is an unnecessary expense. To end on a more positive note, as mentioned in the 2010 report, candidates produce some interesting individual personal responses to the Art and Architecture they have studied. Below are just two of the many examples enjoyed by examiners this year:

- The Propylaia was 'an astounding entrance to the Simon Cowell of all sanctuaries'.

- 'Kritios Boy just stands there as though he is modelling underwear for Marks and Spencer.'

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

Once again, the popularity of vase-painting question was shown by the number of candidates who tackled this question, around 80%, though this is a slight decrease from last year. The candidates who answered the architectural sculpture question often produced interesting and well thought out responses, though they were sometimes short on supporting detail.

1 **(a)** Most candidates recognised the pot and there was some very sound and creative analysis; fewer successfully analysed the composition in any detail, often focussing on technique at the expense of composition. The best answers covered the whole vase, yet spending most time on the main scene. They identified the scene and commented nicely on the balance between Heracles and his female opponents (though the vast majority of candidates thought Amazons were male). They explored the composition with its intricate overlapping; the variety of figures with their poses, costumes, weapons, groupings; the mirroring, parallels and variations; the anatomy as achieved at this stage, e.g. the attempt at a classical twist of the torso, the use of foreshortening. The best responses appreciated all of this and did not expect the artist to use techniques developed after his time. Weaker answers covered some of these points. There were, however, some misidentifications, e.g. Greeks surrounding a naked savage, or Achilles and Hector fighting at Troy, and there was often a desire for Euphronios to do something different, e.g. introduce facial expression, use fewer characters, and use Classical drapery.

The frieze of dancing men received some very elaborate over-interpretation, but it was generally associated with the purpose of the vase – for drinking parties. There were some answers which were on the right lines but were quite generalised, making no specific reference to elements of the pot's design.

(b) There were some very nice responses in answer to this question. Some candidates, who were not able to do much visual analysis in (a), produced very sensitive discussions on the theme of war and glorifying war, covering a large range of vases with detailed and relevant comment. It was interesting that interpretations differed quite widely, yet were all good – for example, Exekias's Achilles and Ajax was seen both as glorifying war and the opposite, usually with some deft attention to detail and a nice way of exploring the point. Similarly, the Berlin Painter's Achilles and Hector received sensitive and accurate interpretations in both directions. Euphronios's vase was most often taken as a glorification because of its lack of pathos and business-like attitude to the job of heroism. The Kleophrades Painter's Fall of Troy was a favourite example of anti-war and received some heartfelt and detailed treatment. One or two candidates found its savagery to be a glorification – which was puzzling since there are two examples of sacrilege in it, as well as cruelty. Many pointed out there is not much glory in killing the helpless.

Non-war pots also received a lot of coverage. Some candidates made this work very well in their answers, as a contrast and balance. Some used it as an excuse to write about any pot they could remember.

2 **(a)** The answers to this question tended to lean fairly heavily on Woodford's description and interpretation. The central characters were often described in some detail, as were the horses [though some assumed there were just two horses]. Few candidates dealt with the whole pediment, the Anxious Seer, the Crouching Youth and the river-gods, or considered it as a totality.

Most candidates addressed both the ideas stated in the question. There were some quite sensible comparisons with earlier pediments [most often the Siphnian Treasury], to test whether the east pediment from the temple of Zeus was indeed 'original and imaginative', for example, the use of a central deity, the hierarchical arrangement of central figures, whether the outer figures are relevant to the theme, and the use of animals fitting to the slope. Some candidates limited their analysis to the figures shown in the image. Some focused on technical merit of the sculpture, rather than engaging with original and imaginative, which was not always helpful in producing a balanced response.

(b) Most candidates seemed to find this question quite straightforward, and some of those candidates could give plenty of detail from the temple of Zeus *pediment* and the *metopes* from the Parthenon (and a few from the *friezes* from the temple of Hephaestus, and the temple of Apollo at Bassae, though neither of these was necessary for a successful response to the question). The majority limited the content of their answers to what was visible in the photograph. There was little discussion of Apollo and whether his presence made a difference to the whole impression and meaning, or of the symmetry that orders the chaos of the *pediment.* It was sometimes difficult for examiners to decide which *metope* was being discussed as the description was so sketchy. As usual, the centaur without a neck was the most mentioned character of all.

The vote seemed to be between seeing a mass of fights all at once in the pediment versus isolated duels in the *metopes*. Both formats were judged suitable: *metopes* were viewed as clearer for the viewer, whilst *pediments* were felt to represent the whole incident better. There were several responses which contained a good analysis of which type of sculpture was the most successful without mentioning a single example.

As always, it is important for candidates to read the question carefully. Some decided to focus on the popularity of the subject of the Centauromachy rather than answer the question of the success of its depiction in a particular medium. A few candidates even digressed into a discussion on the theme in vase-painting.

Essay Questions

The best essays showed evidence of planning and a clear, well-thought out structure. Question 3 was slightly more popular than Question 4, with a 60% - 40% split.

3 Most, but not all, candidates could identify the relevant statues for the two sculptors. As with 2(a), a common strategy was to compare them with what went before in terms of Contrapposto, pose, musculature and naturalism, grouping and props [though there was sometimes too much concentration on comparative material]. For example, Polykleitos was judged as less original because the asymmetrical pose of the Doryphoros already existed in Kritios Boy and the Riace Warriors; similarly, Praxiteles's work on Hermes and Dionysus was 'less original' because there was already an adult and baby in Eirene and Ploutos but at least Hermes had a 'story'. This approach could work quite well, but at times it could also be a little negative. A positive approach generally worked better, e.g. Doryphoros was seen as more naturalistic; Diadoumenos was judged as subtle, proportionate and looking good from all sides; Aphrodite scored highly by being the first female nude, having a 'coherent story' and a definite pose. Some candidates were able to characterise these sculptures quite well, but others found it hard to recall the details and qualities of the materials the sculptures were made from, and whether the props were a necessity. A significant minority of candidates who attempted this question did not know which statues Polykleitos and Praxiteles had produced; such answers struggled to engage in sufficient detail with the task. Praxiteles was thought to have sculpted everything from Kritios Boy to Aphrodite of the Agora; from Diskobolos to Apoxyomenos. Polykleitos was cited as the sculptor of the Delphic Charioteer, the Artemisium Zeus and an 'elephantine statue of Zeus'. It was not always clear that candidates understood Contrapposto and its effects; even when it was understood, many assumed that it was a Polykleitan invention and that it was used in every statue thereafter.

The best answers displayed a command of the appropriate factual knowledge, producing a detailed analysis, and distinguishing between 'bold innovator' and 'experimenting with a variety of novel poses', rather than lumping the two ideas together.

4   Many candidates answered this question well, displaying detailed knowledge of all the buildings on the Acropolis and showing good understanding of contextual matters, such as the Persian sack of Athens and the formation of the Delian League, as well as a basic grasp of the requirements of Greek religious practice.

The best answers gave a balanced coverage to the general character of the building programme, the background to why new sanctuary buildings were required, and their comparative degrees of decoration. Many answers provide a good guided tour from the Propylaia and the Nike temple into the sanctuary, then viewing the elaborate Parthenon and the Erechtheion, but they did not go on to make the material fully relevant to the question. Whilst most candidates were able to comment on the civic pride and triumphal feeling about the Persian Wars, very few actually commented on the idea of religious devotion.

Some candidates discussed only the Parthenon; others answered without any detailed reference to specific buildings, which left their analysis unsubstantiated.
In addition, there was a surprising amount of inaccuracy about the Parthenon and the Acropolis in general:

- Acropolis and Parthenon were sometimes used interchangeably.

- Perikles turned the Acropolis into a sanctuary for Athena.

- Perikles built the Acropolis for Athens.

- Perikles placed the Acropolis in an area where it could be seen from miles around.

A minority of candidates misinterpreted, or reinterpreted, the quotation. 'Vain' was sometimes taken to refer to Athena; 'vain' was read as 'in vain' or as 'in vain like a woman'.

F389 Comic Drama in the Ancient World

General Comments

There was rather more parity in candidate choice between the Commentary questions this year, with only slightly more answers to Question 1 than to Question 2, but there was a marked preference for Question 3 over Question 4 in the Essay questions. In the Commentary questions, the phrase 'using the passage as a starting point' seems not to have registered with all candidates as a useful suggestion about where to start thinking about their answer. Some candidates, however, failed to refer to the rest of *Frogs* or *Dyskolos* even though the question specifically asked for information from elsewhere in the play.

Where candidates used relevant material from *Lysistrata* and *The Swaggering Soldier* – presumably studied in addition to the four plays actually required for the examination – this was credited in answers to Question 4, but was unfortunately not relevant to any of the other questions. It may be useful to remind Centres that the plays prescribed for the June 2012 examination are still *Frogs, Wasps, Dyskolos* and *Pseudolus*. From the June 2013 examination, the prescribed plays are *Frogs, Lysistrata, Pseudolus* and *The Swaggering Soldier* (*Miles Gloriosus*).

