

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/11
Greek Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to make full use of the time available and plan longer responses where appropriate. It is important to make full use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

General Comments

There were more rubric errors than in recent years, with several candidates answering questions from all four sections, and some answering only one question; a substantial number of answers were only a few lines long (6–10 lines). The detail of some candidates' knowledge was not as thorough as it might have been; for instance, there were a number of references to Augustus instead of Alexander or to Rome instead of Greece or Athens.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(ii) Most candidates were able to identify the battle, although the dates given varied.
- (iii)–(iv) Virtually all the answers identified the members of his family that Darius left behind, but were less confident about the objects he left behind on the battlefield.
- (v) Descriptions of the victory for the most part tended to be generic, giving general tactics used by Alexander, rather than concentrating specifically on those used at the Battle of Issus.
- (vi) Most candidates had some idea of the relationship between Alexander and Hephaestion, but answers tended to be more narrative than analytical. Few answers mentioned the passage, even though the question demanded it.

Question 2

Candidates were generally aware what the policy of fusion meant, although at times they were unable to give precise details of its implementation. Better answers dealt with both the positive and the negative aspects of the policy on both Macedonians and Persians, while there were also references to the legacy left by fusion. They also gave specific instances of Macedonian opposition. Weaker answers tended to be more general, both on the implementation and its results.

Question 3

This was the most popular of the Alexander questions. Candidates were generally able to discuss not only what Alexander inherited from his father, but also other factors in his military success. There were some misunderstandings over the army which Philip created, with some candidates believing that Alexander fashioned the army, inventing the phalanx. Very few candidates made any reference to the generals, while others drifted away from military success into areas such as politics and governing the Empire. Some interpreted the question a little too literally and simply argued that, without an army, Alexander would not have been able to win battles. A few candidates treated this as a general question on Alexander and his achievements.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i) Virtually all the candidates identified the location of the conversation.
- (ii) Most were able to give some of the reasons Crito gave, but few managed to gain full marks.
- (iii)–(v) Many were able to identify one of those who would help Socrates and what reward he proposed originally, but did not always know what punishment he proposed.
- (vi) Most candidates were able to summarise, at least partially, the argument used by Socrates for not escaping, and the part played by The Laws of Athens in this argument.

Question 5

Although a very popular question, most candidates found it hard to fully explain the reasons for Socrates' death. Not all appreciated the prejudice that had built up against Socrates before the trial. Virtually all the candidates found it hard to distinguish between the different aspects of the question, dealing with the reasons as a whole. The references to *Apology* were often limited, especially with respect to the reasons for the death penalty. Some candidates were able to analyse Socrates' attitude in his defence, and draw conclusions about how this contributed to his sentence. Several candidates took the word 'apology' in its modern context of saying 'sorry', rather than Greek idea of a defence speech.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to discuss at least two of the dialogues, with *Euthyphro* being the most popular. Candidates generally had a reasonable knowledge of the content of the dialogues, and of how the Socratic Method was used in them. Opinions differed, with much depending on the candidates' definition of the purpose of the Socratic Method; there were answers which were mostly narrative, with little by way of analysis.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(v) Only a handful of candidates tackled this question, and they displayed little appropriate knowledge in the shorter answer questions. They were, however, able to identify some of Aristophanes' comic techniques and explain their humour. They were less successful in discussing the lessons which Anticleon tried to teach Procleon.

Question 8

There were very few answers to this question on the success of *Frogs*. There was some discussion of different elements which made *Frogs* a success, but candidates did not always deal with the plot.

Question 9

Candidates tended to deal with why spectators would have enjoyed the plays, without specific reference to spectacle. Some candidates discussed the reaction of a modern audience, rather than that of an ancient audience.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i) Most candidates were able to identify the type of pot as a kalyx krater, although some gave its name rather than the type of pot.
- (ii) Most were also able to identify that it was used for mixing, although not all mentioned wine and water.

- (iii)–(v) The Painter was variously identified, as was his group and the date.
- (vi) Many candidates correctly identified the figures as Herakles (or Hercules) and Antaios, but simply stated that it was one of his twelve labours. Very few were able to recall the need to lift Antaios off the earth.
- (vii) Successful analysis of the composition was limited, although there were some good answers. Some picked up on the symmetry of the design. Discussion of the contrast between the two figures was generally tackled better, with appropriate details about appearance and musculature from the pot discussed.

Question 11

Candidates who answered this question had little knowledge about the Trojan War, and struggled to offer references to appropriate vases.