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1   **(a)**   Answers to this sub-question generally showed good use of parts of the passage, but 'effective piece of comic drama' and 'funny' are not the same thing, and many candidates assumed that the question required merely a list of the jokes. Since that meant that in most cases half the passage was ignored, there were a lot of incomplete answers.

     (b)   Many candidates were able to recall both the formal *Agon* between Philocleon and Bdelycleon and the Trial scene in *Wasps* in considerable detail, and were able to make good points relevant to the question. Some answers also displayed effective use of the initial entry of the Wasp Chorus. The *Agon* in *Frogs*, however, proved more tricky and was used less effectively, often with inaccurate recall of its contents. Some good points were made about the respective values of *Agon* and *Parabasis* in presenting serious points. Although this was not strictly required, being in fact material required for Question 4, appropriate credit was given for relevant comments.

2   **(a)**   This question was generally well done. There were particularly well-balanced analyses of Sostratos' character, though only a few candidates seemed to consider that the influence of Pan might have been a factor in his behaviour. The words 'throughout' and 'always' were important, and weaker answers did not always acknowledge these. There was a case for considering the possibility that Gorgias might not always have had unselfish motives, but these were made more rarely.

(b) This question was, however, a casualty of the 'not reading the question' syndrome. Candidates had clearly done a lot of work comparing and contrasting the role and treatment of slaves in both *Dyskolos* and *Pseudolus* and there were a lot of good general answers to a question on that topic. The actual question focused specifically on the slaves of Gorgias and Sostratos in *Dyskolos*. Only Daos (who appeared in the passage as a hint) and Pyrrhias were really relevant, though there was a case for briefly indicating that Sostratos wanted to ask for advice from Getas, referred to specifically in the play as being Kallipides' slave, not that of Sostratos. In *Pseudolus*, discussion had to focus on the eponymous hero.

Essay Questions

3 Answers to this question suggested that had last year's 'timeless/of its own time' question been set again there would have been many excellent answers. Again there was an indication in some of the weaker answers that candidates thought that all that was required was an analysis of the different kinds of humour and a discussion of which play was the funniest. Successful answers took 'audience' or 'viewer' as a starting point and some good comparisons were made with modern theatre or viewing experiences as the focus of the argument.

In the context of this question, it should be noted that comments were required on both *Dyskolos* and *Pseudolus*. Some candidates seemed to be under the impression that comparing just one Aristophanes play with just one New/Roman comedy play would be sufficient. The 'more difficult to understand' side of the question was also less well tackled in weaker responses. Some answers showed a lack of understanding of the plays, but there were also many good answers which drew constructively on candidates' personal responses and showed clear individual engagement with the plays both on the page and in performance. Some candidates went so far as to state that Aristophanes is the greatest comic writer the world has ever seen but this seemed to be contrary to their own beliefs, especially when they contradicted the statement in their argument.

4 This was not a popular question, and it is therefore difficult to make general comments. Stronger answers looked at costume and staging as well as choral odes and the *parabases* in Aristophanes, and commented also on the features of New Comedy plots which made a scripted Chorus less necessary. There were also some good comments on the way in which Plautus used Pseudolus' soliloquies to involve the audience. Some answers failed to distinguish between the Frog and the Initiate Choruses in *Frogs*. One or two candidates commented on the musical elements of ancient Comedy, both in relation to the flute player specifically mentioned in *Pseudolus* and to the stage directions in *Dyskolos.*

F390 Virgil and the world of the hero

General Comments

Examiners felt that the vast majority of candidates had clearly enjoyed their studies because their responses showed a great deal of enthusiasm and engagement with the texts. It was felt that the paper allowed candidates to perform to the best of their abilities. It was accessible enabling all candidates to find something to write about and there were subtleties in the questions which enabled some candidates to stretch themselves and actively explore their material. At the top end there were a number of responses which were exploring the subtle nuances of the literature in an astute, analytical and authoritative way – these in particular were a joy to mark.

Timing did not seem to be a problem for the vast the majority of the candidates. However, there did seem to be a greater number of candidates who were not reading the question carefully enough. Problems included ignoring the 'how typical' in 1(a), recalling events from Books 7-12 in 2(b), including immortal women in Question 3, totally ignoring the quotation in Question 4 and the recalling of a prepared essay on whether Aeneas should be seen to be a hero.

Comments on Individual Questions

Commentary Questions

1   (a)   Some candidates simply wrote a character analysis of Juno and ignored the majority of the passage and the actual question. Generally, however, those candidates who could analyse the passage could compare Juno's behaviour here with the rest of the epic. There were some good answers which explored how truthful Juno was being here and saw that she does not really care for Turnus – how can she when she uses Allecto so cruelly to inspire him and Amata? He is simply a convenient way to delay Aeneas achieving his destiny.

     (b)   Candidates were generally stronger when discussing Jupiter and had seemingly not been prepared on the role of Fate as much. Some did explore the ambiguity of the concept well and made full use of the passage but overall too many did not seem to understand that Jupiter is a facilitator of fate, not its ordainer. One or two did note that if he controlled fate he would not need his scales to discover the outcome of a fight. A few commented that Jupiter often takes the easy way out by letting the ball go by to the wicket-keeper, such as in the Council Meeting in Book 10. It was pleasing to note the number of candidates who made a valid attempt at assessing their importance to the epic.

2   (a)   There were some very good answers to this question. Candidates were skilled in tracking through the passage and explaining why it was effective. In particular, there was greater analysis of the simile and detailed discussion of the question than in previous years. Stronger responses made full use of the second half of the passage. A handful of responses wrote about Passage 1 instead of Passage 2.

     (b)   Weaker responses tended to recycle their 2(a) answer and did not give enough time to the *Iliad* passage or wrote of war in general or did not focus on TROY. There was much good work on fathers and sons and on the loss of friends. There were some lovely studies of book VI of the *Iliad* with Hector and Andromache, which were mature and sophisticated. Although the best answers did range across the whole of *Aeneid* II, not enough did and many simply stuck to the passage. The focus on sorrow and pity was generally good, but many candidates found it difficult to explain why one was more sorrowful than the other.

Essay Questions

3   What was good about this very popular question was the masses of detail candidates were able to offer. AO1 was well achieved especially on Dido, Andromache and Creusa – the most popular triad. Weaker responses tended to list the sad things which happened to women but the stronger answers considered the different stages of Dido's portrayal and discussed divine intervention with her and Amata. Time was also valuably spent considering exactly why their portrayals were sympathetic or not. The best responses considered both ancient and modern audiences – perhaps how a Roman audience would see similarities between Dido and Cleopatra.

4   Candidates compared the two heroes well but some did not return to the quotation. As in 2010, candidates were generally stronger on their recall of the *Iliad* than the *Aeneid*. Many candidates would have benefitted from citing a greater range of examples from the second half of the *Aeneid*. Most considered the different types of hero and why it is difficult to compare them. There was good understanding on the Roman hero, though some candidates were hazy about what makes a Greek epic hero. The most able saw that within the *Aeneid*, Aeneas changes from the Greek prototype to the New Roman.

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)
Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)

Chief Examiner's Report

The specification continues to attract more centres and candidates. There is clear evidence in the answers to the various units that those undertaking a study of the subject are enjoying their experience and engaging with the material. Furthermore, the examiners have been generally pleased with the personal responses to the material studied at both AS and A Level and by the way candidates have approached the issues in a thoughtful and well-informed manner. The vast majority clearly knew the prescribed material in each option at AS and had a wide range of knowledge at A2. The examiners are extremely grateful to teachers for their continued efforts in enthusing their students and providing them with both the knowledge and the skills required by the specification.

It is clear that in the second full year of the specification students are more aware of the skills required. This year there was more evidence of candidates using source material in a constructive and thoughtful way to answer the questions. There was a greater use of plans by candidates for longer answers at both AS and A2. There was also evidence of more careful approach in terms of dealing with the specific issues within a question rather than offering material vaguely connected to it. The candidates displayed an impressive amount of knowledge overall, and many showed a comprehensive understanding of their chosen options. At times, however, this knowledge was not used to develop an argument in answer to the question, or even accompanied by an explanation of its relevance to the issues.

A very large number of answers to the document study elements and the pure essay question displayed a good understanding of the issues surrounding the use of original ancient sources. Evaluation of the material was much in evidence. While some candidates felt secure with a general explanation of the context and approach of a particular author, many more attempted to evaluate specific references which they were using. It was pleasing to see less reliance on the final paragraph general evaluation of an author, and much more on placing the evidence in a context. There were very few answers at either AS or A2 which offered very few or no source material – in itself a pleasing development from the past. However, it is also noticeable how candidates make use of source material which is not adding to the answer. Arbitrary quotations or references which in no way answer the question are included – alternatively the reference is not made relevant with any developed argument.