Question 12

There were very few responses to this question. Most were able to comment on the benefits of the red figure technique, but were less good at dealing with the ideas of 'bold' and 'lively'. Some strayed beyond the specified dates, and would be encouraged to take note of what the question specifically asks.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/12
Greek Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to make full use of the time available and plan longer responses where appropriate. It is important to make full use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

General Comments

There were more rubric errors than in recent years, with several candidates answering questions from all four sections, and some answering only one question; a substantial number of answers were only a few lines long (6–10 lines). The detail of some candidates' knowledge was not as thorough as it might have been; for instance, there were a number of references to Augustus instead of Alexander or to Rome instead of Greece or Athens.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(ii) Most candidates were able to identify the battle, although the dates given varied.
- (iii)–(iv) Virtually all the answers identified the members of his family that Darius left behind, but were less confident about the objects he left behind on the battlefield.
- (v) Descriptions of the victory for the most part tended to be generic, giving general tactics used by Alexander, rather than concentrating specifically on those used at the Battle of Issus.
- (vi) Most candidates had some idea of the relationship between Alexander and Hephaestion, but answers tended to be more narrative than analytical. Few answers mentioned the passage, even though the question demanded it.

Question 2

Candidates were generally aware what the policy of fusion meant, although at times they were unable to give precise details of its implementation. Better answers dealt with both the positive and the negative aspects of the policy on both Macedonians and Persians, while there were also references to the legacy left by fusion. They also gave specific instances of Macedonian opposition. Weaker answers tended to be more general, both on the implementation and its results.

Question 3

This was the most popular of the Alexander questions. Candidates were generally able to discuss not only what Alexander inherited from his father, but also other factors in his military success. There were some misunderstandings over the army which Philip created, with some candidates believing that Alexander fashioned the army, inventing the phalanx. Very few candidates made any reference to the generals, while others drifted away from military success into areas such as politics and governing the Empire. Some interpreted the question a little too literally and simply argued that, without an army, Alexander would not have been able to win battles. A few candidates treated this as a general question on Alexander and his achievements.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i) Virtually all the candidates identified the location of the conversation.
- (ii) Most were able to give some of the reasons Crito gave, but few managed to gain full marks.
- (iii)–(v) Many were able to identify one of those who would help Socrates and what reward he proposed originally, but did not always know what punishment he proposed.
- (vi) Most candidates were able to summarise, at least partially, the argument used by Socrates for not escaping, and the part played by The Laws of Athens in this argument.

Question 5

Although a very popular question, most candidates found it hard to fully explain the reasons for Socrates' death. Not all appreciated the prejudice that had built up against Socrates before the trial. Virtually all the candidates found it hard to distinguish between the different aspects of the question, dealing with the reasons as a whole. The references to *Apology* were often limited, especially with respect to the reasons for the death penalty. Some candidates were able to analyse Socrates' attitude in his defence, and draw conclusions about how this contributed to his sentence. Several candidates took the word 'apology' in its modern context of saying 'sorry', rather than Greek idea of a defence speech.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to discuss at least two of the dialogues, with *Euthyphro* being the most popular. Candidates generally had a reasonable knowledge of the content of the dialogues, and of how the Socratic Method was used in them. Opinions differed, with much depending on the candidates' definition of the purpose of the Socratic Method; there were answers which were mostly narrative, with little by way of analysis.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(v) Only a handful of candidates tackled this question, and they displayed little appropriate knowledge in the shorter answer questions. They were, however, able to identify some of Aristophanes' comic techniques and explain their humour. They were less successful in discussing the lessons which Anticleon tried to teach Procleon.

Question 8

There were very few answers to this question on the success of *Frogs*. There was some discussion of different elements which made *Frogs* a success, but candidates did not always deal with the plot.

Question 9

Candidates tended to deal with why spectators would have enjoyed the plays, without specific reference to spectacle. Some candidates discussed the reaction of a modern audience, rather than that of an ancient audience.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i) Most candidates were able to identify the type of pot as a kalyx krater, although some gave its name rather than the type of pot.
- (ii) Most were also able to identify that it was used for mixing, although not all mentioned wine and water.

- (iii)–(v) The Painter was variously identified, as was his group and the date.
- (vi) Many candidates correctly identified the figures as Herakles (or Hercules) and Antaios, but simply stated that it was one of his twelve labours. Very few were able to recall the need to lift Antaios off the earth.
- (vii) Successful analysis of the composition was limited, although there were some good answers. Some picked up on the symmetry of the design. Discussion of the contrast between the two figures was generally tackled better, with appropriate details about appearance and musculature from the pot discussed.

Question 11

Candidates who answered this question had little knowledge about the Trojan War, and struggled to offer references to appropriate vases.

Question 12

There were very few responses to this question. Most were able to comment on the benefits of the red figure technique, but were less good at dealing with the ideas of 'bold' and 'lively'. Some strayed beyond the specified dates, and would be encouraged to take note of what the question specifically asks.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/13
Greek Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to make full use of the time available and plan longer responses where appropriate. It is important to make full use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

General Comments

There were more rubric errors than in recent years, with several candidates answering questions from all four sections, and some answering only one question; a substantial number of answers were only a few lines long (6–10 lines). There was less evidence of planning the longer answers than in recent years.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(iv) Most candidates did very well on these short answer questions, giving the factual information required with some level of detail.
- (v) The answers to the question about what happened to Darius after the Battle of Gaugamela varied in the amount and accuracy of the detail, although most knew the basic outline of what happened.
- (vi) This question had a range of answers. Most were able to deal with Alexander's personal bravery, with a good variety of examples given, and discussion of how his bravery contributed to his success in battle. Better answers also dealt with other factors which helped, while some concentrated more on these other factors (strategy, organisation, army, etc.), with little reference to his bravery. Few candidates actually referred to the image, despite the instruction in the question.

Question 2

Candidates were able to give examples of when Alexander was in danger, both from his enemies and from his own men. Examples of enemies' danger included various battles, but more perceptive answers distinguished between general battles, and specific personal danger (Granicus, Mali). Danger from his own men included discussion of mutinies and plots, but not often in the same answer. More perceptive answers included reasons for Alexander's men turning against him, and discussion of incidents such as the death of Cleitus. Opinions on the quotation varied, with candidates more or less equally divided.

Question 3

Candidates were generally able to deal with all the aspects of the question, including the influence of both parents, as well as his education. Not all answers dealt with all three aspects. Some answers were more of a narrative of his early days, but better answers did look at Alexander's behaviour later in life, and analyse what factors contributed this, with reference both to events which showed influence from his early days, and to ones which did not. They also assessed the relative influence of each of the different aspects.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i)–(iii) Most knew who was narrating Socrates' death, and to whom, but quite a few could only name one of the people Socrates was talking to.

- (iv) Many wrote down the pleasures which appear in the passage, rather than those mentioned before the passage.
- (v) Most knew the details of Socrates' last moments, although some described the whole of the last day, rather than just the last moments.
- (vi) Candidates were, in general, able to discuss Socrates' views on death, and mostly limited themselves to *Phaedo*, although some ideas from *Apology* did intrude occasionally. The idea of freeing the soul from the body, and the pursuit of knowledge were discussed by most candidates, as were Socrates' views on suicide.

Question 5

Most candidates knew how Socrates differed from the Sophists, such as lack of payment and claiming not to be a teacher. The reasons why he did not wish to be considered as a Sophist caused more problems, with many answers not discussing *Apology*, and Socrates' rebuttal of the 'Old Charges', or Aristophanes' portrayal of Socrates.

Question 6

Candidates knew of Socrates' attempts to discover the truth of the Delphic Oracle, and his belief in his personal *daimon*. All of the dialogues were discussed – *Euthyphro* and its concentration on holiness, *Apology* and the charge of impiety, *Crito* and the good life, and *Phaedo* and death and the gods. Most considered the charge of impiety to not be justified, although there was sometimes confusion as to the exact meaning of the charge, with it being considered to be atheism, rather than believing in gods not recognised by the state. For this reason, some candidates saw Socrates' belief in his *daimon* as a reason the charge was not justified, rather than the opposite.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(ii) Virtually all the candidates knew the answers to these questions on the underworld.
- (iii) Most knew the general details for this question, but did not know the precise details, with Salamis and Marathon being mentioned, as well as the Peloponnesian War.
- (iv) Virtually all the candidates were able to extract examples of Aristophanes' comic technique from the passage, and explain their humour.
- (v) Candidates were able to discuss the relationship between Dionysus and Xanthias, with examples drawn from the play. They also discussed its contribution to the comedic aspects of the play, and the messages the play was conveying, but not many candidates considered both.

Question 8

Candidates discussed many aspects which contributed to the success of *Wasps*. These included not just the plot, but also the comedy, characterisation, visual spectacle and messages, amongst others. Success was variously attributed. Candidates were able to quote examples to back up their ideas in varying degrees. Many disregarded the plot, concentrating on other aspects in their answers.