One of the most common features of the less successful answer was the tendency to answer only part of the question which was set. This is true at all levels and in all options. Many questions are phrased to ask about the source material – this may by asking 'How far the sources support the view' or 'To what extent do the sources allow us to assess...' or 'How reliable are the sources for...'. Many candidates, while using source material to support their answer, often fail to address the aspect of the questions which asks about the sources themselves. So there might be much information on an aspect of Spartan kings or women, supported by sources, but no attempt to assess how far they support a particular view about kings or women, nor whether they are sufficient to allow an assessment. Occasionally this might also be the result of a pre-prepared answer which the candidate was trying to fit into a different question.

The candidates must read the question carefully and give themselves sufficient time to think through what the issues are and what they should provide in the way of factual knowledge, sources and argument to answer it. This may be easier to do at A2 where candidates have one hour for each question, than at AS where there is less time. However, time management of each part of the AS paper is an aspect which may be worth some attention.

Chronological understanding continues to be an issue. While many are quite capable of recognising the order of events, the lack of precise dating can lead the candidate to conflate or confuse events, make connections between them which do not exist and even provide them with significance they do not have. The same is true for authors: when they lived and wrote is very often not known with any certainty, and conclusions based upon such uncertain knowledge naturally lack substance.

It has to be said that the quality of the communication and legibility is much the same as last year. There are still candidates whose scripts are quite difficult to decipher and whose structure and command of technical terms is weak. Lengthy sentences which become so involved as to lack clarity and a lack of paragraphs weaken the quality of the answer and leave the argument under-developed. Assertions which are neither supported by evidence nor explained are not a substitute for developed analysis. The spelling of names of people and places, some of which appear on the examination paper, is variable and, at times, incomprehensible.

It is pleasing to see the continued support for the subject in a wide variety of centres. There continues to be a growth in the numbers. There is considerable enthusiasm for the subject among the students and this is largely due to the hard work of many teachers who clearly inspire their students when exploring the original ancient sources. This comes through at all levels of the examination.

F391 Greek History from original sources

General Comments

From the performance of candidates this year it is clear that the new specification is bedding down well. Across the three options, candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of the material they covered during the year, which they could deploy effectively under exam conditions. The majority of candidates were able to draw on a range of sources in producing their answers, and there was plenty of evidence of skilful interpretation and clear understanding of context. The evaluation of sources remains a sterner test for many, however, and there are still too many vague discussions and imprecise references. Some candidates have been taught to produce general evaluative paragraphs, which are often added at the end of the essay without any reference to the particular question asked; such paragraphs contribute very little to the essay as a whole, and in some cases seem to divert the candidate from more promising approaches.

As last year, there were a very few candidates who attempted the wrong section; it may be worth warning candidates taking Options 1 and 2 about sources common to the two topics, such as the Old Oligarch.

Most candidates appeared to be able to complete the paper in the time allowed, though again this year there were too many over-long answers to the (a) and (b) questions, which account for 30 marks; the (c) question and the essay together carry 70 marks, and so candidates must be encouraged to organise their time effectively under exam conditions. There were a very few rubric infringements where candidates answered two questions from a single section or answered questions from more than one option. It is clear that schools have done an excellent job in ensuring that candidates are familiar with the layout of the paper.

As last year, Option 3 on Sparta was the most popular option. Athenian Democracy was next in popularity, while Option 2 (the Athenian Empire) was taken by the smallest contingent.
Only a small number of candidates attempted to answer the essay question first, followed by the commentary question. The paper has been designed so that the (a) question allows candidates a straightforward introduction to the exam, based on the selection of details from the passage on the paper. For the majority of candidates this worked very well, and they were able to draw out of the passage a wide range of relevant points; the best answers also communicated the context effectively. The (b) and (c) questions build on aspects of the passage set. There was a very small number of candidates who used the (a) question as the starting point for a broader (and in some cases, lengthy) discussion; examiners were able to reward such discussion where it clearly derived from the passage set, but where candidates introduced material from other sources, examiners were unable to reward its use, even if the answer demonstrated a very good grasp of the topic. As in previous years, a very few candidates wrote at excessive length in (a), which in some cases put them under time pressure towards the end of the paper. The very best answers made impressive use of the passage and concisely conveyed an excellent understanding of context.

The focus of the (b) question had been refined for this year's examination, as was discussed at Inset. The wording of the question is now much closer to the (a) question, but candidates are explicitly required to draw on material other than the passage on the paper, and, as a consequence of this, references to the passage are not credited in (b). In addition, we are no longer looking for evaluation in responding to this question, though if candidates choose to evaluate the sources they select, that can be credited using the marking grids. The emphasis is much more on recall of detail and interpretation of the evidence. The idea behind the change was to make a more natural transition from the (a) question, and also to enable a more concise answer; this then allows the candidate more scope to develop an extended answer (without the

problem of repeating, or not repeating, something they have already said) to (c) and a more substantial essay. Although many candidates continue to offer evaluation of the sources they discuss, the change in wording largely achieved its purpose.

There were many well-judged answers to the (c) questions, though some candidates did not structure what they wrote as a response to the question. In the best answers, the interpretation and evaluation of sources were clearly and effectively integrated into the wider argument; examiners found it easy to reward these appropriately under the assessment objectives.

It is well worth spending some time encouraging students to engage with source evaluation in a meaningful way. It is a requirement for the (c) question and for the essay, and can prove one of the significant discriminators between answers. The best answers incorporated evaluation into their discussion of the evidence, and clearly related to what they were saying to the question. Weaker responses often separated the interpretation of evidence from any attempt at evaluation, and in many cases the evaluation offered was in a very general form which contributed very little to the answer. A significant number of candidates trotted out the line about Herodotus being the 'father of lies' (sometimes in the same sentence as describing him as 'father of history'), without relating this in any way to the value of the specific detail they had extracted (in many cases, correctly) from the *Histories* or using it to address the question set.

There were many excellent essays across all the options where candidates were able to make judicious use of material they had covered during the year to answer the question to very good effect. The most effective answers were very well organised, incorporating the issues raised in the bullet points as part of a coherent argument; in many cases it was clear from what was written that there had been over the course of the year lively and intriguing debates in the classroom about some of the more challenging aspects of the different options. This could also be seen in many weaker responses as well, though these were in some cases limited by an uncertain grasp of detail and a less coherent structure. Some candidates continue to rely on the bullet points as an essay plan, in some cases losing sight of the question almost completely. It is worth reinforcing to candidates that they must remember to state the obvious; in Option 2, Question 7, for example, a number of candidates referred frequently to the "original purposes" of the Delian League and clearly knew exactly what was meant by the phrase, but never unpacked its meaning explicitly so examiners could credit them for what they knew.

Producing handwritten work under examination conditions is clearly a challenge for some candidates, just as reading what is produced and rewarding it appropriately is increasingly a challenge for examiners. Each year there are more candidates presenting their work by alternative means and this is certainly worth considering if the candidate is likely to be disadvantaged by presenting in the traditional manner. Examiners work very hard to assign the correct mark to a script, but this can be very difficult in some cases. Where candidates are using a computer, they should remember that poor typing can also impact the clarity of their argument, and that a larger font, preferably with double spacing, can enable their work to be marked more straightforwardly. In some cases candidates would be well advised to spend more time planning and organising their thoughts before committing them to paper, rather than relying on the sheer quantity of answer produced. The same comment also applies to some candidates handwriting their answers. All candidates should bear in mind the value of proper paragraphing; where candidates add material at a later stage on the handwritten paper, they should make as clear as possible the links to the extra material. In some cases, candidates with larger handwriting doubled spaced their work which made it easier to reward them appropriately.

The precise understanding of the chronology of the period studied remains an excellent indicator of candidate's grasp of the subject; any uncertainty here communicates itself very quickly to the examiner, though, of course, the examiner is looking for more than just this. The majority of candidates were able to use appropriate technical terms accurately and clearly, though some might be better advised to use English terms rather than transliterations of the Greek. While papers are likely to choose English terms in the questions where appropriate (*assembly* rather

than *ekklesia*, for example, or perhaps both), there are some terms for which there is no commonly agreed substitute; a good example of this in this year's paper was *gerousia*.
As in previous years, the examiners were struck by the quality of work produced by individual candidates and centres, which reflect considerable credit on all involved. It is refreshing to see the continuing interest in the classical world reflected in the range of responses to this paper.

Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5th century BC

In this option, Question 2 proved the more popular.

Q. 1(a) Most candidates were able to find appropriate points from this passage, such as the competition between members of the aristocratic families and the wholesale changes introduced by Cleisthenes. A very few failed to note that Cleisthenes 'took the people into his party'.

Q. 1(b) The majority of answers covered a good range of examples where we can see competition between political leaders in Athens. Popular choices included: Cimon and Pericles/Ephialtes, Cleon and Nicias, Nicias and Alcibiades. Relatively few candidates discussed the dispute between Pericles and Thucydides, son of Melesias. The best answers made clear references to the sources for the examples they chose, and interpreted them well: there were some good discussions of the Hyperbolus ostracism.

Q. 1(c) The best answers demonstrated a good understanding of the relationship between political leaders and the assembly, examining in some detail contrasting examples such as Pericles and Cleon, as presented by Thucydides. Weaker answers were not clear about the meaning of 'rely on'. A number of candidates used the Mytilene debate as an example, but the context of this was not always understood well; in some cases candidates seem to think that this debate, as presented by Thucydides, demonstrated Cleon's control of the people in the assembly.

Q. 2(a) The majority of candidates were able to draw a good range of points from the two passages, though it was clear that some candidates did not understand the references to 'business' in the Thucydides passage. Quite a number also failed to note the reference to the aristocratic perspective in the Xenophon passage.

Q. 2(b) There were some excellent responses to this question, drawing on a range of different types of evidence, from the opening of Aristophanes *Acharnians*, the archaeological evidence at the Pnyx and a range of material drawn from Thucydides (such as the Mytilene debate, the Pylos debate and his discussion of the oligarchic coup in 411 BC) and Xenophon (the Trial of the Generals).

Q. 2(c) This question offered considerable scope for different approaches. Many candidates were able to secure decent marks by selecting particular sources and discussing their attitude towards the Athenian democracy. There were some interesting discussions of Thucydides: some, relying heavily on his attitude towards Pericles, saw him as very much in favour of democracy, while others focused more on the negative aspects of his presentation of the democracy in action.

Of the essays, Question 3 proved more popular than Question 4.

Q. 3 The majority of candidates were able to put what the Old Oligarch said in context and draw on a wide range of other sources to support their discussion. There were some interesting assessments of the significance of individual political leaders (such as Cimon, Pericles and Alcibiades), and other changes over the course of the period studied. The best answers presented an interesting analysis of the increasingly radicalised democracy.

Q. 4 The best responses demonstrated an excellent grasp of Cleon's career, and were able to discuss the limitations of our available sources in considerable detail. Weaker responses tended to be rather vague about the details of what Cleon achieved, and there was considerable uncertainty about the chronology of the period. Some candidates appeared not to know that Cleon died during the Archidamian War, and traced his direct influence in later events.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

This was the least popular option. Answers were evenly distributed between the two questions in Section A, .Question 7 was considerably more popular than Question 8. Examiners were pleased to see better responses making reference to sources beyond the prescription (ie Aelian, Thoudippos Decree etc); some weaker responses continued to confuse Herodotus and Thucydides (and Thucydides and Xenophon). It is also worth reminding candidates of the difference between Thucydides, son of Olorus, and Thucydides, son of Melesias; there was also some confusion over Thucydides' career, though his hostility towards Cleon shone through many accounts of the 420s.

Q. 5(a) Most candidates were able to draw relevant material from the passage which brought out the importance of the tribute through the close attention to the details of the procedure for collection. Many discussed the role of the prytaneis and noted the significance of the 'identification token'.

Q. 5(b) Many candidates did not focus on the attitude of the allies to Athenian control, merely giving lots of examples of Athenian control, though these were normally well supported from the sources. Most candidates mentioned the Mytlilene Debate from Thucydides, but without focusing on the complaints of the Mytilenians, whether explicit or implied, so failing to address the key question of why they revolted. Most chose instead to focus on the details of the debate between Cleon and Diodotus and its outcome. Many candidates made good use of the Khalkis, Methone and Standards decrees, and the ATL, and could give individual instances of revolts, though not always the reasons for them. A few candidates discussed very effectively the limitations of what we can tell from the sources about those states that chose not to revolt.

Q. 5(c) Some candidates discussed the Melian Dialogue, although Melos was not an ally at the time; however credit was given where details about Athenian imperial control were given from the dialogue. For both parts b) and c) only the very best answers were able to conclude that the allies' attitudes, Athenian control, and Athenian interference changed over time.

Q. 6(a) This proved quite a demanding question, but those candidates who extracted relevant material from the passage achieved very high marks. Some candidates were drawn away from the passage to discuss economic advantages more generally.

Q. 6(b) Weaker answers did not focus on 'economic impact', though it was good to see many citing the Methone Decree (and other examples) as evidence of positive impact for the allies, and some discussion from better candidates of the advantages (and disadvantages) for states outside the Delian League, and also for metics and other non-Athenians.

Q. 6(c) Most candidates mentioned Plutarch on the Periclean Building Programme, but only the better answers ranged more widely, considering the development of the Athenian fleet, the opportunities offered for pay on campaign and for official duties, together with cleruchies (eg Naxos) and colonisation (eg Amphipolis). The best responses considered 'to what extent' and so gave balanced answers.

Q. 7 A significant minority of candidates picked up the term 'original purposes' from the question, but did not explain what they understood it to mean; it is worth reminding candidates to explain the obvious so that it can be credited. Examiners were pleased to see many candidates referring to Thucydides 1.96 and his use of the word 'pretext' (in the translation), though fewer could

discuss in detail 1.99. The majority of candidates referred to both the Mytilene Debate and the Melian Dialogue, though not always without confusing the two. There was also some good discussion of the Peace of Callias before moving on to talk about increasing Athenian imperialism, though only a very few candidates discussed Athens' use of League forces for operations other than against the Persians.

Q. 8 Some candidates who attempted this lost sight of the question, and focused too much on the development of Athenian imperialism, and did not relate this to Thucydides; nor did they address 'to what extent'. Some also were tempted to spend longer on evaluation of Thucydides than they might have in other questions, but where this was accurate and relevant due credit was given. Better answers gave full consideration to what decrees might add to our understanding. Several candidates when evaluating Thucydides dismissed his account of the Pentacontaetia on the grounds that it was not his main theme, some going further stating that the purpose of the Pentacontaetia was not to show increasing Athenian power and imperialism; it is worth considering Thuc. 1.23 & 1.89.

Option 3: Politics and society of Ancient Sparta

There was a pretty even split on questions 9 and 10, with the latter being marginally more popular and generally answered slightly better. Question 12 proved much less popular than Question 11, though there were many excellent answers from candidates who showed an excellent understanding of Sparta's very different relationships with Corinth and Argos. There were also many references to the 'Spartan mirage' (variously spelt), with no explanation of what this means.

Q. 9(a) This question was generally well handled by candidates; most were able to draw a good range of material from the passage, though there were some who thought that the passage suggested that Anaxandrides replaced his first wife. It is also worth noting that the passage can be used as evidence in Section B: relatively few candidates who attempted Question 11 noted the reference to the Elders here (ie members of the *gerousia*), and there were quite a few who used the incident to illustrate the importance of the Ephors ahead of the *gerousia*.

Q. 9(b) Some candidates interpreted 'family' in a way that surprised examiners (eg 'the royal family'); where possible, credit was given for this. There were some very good answers arguing that the family was of limited importance, because of the value Spartans placed on 'community'; and some equally good ones arguing that family was extremely important. Some chose to emphasise the communal aspects of Spartan life (eg the *syssitia*, the *agoge*), while others focused on the importance of producing the next generation and the honour paid to women who died in childbirth. As is often the case, any mention of the *agoge* can become overblown; candidates must be encouraged to focus on the demands of the question.

Q. 9(c) There were some interesting discussions of the position of women in Sparta. There were plenty of candidates who were able to give the stranger details of the Spartan wedding ceremony and make comparisons with Athenian women, but only the best candidates could go further to think about the social implications of the Spartan system for women. Most candidates were able to draw on the evidence of Plutarch and Xenophon, but significantly fewer were able to discuss Aristotle's attitude towards Spartan women in detail, and his views were often dismissed as 'misogynistic' without clear explanation.

Q. 10(a) This passage was used successfully by most candidates, who were able to make a good range of points.

Q. 10 (b) Most candidates were clear about the domestic roles of the helots, and some were able to recall in detail the contribution required by Spartiates from the land allotted to them (and the importance of this to their membership of the *syssitia*). Rather fewer were clear about the military uses of the helot population (eg at Thermopylae and Plataea, or rather differently by Brasidas in his northern campaign). A significant number of candidates included discussion of the passage, which cannot be credited for a (b) question.

Q. 10(c) Some stronger candidates were aware of the Corinthian jibe directed at the Spartans in Thuc. 1.69 & 70, but fewer seemed aware of Thucydides' own comment at 1.118. Most mentioned the helot revolt of 465/4 BC, but far fewer made mention of Pylos in 425 BC (both because of the confusion this incident caused in Sparta and because of the use by the Spartans of helots to supply the men trapped on Sphacteria). Many candidates produced examples where the sources (they claimed) refer to the Spartan fear of a helot rebellion; for example, Cleomenes' refusal of help to Aristagoras (Herodotus Book 5) or Archidamus' speech to the Spartan assembly (Thucydides Book 1) – however, in neither of these cases is there a direct reference to the helots.

Q. 11 This proved a very popular question. Weaker answers revealed some confusion about the role of the *gerousia*, and even what it was, with many confusing it with the *ephors*; not all answers gave details of the membership. There was not secure familiarity with Plutarch *Lycurgus* 5 & 6, and surprisingly large numbers seemed unaware that the *gerousia, 'elders'* and *'founding fathers'* were one and the same. Only a very few of the very best responses appreciated that the importance of the *gerousia* might have changed over time, fluctuating as the kings lost power and the *ephors* rose in importance, notwithstanding the fact that the *ephors* were in office for only a year as opposed to the *gerousia* members' life tenure once elected. Very few candidates really discussed the *gerousia's* probouleutic function, and too often candidates made assumptions about what the sources include. Relatively few made explicit use of the Herodotus passage in Question 9.