Question 9

Candidates had knowledge of both plays, and the contribution of the Chorus in each. They considered the contributions to both the humour and the messages in the plays, and, in many cases, the visual impact. *Wasps* was generally considered to use the Chorus more effectively, through its visual impact, the comic scenes it was involved in, and the *Parabasis*. Some candidates did not discuss both Choruses in *Frogs*, and many considered their contribution to the humour to be negligible. A surprisingly large number ignored or disregarded the *Parabasis* of *Frogs*.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i) Most candidates were able to identify the type of pot as a column krater.
- (ii)–(iii) Most were able to identify the date and the painter.
- (iv)–(v) The return of Hephaistos to Olympus was usually identified and most were able to pick out elements of the scene which reflected the vessel's use at a symposium.
- (vi) Candidates were generally aware of how a scene is made lively and vivid, although they were sometimes not able to distinguish between the two. Examples were drawn from the pot to help with assessing the artists' success.

Question 11

Candidates seemed to find the different aspects of the question about the Pioneers and the Mannerists challenging. They lacked the precise detail over who were Mannerist or Pioneer Painters. Even when candidates were able to allocate particular painters to the correct school, they struggled to recall exact pots, which meant they were unable to deal with the 'innovative' aspect of the question.

Question 12

Generally, candidates knew of pots which depict gods and heroes, although there was often confusion over the precise details of the painters and pots discussed.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/21
Roman Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to:

- make full use of the time available;
- plan longer answers;
- use the mark allocation to determine how much to write;
- make use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(ii) Many candidates named the battle although there was less certainty about the date.
- (iii) Candidates found it hard to explain the references to the gods, especially the Penates.
- (iv) Most identified the ‘Egyptian wife’ as Cleopatra, but did not always explain the importance of war being declared against her.
- (v) Few responses showed real awareness of the significance of the closing of the Gates of Janus.
- (vi) Most candidates were aware of the role played by Agrippa in winning the Battle of Actium but seemed less confident in explaining how he assisted Augustus. There was evidence of good recall on Agrippa’s role as a general and in helping to build things, but not all linked this to propaganda.

Question 2

Many candidates chose to answer this question by providing a narrative of how Augustus gained power. They tended to start with the death of Julius Caesar, not at 27 B.C. as specified in the question. This made a large part of these answers irrelevant and moved the focus of the answer away from the Constitutional Settlements of 27 and 23 B.C. and other methods of staying in power.

Question 3

There were some solid answers to this question, but many struggled with the concept of succession; some considered it to mean success in ruling, while others confused Augustus succeeding Julius Caesar with Augustus being succeeded. Those who discussed Augustus’ heirs did not always name the nominated successors and, although there were some good details of the way in which Augustus nominated his successors, only a few answers discussed the reasons for Augustus’ policy.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i)–(ii) Most candidates explained why Aeneas visited the Underworld, but did not state where he was.

- (iii) There were mixed responses to the simile question with some making good links between the simile and the situation in the Underworld. A minority of responses elaborated on the two with sufficient detail.
- (iv) Most responses demonstrated knowledge of Jupiter's orders.
- (v) Some candidates did not know who Sychaeus was but most accurately described the situation surrounding his death.
- (vi) Typically, most candidates recalled Dido leading her people away from Tyre, building the city, her hospitality, her descent after being shot by Cupid and her 'marriage'. Some referred to her curse at the end. The ability to link this information to the question and to apply it to the concept of pity, while considering both sides of the argument, proved challenging for many. Virtually all the candidates felt pity for Dido, but they often found it hard to explain why they felt this way.

Question 5

There were some good answers which discussed Aeneas's heroic traits, both Homeric and Roman, but some responses struggled to define heroism, which compromised their answer. There was some evidence of pre-prepared answers which dealt with isolated heroic concepts – strength, bravery, compassion and caring for family. While these provided some relevant examples, many did not see Aeneas' flaws as a hero. However, a majority of answers talked about the Greek hero as opposed to the Roman hero and recognised the differences between ancient and modern concepts of heroism.

Question 6

Most candidates recalled the role of the deities in the relevant books, and in some depth. Why they were important was left implicit by some, while others tried to wrap this up in two sentences in their conclusion. There was some confusion over the specific activity of each god. Some found it harder to assess the importance of the gods to the epic and this meant their answers were mainly narrative.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(ii) Generally responses did not place this passage within the context of the whole of the Satire. The reference to the 'idiot Otho and his Reserved Seat Act' was not widely known, and a number were unable to recall what Juvenal goes on to say about a poor man's accommodation.
- (iii) Candidates were more successful in responding about Juvenal's satiric technique. They picked out techniques (even if they did not use the technical names), and provided apt examples. Explaining the effect of the techniques proved to be a little more challenging.
- (iv) Most discussed the effect of wealth on Roman society. As in other sections, candidates rarely used the passage as the starting point for their argument. The most common trait here, however, was excessive brevity. Candidates need to display their knowledge of the text in order to support their points.

Question 8

Answers tended to be quite general with limited reference to Juvenal's work.

Question 9

There were too few answers to this question to make appropriate general comments.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i) Most candidates identified the Arch of Titus and its location on the Sacred Way in Rome.

- (ii) Knowledge of who commissioned the monument was patchy; some thought that Titus dedicated it to himself.
- (iii) Most responses dated the dedication of the Arch correctly.
- (v) The events commemorated by the Arch of Titus were generally well known.
- (vi) Candidates described the sculptural decoration in some detail.
- (vii) There was some sound analysis of the Arch of Titus, with candidates displaying a good level of detail about the Arch. Where candidates possessed knowledge of other arches, they made relevant and apt comparison. A few attempted to compare the arches from aqueducts and the Colosseum which was, perhaps, stretching the question a little too far.

Question 11

Most responses made appropriate comments on the strength and cheapness of concrete as a building material. There was generally some reference to the Pantheon or the Colosseum, but not many specific examples or explanations of how concrete helped in the construction of each individual building.

Question 12

This question about the theatre was a popular one. A large number of candidates used the Colosseum as one of their examples although it is not a theatre. It was possible to make general comment on the ability to see and hear, the allocation of seats and the awning, but little else of relevance.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/22
Roman Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to:

- make full use of the time available;
- plan longer answers;
- use the mark allocation to determine how much to write;
- make use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(ii) Many candidates named the battle although there was less certainty about the date.
- (iii) Candidates found it hard to explain the references to the gods, especially the Penates.
- (iv) Most identified the ‘Egyptian wife’ as Cleopatra, but did not always explain the importance of war being declared against her.
- (v) Few responses showed real awareness of the significance of the closing of the Gates of Janus.
- (vi) Most candidates were aware of the role played by Agrippa in winning the Battle of Actium but seemed less confident in explaining how he assisted Augustus. There was evidence of good recall on Agrippa’s role as a general and in helping to build things, but not all linked this to propaganda.

Question 2

Many candidates chose to answer this question by providing a narrative of how Augustus gained power. They tended to start with the death of Julius Caesar, not at 27 B.C. as specified in the question. This made a large part of these answers irrelevant and moved the focus of the answer away from the Constitutional Settlements of 27 and 23 B.C. and other methods of staying in power.

Question 3

There were some solid answers to this question, but many struggled with the concept of succession; some considered it to mean success in ruling, while others confused Augustus succeeding Julius Caesar with Augustus being succeeded. Those who discussed Augustus’ heirs did not always name the nominated successors and, although there were some good details of the way in which Augustus nominated his successors, only a few answers discussed the reasons for Augustus’ policy.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i)–(ii) Most candidates explained why Aeneas visited the Underworld, but did not state where he was.

- (iii) There were mixed responses to the simile question with some making good links between the simile and the situation in the Underworld. A minority of responses elaborated on the two with sufficient detail.
- (iv) Most responses demonstrated knowledge of Jupiter's orders.
- (v) Some candidates did not know who Sychaeus was but most accurately described the situation surrounding his death.
- (vi) Typically, most candidates recalled Dido leading her people away from Tyre, building the city, her hospitality, her descent after being shot by Cupid and her 'marriage'. Some referred to her curse at the end. The ability to link this information to the question and to apply it to the concept of pity, while considering both sides of the argument, proved challenging for many. Virtually all the candidates felt pity for Dido, but they often found it hard to explain why they felt this way.

Question 5

There were some good answers which discussed Aeneas's heroic traits, both Homeric and Roman, but some responses struggled to define heroism, which compromised their answer. There was some evidence of pre-prepared answers which dealt with isolated heroic concepts – strength, bravery, compassion and caring for family. While these provided some relevant examples, many did not see Aeneas' flaws as a hero. However, a majority of answers talked about the Greek hero as opposed to the Roman hero and recognised the differences between ancient and modern concepts of heroism.

Question 6

Most candidates recalled the role of the deities in the relevant books, and in some depth. Why they were important was left implicit by some, while others tried to wrap this up in two sentences in their conclusion. There was some confusion over the specific activity of each god. Some found it harder to assess the importance of the gods to the epic and this meant their answers were mainly narrative.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(ii) Generally responses did not place this passage within the context of the whole of the Satire. The reference to the 'idiot Otho and his Reserved Seat Act' was not widely known, and a number were unable to recall what Juvenal goes on to say about a poor man's accommodation.
- (iii) Candidates were more successful in responding about Juvenal's satiric technique. They picked out techniques (even if they did not use the technical names), and provided apt examples. Explaining the effect of the techniques proved to be a little more challenging.
- (iv) Most discussed the effect of wealth on Roman society. As in other sections, candidates rarely used the passage as the starting point for their argument. The most common trait here, however, was excessive brevity. Candidates need to display their knowledge of the text in order to support their points.