Q. 12 There were surprisingly few answers to this question, given that the topic is clearly in the specification and the question made straightforward demands of candidates, as was shown by the generally good answers from those who did attempt it. The best answers showed a sure grasp of the chronology of the period studied and were very clear about the very different relationship Sparta enjoyed with the two states. Most, but not all, candidates who attempted this question were very clear about the limited nature of our sources for Spartan relations with other states.

F392 Roman History from original sources

General Comments

Once again, credit is due this both to teachers and candidates from all those centres involved in the Roman History AS paper. The quality of work noted, including detailed, supported arguments and succinct, specific answers to commentary questions, was admirable, and from this perspective it is heartening to see the fruits of much hard work from all parties involved.

No particular problems were noted with any parts of the paper. There was a good range of responses to each part of the paper; it seemed as though there was a greater number of centres now studying Roman Britain, and slightly fewer studying the Republic.

One point to bear in mind by ALL centres is that in every Option of the paper, the (b) question has been re-worded so that there is no need for candidates to evaluate sources – simply to cite them, to interpret them, and to refer to their content. However, where specific evaluation of sources was found, it was credited: but teachers need to bear in mind, throughout the paper, that specific, rather than generic or general information, about the reliability of a Plutarch or a Suetonius will help to raise marks in AO2. It is also disheartening to read the same paragraphs, trotted out *sui causa*, in (b), (c), and in an essay.

Another peculiar practice noted this year was the habit of students from a few centres to answer the questions in reverse order. For the sake of giving a candidate enough time to answer an essay – and time pressures are tight – it may be sensible for a candidate to do the essay question before the commentary questions; but it appears to be completely counter-productive to do (c), then (b), and finish with (a), since the questions have been devised specifically to enable even a candidate of modest ability to identify points on the question papers and say **something** in (a), then refer to **other** sources in (b) and then to compose a short essay of wider scope in (c). To do them in any other order leaves the weaker candidate without recourse to the help we had intended to provide by setting the questions as we did.

(a) questions were done pretty well on the whole, though several candidates made only passing reference to points, or (in some cases) cited everything whether it was asked for or not. There was still an occasional discovery of a general essay in (a), with little or not reference to the passage. Highlighting relevant parts of the passage on the question paper, on which to focus should be encouraged, and *citation+comment* – 'this shows that . . . because . . . '. Four or five points usually secure a mark of 8/10 – though marks depend on the quality or relevance of the point made and the amount of material in the extract.

(b) questions were generally done quite well, with three or four detailed references to sources being enough to enable good marks to be scored in (a) and (b). In weaker responses, sources are referred to, and then an general evaluative paragraph frequently follows, rather than a discussion raised by the evidence focused on the question. Again, practice is needed. As noted above, there is no longer any need for a candidate to write any evaluation of the source in (b), though it is credited where found.

(c) questions were also done well on the whole – often better than (b) – though weaker responses had often covered the same subject-matter there and needed to say it again. Essays were often impressive in both length and detail, and took the wording of the question into account. Responses which tended to include quite a good amount of factual knowledge, but then made no use of it in addressing the issue raised in the question, and/or added a vague, general evaluation of reliability of the sources, would have been greatly improved if there had been consideration and specific comment relating the point or source back to the question.

Time was generally well-managed and appropriately balanced between the questions. Where candidates seemed to have managed their time poorly, this appeared to be more to do with the imbalances in their knowledge base. Very few rubric errors were noted.

The standard of written English remains very variable. 'Emporer' and 'invation' were by no means the only examples of words common within the sources, which candidates really should be able to spell accurately. 'Ceasar' and 'Britain/Briton' remain ongoing issues. Due allowance is made for errors resulting from writing at speed, but centres need to stress that accurate spelling of subject-specific terms is a desideratum. Slang was less common this year.

Other issues

Centres need to remind candidates to start each question or sub-question on a new page. The examiner needs some space to write summative comments and enter marks.

Comments on Individual questions

Option 1

1 By far the most popular choice.

(a) was mostly well done, with good use of the passage; there were some subtle interpretations of those who both 'build like millionaires . . .' and yet 'are never likely to become solvent again.' Weaker responses tended to see both groups described in the passage as one lump – close reading needs to be encouraged (and practised) here. There was some good context supplied to explain why the groups had found themselves in this state.

(b) was more demanding, with *seriousness of the threat* (or at least *seriousness*) often being overlooked, which led to fewer marks being awarded in AO2. There were also some fairly creative anti-Ciceronians who argued that there was really not that much threat at all from Catiline. Provided they considered such factor as a consul leading an army against Roman citizens, and the gravity of an SCU, they gained good marks for this approach.

(c) this question differentiated well. Weaker responses tended to stick to the printed extract and say 'yes, they were all poor.' There were some very good answers which were able to distinguish between 'poor' and 'desperate' – often those who had also been careful readers of the passage, to judge from their answers to (a).

2 About 1 in 5 candidates in Option 1 answered this question.

(a) was generally done well, as there was a lot to draw on, though more evidence of awareness of context to explain the differences in status and importance in the voting process would have been welcome.

(b) Problems arose with the precise use of the term *'amicitia'.* Candidates often interpreted it as any kind of political alliance. Centres need to make sure that this kind of technical terminology, which is often not readily transferable to the modern world, is clearly explained.

(c) was generally done better than b), with plenty of examples of individuals who succeeded without lots of support from all parts of society – Julius Caesar and Clodius being the most popular examples. Several responses tried to include Catiline, who hardly classes as a runaway success.

3 was less popular a choice than 4 – about 25% of candidates offered it. It was sometimes done very well, but too often there were elements from the sources – particularly his role as aedile – which were omitted, and some weaker responses tried to incorporate material which they appear not to have studied in any depth, as far as his death. There is no set limit of the relevance of material – the specification merely speaks of 'the late Republic' – but the criteria about accurate detail in the grids apply to all material seen.

4 was the most common choice, and was sometimes done well, but some ended up trying to make it into a different question, along the lines of 'how much was Catiline's defeat due to Cicero alone' or 'does Cicero exaggerate his own role' – the latter being closer to the question set, and more rewardable.

Option 2

There was – roughly – a 50-50 split between answers to Questions 5 and 6.

5 (a) Generally well done, though weaker responses included much irrelevant material instead of finding material which 'tell us about the importance of military success to Augustus.'

(b) not that well done. Candidates often found themselves at a loss to go beyond Actium and its propaganda-portrayal by Horace and Vergil.

(c) was generally better. It was not necessary for candidates to discuss other factors than the army to gain marks at the highest level, though they were credited as appropriate.

6 (a) was usually done well, with candidates finding plenty to comment on, and talk about 'seriousness.'

(b) 'popular support' caused some problems. Examiners allowed 'popular support' of all kinds where it was clearly defined – but not, for example, courting the Senate for its support.

(c) was sometimes done well, but there were too many vague and imprecise answers which made no mention of any 'actions taken by Augustus' – lots of answers missed the settlements out completely.

7 about 1/3 candidates tackled this, and 2/3 did Question 8.

7 was sometimes done well, with a good detailed exposition of which individuals did what to help Augustus – notably Agrippa and Maecenas – with quite wide knowledge of Tiberius and the rest of the family. Some answers tried to make out ways in which Julia & Julia were necessary or helpful in Augustus' rule of Rome, where this was attempted it was not done convincingly. At the lower end of answers, there was no accurate knowledge on show beyond Agrippa and Actium, and little consideration of 'extent.'

8 Done in much the same way as 7; some answers well supported and wide-ranging, and at the lower end just assertions with no examples. Candidates need to be taught techniques so that they include some supporting material: some kind of habitual adding of 'this is shown by . . . .' to every general point they make.

Option 3

Answers to all parts of the commentary questions were done much more securely than last year. There were very few responses to Question 10 (under 10%), which is disappointing, since – despite its unusual W. H. Auden-esque appearance on the page – it ought to be a familiar text.

9 (a) This question was sometimes done well, with fine reference to the passage and good coverage. Weaknesses were displayed where candidates only used two sections of the passage, or left out obvious sections and as a result made use of only three or four citations.

(b) most candidates were able to manage at least some discussion of varying reactions to the Roman invasion, but too many seemed to resort to Boudica too hastily. The examiners allowed 'Roman invasion' to include any expansion into new territory, so Calgacus and the Caledonii were accepted; Boudica was not, unless there was good context explaining how the material was relevant.

(c) was generally done better than (b) though many candidates confused Dio with the non-surviving Tacitus, and and quite a few seemed to have no detailed knowledge about the invasion at all. A lot of candidates wrote about Caesar and stopped in 54 BC – relevant, but rather limited.

10 (a), where seen, was done well very occasionally, but more often there was a limited use made of the passage.

(b) Answers varied, not in range, but in detail. One or two were very finely done, with excellent support from inscriptions and archaeology – funerary sculpture – as well as literary evidence.