Question 8

Answers tended to be quite general with limited reference to Juvenal's work.

Question 9

There were too few answers to this question to make appropriate general comments.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i) Most candidates identified the Arch of Titus and its location on the Sacred Way in Rome.

- (ii) Knowledge of who commissioned the monument was patchy; some thought that Titus dedicated it to himself.
- (iii) Most responses dated the dedication of the Arch correctly.
- (v) The events commemorated by the Arch of Titus were generally well known.
- (vi) Candidates described the sculptural decoration in some detail.
- (vii) There was some sound analysis of the Arch of Titus, with candidates displaying a good level of detail about the Arch. Where candidates possessed knowledge of other arches, they made relevant and apt comparison. A few attempted to compare the arches from aqueducts and the Colosseum which was, perhaps, stretching the question a little too far.

Question 11

Most responses made appropriate comments on the strength and cheapness of concrete as a building material. There was generally some reference to the Pantheon or the Colosseum, but not many specific examples or explanations of how concrete helped in the construction of each individual building.

Question 12

This question about the theatre was a popular one. A large number of candidates used the Colosseum as one of their examples although it is not a theatre. It was possible to make general comment on the ability to see and hear, the allocation of seats and the awning, but little else of relevance.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/23
Roman Civilisation

Key Messages

Candidates should be encouraged to:

- make full use of the time available;
- plan longer answers;
- use the mark allocation to determine how much to write;
- make use of the passage or image in the commentary questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section One

Question 1

- (i)–(ii) Most candidates correctly identified the battle, although various dates were given.
- (iii) Most candidates knew about the proscriptions and supplied details of how they were carried out.
- (iv) Many responses discussed how the Triumvirate, rather than Augustus, organised the provinces.
- (v) The majority of responses demonstrated clear understanding of how Augustus gained control of the Empire, starting from the death of Julius Caesar up to 23 B.C. Most dealt principally with the period up to the Battle of Actium and discussed the Constitutional Settlements, although sometimes the details were indistinct.

Question 2

Candidates discussed the varying aspects of propaganda used by Augustus in gaining power. The political elements were generally dealt with well, including the use of Julius Caesar's name. They also discussed the war against Mark Antony. Keeping power was dealt with less successfully; some aspects such as the use of titles and the building programme were discussed in detail, but analysis of the use of poetry and sculpture was much less common.

Question 3

Those who attempted this question on religion during the reign of Augustus demonstrated a good grasp of detail on the restoration of temples and re-establishment of certain religious practices and priesthoods. Some found it harder to discuss why Augustus considered religion to be so important.

Section Two

Question 4

- (i) Virtually all responses recognised Carthage, but not all identified Juno's temple.
- (ii) A surprisingly large number of candidates did not recognise the references in the temple to the scenes from Troy.
- (iii) The analysis of the simile was rather weak and points were often general. The best responses made good use of the text to support their analysis.

- (iv) The 'cloak of cloud' was generally fully explained.
- (v) Candidates discussed the portrayal of Dido's leadership with good knowledge, giving examples of how she created and developed Carthage, often following this with discussion of her fall from grace after her entanglement with Aeneas. A good number noted Anna's persuasion that a union with Aeneas would be good for the city's protection. Most made reference to hospitality, Aeneas' awe, Dido's neglect of her city after Cupid's spell and her suicide. Surprisingly few used the passage where there was a wealth of relevant material.

Question 5

Candidates considered not only the prophetic passages in books 1 and 6, but also the prophecies of Creusa (book 2) and even the curse of Dido (book 4). Although candidates showed good knowledge of the text of the *Aeneid*, they found it harder to explain the significance of the prophecies, whether in the context of the plot of the poem, or with regard to its place in the possibly propagandist aspects of Virgil's work.

Question 6

Responses included a wide range of examples of love. The most common type of love discussed was between men and women, and mostly focused on the love between Dido and Aeneas. This was generally considered to be a negative portrayal due to the impact on both Dido and Aeneas. Aeneas' love for his wife was also analysed and considered to be a hindrance to him. Many candidates also discussed parental love and patriotic love. While both Dido and Creusa were generally seen as examples of a negative portrayal of love, other types, such as the bonds between Aeneas and Anchises and Ascanius, were considered to be more positive. There were also candidates who saw *pietas* as a positive form of love.

Section Three

Question 7

- (i)–(iii) Responses were not always sufficiently secure in their knowledge of the text and its context. Answers demonstrated little knowledge of Hippolytus, Bellerophon or Gaius Silius.
- (iv) Responses extracted and discussed to good effect elements of Juvenal's satiric technique as seen in the passage.
- (v) Discussion of women concentrated on *Satire* 1, with general examples given and little mention of Messalina or other women. Only the best responses attempted to counter the assertion in the question.

Question 8

Candidates concentrated on *Satire* 4, and Domitian. Knowledge of the satire was generally good, but responses did not always use their knowledge to advance the argument to best effect.

Question 9

Candidates seemed to enjoy answering this question. Knowledge of Juvenal's *Satires* was exhibited at a variety of levels, with a good range of Juvenal's targets discussed. Most candidates mentioned concepts such as Juvenal's attitudes to foreigners and women as well as corruption, wealth and the differences between town and country living. These were mostly adequately illustrated by examples. Most candidates drew parallels between Juvenal's Rome and the modern world, but did not always discuss both. Better answers also considered areas where Juvenal's work seemed to have little or no relevance to modern life.

Section Four

Question 10

- (i)–(v) Most candidates identified the building, its location and functions. There was, however, some confusion over the date of the basilica.
- (vi) Most candidates had good knowledge of the details of the basilica, its construction, size and layout. Some went on to make a comparison with at least one other basilica.

Question 11

Responses covering a variety of building types were seen. Some answers only considered types of buildings in general, with few specific examples. Better answers discussed not only specific buildings, but also analysed what made them impressive, and explained their preference for one over others. Most commonly discussed were the Pantheon and the Colosseum.

Question 12

Candidates chose a variety of buildings to discuss and analysed the different features demanded by the question. Discussion of function was addressed most effectively, especially with reference to the Colosseum. The most testing part of the question proved to lie in analysing the ways in which buildings might or might not be seen to be beautiful. The key was the careful selection of buildings to discuss as examples.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/31

History: Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

The best answers were clearly planned and used the passages to enable a determined response to the question. Some less strong responses spent time repeating the passages without showing critical engagement. The strongest responses showed a confident grasp of the material and organised the material they selected so that it was clear how they were addressing the question.

General Comments

The majority of candidates attempted **Question 1** on the Greek world. Both questions elicited a range of responses, though there was something of a divide between those who were confident about the period they had studied and put the issues discussed into context, and those who confined themselves largely to the texts provided and were less certain of the broader context. Weaker answers often devoted considerable space to repeating what was in the passages without adding much that related to the question.

Essay length varied considerably: there were only a few brief responses and the majority of answers were developed in reasonable detail. The strongest answers were not only fully-developed but also well-structured, so that it was easy to follow the direction of the argument. Weaker essays often tended towards description. For example, in **Question 1** there were a number who related the contributions of Solon and Cleisthenes to the development of democracy in Athens, but did not make the discussion relevant to the question. In a similar way, some **Question 2** responses spent too long setting out the narrative of the Jewish rebellion without relating the detail to the question.

For the most part, essays were well-presented and spelling of classical names was good (though 'Peloponnesian' continues to prove challenging). A small number of candidates wrote rather long essays which would have secured a higher mark with greater focus on the question.

Few candidates evaluated the sources they used (whether the passages given or those drawn from memory), even in **Question 1** which explicitly raised issues of reliability.

Some candidates drew on a wide range of broader reading, including works of other ancient writers (such as the Old Oligarch) and modern scholars, sometimes with relevant material directly quoted or paraphrased. Direct quotation is not required to demonstrate appropriate understanding of the evidence for the period studied.

Weaker responses often demonstrated an uncertain grasp of what happened during the periods studied, and this impacted on their discussion of issues. Knowledge of historical detail is an important element in this paper, as is the ability to place material in context effectively. Weaker responses to **Question 1** were not clear about the changes to the democracy during the Peloponnesian War, though there were some excellent analyses of the way the sources dealt with later events.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The best answers communicated an excellent understanding of the broader context. This was often demonstrated by a clear sense of the chronology of the period, which enabled a well-judged discussion of the development of the democracy during the fifth century and the limitations of our sources for this period. By comparison, weaker responses sometimes resorted to narrative with relatively little focus on the issue of the reliability of the sources. The majority of candidates made some use of the Hansen passage and there

were some interesting challenges to the issues that he raised. Many candidates contrasted the democracy which can be drawn from the Aristophanes and Thucydides passages. However, only a few stronger responses placed these passages convincingly in context. Although most recognised the satirical nature of Aristophanes' work, relatively few made use of the competitive aspect of Athenian comedy, which suggests that Alcibiades had to appeal to his audience in some way. Not all candidates placed the Thucydides passage in context within Pericles' Funeral Speech, and this led some to enthuse about the historian's partiality for democracy in Athens. Relatively few commented on the generally negative accounts of democracy from the fifth century, though there were some excellent contrasts made between the impressions presented in the two passages.