(c) Again a few excellent answers here, and the standard overall better than in (b), with supported examples of the activities of 'various units.'

11 This was often done well, with good use of archaeology and literary sources – not just the expected Caesar and Strabo, but one answer in particular stands out for its use of Horace, Tibullus, and Suetonius. There were some fine answers which made some detailed use of the coins from LACTOR, which was pleasant to see. Weaker responses focused not so much on contact 'between British tribes and the Roman Empire' as 'Roman contact with Britain' – more limited standpoint – and the weakest talked about Caesar and then stopped (much as was seen in weak answers to 9 (c).

12 There were some very good, very thorough essays here, though again, accounts could be limited; some just gave narrative, covering the whole period with little attention to 'how varied' (a major differentiator in this question, as it turned out.) Others misplaced the Antonine Wall, confusing it with the Stanegate and putting it chronologically before Hadrian's Wall; one or two only talked about Agricola.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

The standard of work presented this year in the examination was generally similar to that last year. There was a slightly greater tendency for candidates not to answer the question set, but to prefer to write lengthy accounts of 'what they knew about'. For example, the first question on the paper elicited a number of lengthy accounts of the Ionian revolt, which candidates clearly knew well, but they failed to connect fully with the question of whether Darius attacked Greece in response to this or whether there were other issues at play. In general, candidates should be reminded of the importance of considering what the question asks, so that their argument and the information and source material which they select can be directed towards an appropriate response. When an answer is not properly directed towards the issues in the question, it is all too easy for marks to be lost both under AO1 – because the material is not fully relevant – and AO2 because the issues in the question are not being appropriately analysed and the validity of the sources in this area evaluated. Candidates should be encouraged to think carefully about the sources and about key episodes in those sources, so that they can analyse, evaluate and interpret them effectively in the light of the demands of the question.

Option 1 Greece and Persia

Q.1 This was a popular choice of question which was, on the whole, tackled well. Candidates discussed Darius' possible motives in detail and drew on Herodotus and Diodorus as well as some good use of Cornelius Nepos and some Persian inscriptions. Some candidates drifted away from the focus and discussed Xerxes' motives for the 2nd invasion. Least successful were the candidates who narrated the events of the Ionian revolt. Candidates should also be careful when speaking about the hubris/nemesis theme in Herodotus that it is appropriately applied to the question. In relation to the use of sources, there was a tendency in some candidates to narrate sections of Herodotus, and perhaps evaluate them briefly, but then not draw any wider historical conclusions from these passages. The best answers recalled the detail from Herodotus that indicated that it was revenge, and then went on to say why quotes such as 'Grant O god that I might punish the Athenians' might have been made up. They then evaluated the accounts with reference to Herodotus' fascination with hubris/nemesis, the role of individuals or his exaggeration of the importance of Athens. Some then went on to talk about trade, economic reasons, political reasons, especially pressure from individuals such as Mardonius, Hippias, Atossa, the different routes taken in 492 and 490, the size of the invasion force and then reached a conclusion balancing up all the different factors at work. There were some good references to various Persian inscriptions, but many candidates did not appreciate that by the time of the Ionian revolt Darius had been on the throne for 23 years. Indeed, a number of candidates seemed to think he had just come to power. The best candidates recalled the detail of how Darius dealt with the Ionians who had revolted, and used that to illustrate how the Persian empire and Darius as ruler worked. Some candidates used the idea of the expansion of the Persian empire effectively in their answers, but then conflated Herodotus' and Diodorus' accounts, with the result that there evaluation of the former was rather confused.

Q.2 was a popular choice, but less successfully tackled than Q.1. Details of the Battle of Salamis were generally well known, although a surprising number of candidates failed to give accurate detail from Herodotus' account. On the other hand, knowledge of events after the battle proved to be somewhat weaker. Some candidates referred to, and used, Aeschylus' *Persae* successfully, whilst others were able successfully to compare other possible turning points, such as Thermopylae, Plataea and Mycale. Candidates often failed to take into account the idea of a turning point, and instead merely gave a list of events, or just stated that each of the other battles was also a turning point. There were lots of details about the build up to Salamis and Themistocles' role in the battle, and what happened in the battle but very little on why these events marked Salamis as the turning point. Recalling the details of the other battles seemed to

be beyond many and a number in their desperation brought in Darius/Marathon and events after Xerxes death. Although many mentioned Plutarch and Aeschylus as well as Herodotus, they generally were not evaluated effectively – in fact evaluation was rather simplistic and generic rather than specific to the quotes they were referring to.

Q.3 Fewer candidates attempted this. The best answers were able to deal in detail with Xerxes, Darius and individuals in their courts. Some answers avoided discussing the role of the kings, others concentrated on their character, rather than what they did. Many were able to successfully deal with the exaggeration issue, but some ignored this element of the question completely. There were some perceptive arguments about how the Persian empire operated and how critical the court and the king were. Comparisons with other sources such as the bible or inscriptions or Aeschylus' *Persians* to Herdotus would have really been helpful. There was too much general argumentation about the role of kings and their courts and not enough specific detail from the sources eg Artmnesia's contribution, the debate before Xerxes finally decides to invade etc. Candidates struggled to reach convincing conclusions about whether Herodotus did exaggerate.

Q.4 Whilst some answers to this question were excellent, many candidates who attempted it lacked knowledge of barbarians in battle. Candidates tended to talk about the Persians in general rather than in battle and even when focused on the question they struggled to recall the specific detail of how the Persians behaved at Lade, Marathon, Thermopylae, Artemesium, Salamis, Plataea, Mycale and Eurymedon. A number of candidates chose to discuss whether Persians were *barbaric* or not. Many candidates did not seem to understand what the term *barbarian* meant to a Greek. Candidates are reminded of the need to read questions carefully and focus on the wording. It was also rare for candidates in this question to refer to Persian inscriptions/reliefs and more importantly to how Persians were represented on Greek vases and in Aeschylus' *Persians*. The best answers referred to things like fused jaws bones found at Plataea and the sculptures on the Parthenon of the lapiths and centaurs to broaden their arguments.

Option 2

Question 5 was a very popular choice, and in the main the issues were well discussed. Few candidates spotted that the reference to Thucydides in the question, but this was not necessary and most discussed it well and were able to use a good variety of sources, pointing to the role of allies on both sides successfully. There was a tendency to focus on 431 and short term causes, rather than broaden the argument. There was very little knowledge of the period 460-431 and the issues surrounding the rising power of Athens in evidence, which rather weakened the arguments of those candidates who wanted to focus on causes of the Peloponnesian War in 431.

Q.6 There was a tendency to turn this into a Delian League question, or else to deal with only part of the quote. Most were able to point to examples of tyranny by Athens, only some candidates were able to give examples from the sources of Athenians speaking of freedom at home. There was a tendency to focus on knowledge before 460 – Thasos/Naxos etc, sometimes to the detriment of more detailed knowledge of the later relations between Athens and her allies. In particular, candidates' knowledge of the years 412 and after proved to be rather weak. Few candidates dealt with the wealth of inscriptions available, those that did were often the most successful answers. It is always helpful for candidates to evaluate Thucydides' (or Xenophon's) account with reference to the 'facts' of Athenian behaviour towards their allies as indicated by the inscriptional evidence.

Q.7 The most successful candidates produced detailed answers and discussion of the events at the end of the 5th century BC. In general answers were a bit narrow in focus and candidates should be encouraged to think more widely about the issues, in particular what was meant by the idea of destroying democracy.

Q.8 This question was noticeably better answered than the others – across the board, from the less able to the more able it seemed to allow them to answer effectively. These answers showed better knowledge often than other question by the same candidate. Weaker responses tended just to list individuals rather than answer the question – however they often still did well due to some good knowledge. There was some really thoughtful source evaluation and everyone at least seemed able to access comments on Thucydides and Aristophanes' issues with Cleon. Few candidates went beyond the idea of war tactics, but several showed excellent knowledge and discussion of the roles of generals from both Sparta and Athens in the Peloponnesian War. Some knowledge of individuals from the whole of the period would have provided some balance.

Option 3

Questions 9 and 10 proved to be the most popular.

Question 9 led to some excellent and detailed discussions of the trial of Socrates. Most candidates, but not all, successfully outlined the charges against him and then discussed the evidence for these charges in the sources. Weaker answers focused on whether Socrates was a sophist or not, whilst a number seemed to think that he had been charged with being a sophist. The wider political aspects of Socrates' trial were well treated by some candidates, but many failed to draw out the connections with Critias and Alcibiades effectively. Most candidates showed knowledge of Plato, Xenophon and Aristophanes, although many did not then effectively evaluate Aristophanes in this context, and the significance of his play in relation to Socrates' trial. All too often there is a generic evaluation of comedy, rather than specific comment on this issues surrounding Socrates. Very few candidates drew a clear distinction between the charges levelled against Socrates and his behaviour in court.

Q.10 produced some excellent responses showing detailed knowledge of drama, and often strong deductions about the role of women in Athens. The best used other sources to compare to dramas, and were able successfully to evaluate drama as a historical source. Many candidates used the Medea and Antigone, whilst some also used the Lysistrata and Thesmophoriazusae. Weaker answers often accepted what drama said at face value. Some candidates seemed to take the question as an opportunity to write all that they knew about the plays they had studied or to discuss the plays as literary works rather than historical documents. Candidates should be reminded to look carefully at the plays as sources, considering what can be learned from them about the society within which they were performed, rather than just seeing them as works of literature.

Q.11 was not very popular, but many were able to point to Aristotle and the Old Oligarch for their evidence, usually without going much wider than this. A number of candidates did not address the issue of 'rights and responsibilities' of citizens, and chose instead to write more generally about they knew of the sections of Athenian society. The weaker of these answers tended just to write about slaves, metics and women, with some reference to the sources, and fail to address the issue in the question.

Q.12 was attempted by a good number, some of whom turned the question into a discussion of the Building Programme rather than an analysis of the sculpture. In general candidates did not know enough detail about the sculpture on the acropolis, but a few of the better answers were impressive and were able to compare the material remains to literary sources. Some candidates failed to identify correctly the layout of the Parthenon and what the sculptures meant in terms of the Athenians' position in the Greek world. Some candidates made excellent links between the buildings and the rhetoric of Pericles' Funeral Oration. The discussion of the issues of using sculpture as a source for interpreting Athenian views was limited, and often there were only limited references to other sources to help elucidate the meaning of the sculptures in their political and cultural context. Some candidates, however, were able to discuss Pausanias and Plutarch effectively.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

Many of the answers to questions in all the options indicated candidates had a clear understanding of the factual information and evidence. They made informed responses to specific issues and generally offered relevant literary and material evidence to support their views. As always candidates developed a variety of ways of treating a particular question which produced very good and well-organised discussions based upon interpretation of well-chosen and relevant evidence.

Questions which ask about the extent to which sources support a view or about the evidence and its usefulness or accuracy still cause some candidates to suffer when they do not take this aspect into account in their answers. It is important to remind candidates that the information and argument in their answers has to be relevant to the specific question. This is especially true of quotations from sources or reference to sources – quotations from Suetonius about Augustus leaving Rome in marble are of little worth when the question is about the role of the Senate.

Questions which do not specifically ask about the sources/evidence still need to be answered through references to them; this is explicit both on the paper and in the marking grids and mark schemes.

On the subject of interpretation and evaluation, there are still the generalised paragraphs, often the first or last paragraph of the essay, unrelated to the specific source material being used. The evaluation needs to be tied to the specific source material being used – whether it is valuable evidence or not. Interpretation succeeds where candidates draw conclusions and not just another (unexplained) fact.

Candidates do not always make clear the context of the source material they are using, and the result is very often a misuse of the source. Clearly candidates have learnt a phrase or a sentence but have no idea at which point in the text it comes, or what was the original context or to what it referred. The result is that it is inappropriately used by the candidate. An isolated word or phrase is of little worth. The lack of any supporting source material or evidence affects the candidate's performance in a number of ways.

More candidates are taking the opportunity to plan their answers – although sometimes the plan can be longer than the answer! Well-structured answers are well-rewarded in the marking grids. The candidate should display an understanding of the evidence and issue(s) across the period as a whole. Coverage of part of a period is partially relevant where relevant issues or information has not been used from other parts of the period. There may be good reasons why part of a period is omitted but the candidates should ensure that their answers show an understanding of the development of the period as a whole.

Many responses displayed a limited understanding of the chronology of the period – which seriously affected the quality of their responses when events were placed in the wrong order and conclusions drawn from this. Equally the way the constitution worked, whether in the Republic or the Empire, was clearly a difficult issue for a number of candidates when answering questions about institutions, power, control, decision-making, administration, and political activity. There were some basic errors in understanding and knowledge – it was claimed the Senate elected consuls, Cicero executed Catiline, the Senate organised the building of the temple of Mars, and, most often, details about authors were simply wrong.

Option 1: The fall of the Roman Republic 81 – 31 BC

The candidates provided a range of responses and all questions were attempted. One of the features of this topic is that candidates tend to approach answers with a chronological narrative of the period rather than a thematic discussion. This is understandable to a degree but it can lead to superficial treatment of relevant information as candidates try to mention everything they can.

There was a variety of responses to Q.1 (How far do the sources support the view that the senate failed to deal with the challenges facing the Republic throughout this period?). There were some exceptional answers here in which candidates were able to identify challenges and analyse fully the role/position of the Senate in responding to these across the period. There was a natural tendency to start with Sulla and work through the period. For weaker answers this meant a narrative of events which did or did not challenge the Republic. A few saw occasions when the senate did meet a challenge, thus providing a more balanced response. Better answers offered a more thematic response, looking at the type of challenges or considering separately successes and failures by the senate. Some answers displayed a good range of knowledge without identifying explicitly specific examples of challenges such as illegal acts, bribery and so forth. Most answers had an array of source material, the best of which was tied closely to the question of 'failure'. Some very good answers identified a range of challenges beyond simply ambitious politicians (competition, optimates' exclusiveness, bribery and control of the system through clientala, violence, the army etc). Some candidates displayed a knowledge about the role of the Senate and its limitations as a body. A good number of responses were weakened by an insecure understanding of the material, a lack of secure dating and a tendency to quote, especially Plutarch, with no indication that they knew the original context of the reference. Examples of insecure chronology are: the Leges Gabinia and Manilia were often in the wrong order, Pompey went to Spain in the 60s after dealing with the pirates. A number of candidates were able to focus on some challenges facing the senate but were less convincing in keeping to the time period with excessive discussion of Marius and the early Sulla years. The best answers dealt with how far the sources supported the Senate's failure to deal with challenges rather than just highlighting where and when it failed.

Q.2 asked the candidates to consider how far Julius Caesar was typical of the politicians of this period. This was a popular question with candidates. There was no need for answers to cover every other politician they could think of, and clearly better answers selected a good range to compare with Caesar. Generally students answered this question confidently and successfully with some excellent responses dealing with the career of Caesar and arguing the issue of typicality/or not with precise reference to Caesar's own career and also other politicians of the time (ie comparisons and contrasts). Better answers also provided a balance in terms of typical and atypical comparisons. There was a noticeable lack of knowledge of Caesar's early career, most responses starting with the triumvirate in 60 BC. Some candidates clearly thought that Caesar chose a triumph rather than consulship in 60 BC. Weaker answers viewed Caesar as atypical, ignoring his generally similar behaviour for much of his career. Pompey was the popular choice for comparison, seeing him and Caesar as much the same. His dictatorship seemed to colour a number of candidates responses when judging his typicality. Weaker responses managed to answer without reference to any other politician. It was apparent in this question that candidates of all levels tend to have a very hazy understanding of the how the constitution worked, what was legal or illegal and how decisions were made. Weaker responses tended to provide a narrative of Caesar's career without specifically dealing with typicality.

Q.3 (Was Sallust correct in his view that moral decline was the cause of the collapse of the Republic?) was generally less popular. Some candidates did not refer to Sallust's view in their answers but developed a discussion of the various factors which did affect the Republic. Others defined various aspects which could be considered part of a 'moral decline (use of bribery, violence, corruption, greed etc). Some candidates gave the impression they were unaware of Sallust as a source. Better answers made connections between 'moral decline' and the failure of

the Republic politically with some thoughtful analysis of the effects of wealth and ambition. Better answers developed an argument from well-selected examples with support from Sallust's view of Catiline, Cicero and others such as Pompey, Crassus and Sulla; Cicero was also used to effect. Plutarch was used frequently although less successfully where evaluation was generic rather than specific. There were some candidates who spent time on the Gracchi and Marius, information for which is outside the period. There may be a case for indicating how the 'moral decline' began with them but too much space and time was spent on this by some. There were some answers that relied on prepared material that focused on a general response without really addressing the precise needs of the question.

Q.4 (To what extent were individual politicians able to control decision-making throughout this period?) suffered from a lack of understanding about how decisions were made and how the constitution worked, especially in terms of how individual activity was central to the politics of the period. Better answers provided examples of specific decisions, and the context in which they were made, as well as the extent to which an individual was responsible for them. The range of examples and source references used was impressive and informed. Weaker answers assumed politicians could always control the making of decisions rather than seeing how this happened in specific instances. Candidates also provided more successful responses where they looked at how individuals could affect decision, through amicitia (such as the triumvirates), bribery, violence, control of tribunes and so on. They used the evidence of (?) Quintus' Commentariolum, Cicero's Letters and Speeches, as well as later sources such as Plutarch on political activity. Good balanced arguments were made about Pompey's early successes and later problems. A number of candidates had interesting and well-structured approaches to the question, other than a simple narrative of politicians' efforts to achieved their aims. Appian, Dio and Velleius (variously rendered) appeared in a number of responses, but rarely was the reference given in a specific form and quite frequently in a paraphrase which was barely recognisable. Once again the Gracchi and Marius were discussed as part of the answer, despite being outside of the period. The best answers focused on the extent to which individual politicians were able specifically to control decision making rather than just highlighting occasions when they made decisions for their own benefit.

Option 2: The invention of Imperial Rome

This was a more popular option. However, a number of candidates displayed a weak understanding of the constitution, although stronger candidates were aware of the nature of the constitutional power of the emperor. Equally candidates sometimes took Rome to mean the Empire. Responses often did not provide consideration of the latter part of the period.

There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q.5 (How far do the sources support the view that the emperors extended their power and control over Rome and its people during this period?). This was a popular question most students recognised the role of maintaining popularity through food supply, games and entertainments and there were some good discussions of the key elements of political control established by Augustus. It was clearly important that answers dealt with the issue of the sources in this question; responses which gave a narrative of imperial power and control would inevitably be limited in both objectives. Weaker answers did not distinguish between power and control; many responses focused purely on control of the population of Rome (essentially the lower classes). Understanding of how power worked and how it was exercised was present in better answers. Development beyond Augustus at times was weak, and even where there was some attempt to show how power and control changed, many ran out of information when it came to the Flavians, despite the clear contrast between Augustus and Domitian. Better answers sometimes showed how the emperors' power could be limited. The issue of control was often dealt with by reference to donatives, corn dole, water supply, buildings and propaganda with the emphasis on popularity. Some reference was made to the Praetorian Guard and the vigiles, and under Tiberius, the treason trials. Sources were usually better for Augustus (Res Gestae), becoming less exact and

less relevant as the period progressed. Some answers displayed very little use of sources/evidence.

Q.6 asked the candidates to consider the extent to which emperors gave the Senate and individual senators an effective role in the administration of the city of Rome. In responses to this question, better answers had some detail of what the Senate and senators did. Weaker answers discussed the relative power of emperor and senate. Responses tended to be either very strong or very weak. Candidates again chose not to use the terms in the question and focused on relationships or power. Some answers did not use sources, perhaps because the sources are not mentioned in the question; however, all the questions require use of source material. Some responses did make use of the amici principis, the increased role of the Equestrians and freedmen which offered a relatively straightforward structure to the answer. Some answers discussed the reason for the way emperors treated the Senate without developing what it actually did (or did not do). Answers which became diverted in to discussing the role of senators in the provinces were not focused on the question about the city of Rome. It was clear that some candidates had prepared an essay on the overall relationship of the Senate with the emperor and put this forward disregarding the precise terms of the question.

Q.7 invited the candidates to discuss the evidence for the efforts of the emperors in establishing the Imperial Cult in Rome. The important parts of this question were the scope of the evidence and 'in Rome' and better answers recognised that the answer required addressing both the development of the imperial cult within Rome and whether emperors tried hard to establish this. Better answers examined the quotation critically and in some detail. Not all candidates knew what the Imperial cult was or how it worked. Some responses seemed to see 'established' as 'started'. Many responses appeared to know few details about its ritual, and officers and relevance to the main state religion. Candidates were perfectly at liberty to argue that emperors did not make efforts and the evidence is slight – evaluating in the process the limitations of our evidence. Better answers made that point with some emperors but were also aware of the efforts made by others to extend the worship of the imperial family, and even emperors while alive. Some candidates took the opportunity to question much of the evidence in the literary sources, especially the poets of the Augustan Age, while offering some numismatic and epigraphic evidence. However, these examples were often not given a context – a coin of Nero with radiate crown (actually from Syria) does not help unless interpreted specifically and in detail. There was a tendency to narrate through the emperors, without suggesting a sense of the development of the idea of the cult. Why it was useful, politically and religiously, was again not explored by most. Evidence from outside Rome could be useful as a way of indicating an emperor's intentions if carefully interpreted. Some weaker answers were not certain about definitions of the imperial cult and there were very few answers that focused on religion in the city of Rome during this period, generally.

Q.8 (How consistent were the emperors in their policies towards the city and its amenities?) As in a previous question some candidates did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. They are not mentioned in the questions but the very clear instructions on the paper, as well as the marking grids and previous mark schemes have made it clear that all answers need to be supported by detailed use of the sources. This question was generally well answered with most (but not all) understanding amenities. They were able to give specific examples. Identifying the policy and analysing consistency was less well done. Better answers discussed the idea that emperors often reacted to a situation rather than had specific policies. One policy mentioned was the need to keep the plebs happy. While noticing some inconsistency, candidates did not always note why it occurred. There was good reference to Frontinus and Juvenal which was used to establish some policies or actions as well as their effectiveness. In some answers there was failure to address the issue of consistency or there was insufficient coverage across the period – many candidates were very good on the Julio-Claudian period but seemed less knowledgeable and confident about the Flavians. Some candidates limited amenities to buildings alone. Many candidates were very good on the Julio-Claudian period but seemed less knowledgeable and confident about the Flavians.

Option 3: Ruling the Roman Empire AD 14- 117

Candidates were largely knowledgeable, at least about some parts of the period and some events; they generally had knowledge and understanding of the evidence available. Concentration on the latter part of the period was noticeable in answers. However, there were some excellent answers with detailed use of evidence and a wide range of knowledge. The difficulties we have with source material for provincials was often mentioned but rarely explored in the body of the answer. There are limitations with the source material, and the danger is generalising from one piece of information.

There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q.9 (How typical of the provincial governors of this period was Pliny the Younger?). This was a reasonably popular question and well-done by most. Candidates knew a selection of Pliny Letters. They were less familiar with what other governors did, and oddly did not use the material on Suetonius Paulinus, and other governors of Britain which was used in other questions. There was some weak understanding of what constituted typical activity by a governor. Some answers had detail of governors mentioned in Tacitus and Dio Cassius, and better answers knew the range of tasks a governor had. The most often used governor was Agricola with varied use of Tacitus' biography.

Q.10 asked the candidates to consider how far the sources help us to assess the extent to which Roman rule was welcomed in the provinces. Weaker responses had little to offer beyond revolts with Boudicca the prime example. References to Cogidubnus or Cartimandua were used in better responses. Judaea was often mentioned as an example of a people who did not welcome the Romans (usually in a generalised manner with no idea that some did welcome the Romans). Bithynia and Africa were also employed occasionally. Sources varied, although occasionally and briefly the bible was used (and it could be used more in this option). Pontius Pilate made an appearance as a cause for disquiet (although the bible was not used as a source usually). Josephus (sometimes rather vaguely) was referenced, along with Tacitus (Agricola), Dio Cassius (Boudicca) and Suetonius. Inscriptions were used in responses to good effect. Better answers offered a balance by indicating evidence of cases where the provincials did welcome the Romans; this was further explored by those who distinguished between elites and ordinary provincials. The evidence for this varied from inscriptions of dedications by locals (although the author was sometimes referred to as Lactor 8/18) to the Letters of Pliny. Some showed a discrimination in their use of information recognising that not all revolts indicated a lack of welcome for the Romans but were specific to certain grievances. Examples of locals welcoming the Romans included Aphrodisias, Cogidubnus' inscription, and coinage. There were good arguments about the limitations of evidence concerning only the elites.

Q.11 invited the candidates to discuss the extent to which the evidence supports the view that the Empire was financially well-managed. Answers tended to focus on taxation without much evidence other than the revolts caused by excessive taxes eg Frisii, Sacrovir. This indicated it was not well-managed. There was some reference to good and bad emperors who filled or emptied the treasury respectively. Economic policy, trade and the extent to which the Empire was successful economically replaced the idea of financial management, not without some degree of sophistication and success where it was well-argued. Some candidates used material from Pliny to indicate corruption among local elites and governors. Weaker answers had an overall view but few specific examples upon which to base their arguments. Details of the way the Empire was managed and the officers involved (such as freedmen and procurators) were present in the better answers, as were examples of good and bad practice.

Q.12 ('The security of the Empire depended entirely upon the army during this period.' How far would you agree with this view?) Some candidates did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. The better answers recognised the significance of the word 'entirely' and were able to argue that the army was one of number of factors. Suppression of revolts seemed to be the prime duty of the army (although not always related well to the idea of security as in the question). This often resulted in a narrative of armies putting

down revolts; sources were employed about the revolts but they did not relate to the security of the empire or the role of the army as such; rather they explained the causes of the revolts. Better answers knew of the duties of the army – garrison duty, infrastructure development, settlement in colonies, and internal security. These responses would also indicate that good government by provincial administrators offered an alternative to the army and addressed the issue in 'entirely'. Much information was similar to the material used in Q.10. This in itself was not a problem but it had to be interpreted in terms of this question. Other factors included Client Kings (eg Armenia), Romanisation (Tacitus Agricola 21), diplomacy, and so on, but answers did not always provide specific examples.

The handwriting of a number of candidates caused a problem and an inordinate amount of time was spent trying to decipher what had been written. One suggestion might be to make candidates who invariably word-process their homework to hand-write their work from January onwards. If nothing else it might alert centres to potential problems. The spelling of some words is a perennial problem – Caesar, Emperor, Britannia, Mediterranean are typical examples.

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