Question 2

This was attempted by significantly fewer candidates. In general, the *Cambridge Ancient History* passage was not used very effectively. Some answers were admirably supported with references to the archaeological record which allowed a broader view of the impact of Roman conquest on local religious practices. There were some effective discussions of the differences between the Jewish situation and elsewhere in the Empire. Less strong responses tended towards a narrative approach without significant argument.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/32

History: Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

The best answers were clearly planned and used the passages to enable a determined response to the question. Some less strong responses spent time repeating the passages without showing critical engagement. The strongest responses showed a confident grasp of the material and organised the material they selected so that it was clear how they were addressing the question.

General Comments

The majority of candidates attempted **Question 1** on the Greek world. Both questions elicited a range of responses, though there was something of a divide between those who were confident about the period they had studied and put the issues discussed into context, and those who confined themselves largely to the texts provided and were less certain of the broader context. Weaker answers often devoted considerable space to repeating what was in the passages without adding much that related to the question.

Essay length varied considerably: there were only a few brief responses and the majority of answers were developed in reasonable detail. The strongest answers were not only fully-developed but also well-structured, so that it was easy to follow the direction of the argument. Weaker essays often tended towards description. For example, in **Question 1** there were a number who related the contributions of Solon and Cleisthenes to the development of democracy in Athens, but did not make the discussion relevant to the question. In a similar way, some **Question 2** responses spent too long setting out the narrative of the Jewish rebellion without relating the detail to the question.

For the most part, essays were well-presented and spelling of classical names was good (though 'Peloponnesian' continues to prove challenging). A small number of candidates wrote rather long essays which would have secured a higher mark with greater focus on the question.

Few candidates evaluated the sources they used (whether the passages given or those drawn from memory), even in **Question 1** which explicitly raised issues of reliability.

Some candidates drew on a wide range of broader reading, including works of other ancient writers (such as the Old Oligarch) and modern scholars, sometimes with relevant material directly quoted or paraphrased. Direct quotation is not required to demonstrate appropriate understanding of the evidence for the period studied.

Weaker responses often demonstrated an uncertain grasp of what happened during the periods studied, and this impacted on their discussion of issues. Knowledge of historical detail is an important element in this paper, as is the ability to place material in context effectively. Weaker responses to **Question 1** were not clear about the changes to the democracy during the Peloponnesian War, though there were some excellent analyses of the way the sources dealt with later events.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The best answers communicated an excellent understanding of the broader context. This was often demonstrated by a clear sense of the chronology of the period, which enabled a well-judged discussion of the development of the democracy during the fifth century and the limitations of our sources for this period. By comparison, weaker responses sometimes resorted to narrative with relatively little focus on the issue of the reliability of the sources. The majority of candidates made some use of the Hansen passage and there

were some interesting challenges to the issues that he raised. Many candidates contrasted the democracy which can be drawn from the Aristophanes and Thucydides passages. However, only a few stronger responses placed these passages convincingly in context. Although most recognised the satirical nature of Aristophanes' work, relatively few made use of the competitive aspect of Athenian comedy, which suggests that Alcibiades had to appeal to his audience in some way. Not all candidates placed the Thucydides passage in context within Pericles' Funeral Speech, and this led some to enthuse about the historian's partiality for democracy in Athens. Relatively few commented on the generally negative accounts of democracy from the fifth century, though there were some excellent contrasts made between the impressions presented in the two passages.

Question 2

This was attempted by significantly fewer candidates. In general, the *Cambridge Ancient History* passage was not used very effectively. Some answers were admirably supported with references to the archaeological record which allowed a broader view of the impact of Roman conquest on local religious practices. There were some effective discussions of the differences between the Jewish situation and elsewhere in the Empire. Less strong responses tended towards a narrative approach without significant argument.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/33

History: Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

The best answers were clearly planned and used the passages to enable a determined response to the question. Some less strong responses spent time repeating the passages without showing critical engagement. The strongest responses showed a confident grasp of the material and organised the material they selected so that it was clear how they were addressing the question.

General Comments

The majority of candidates attempted **Question 1** on the Greek world. Both questions elicited a range of responses, though there was something of a divide between those who were confident about the period they had studied and put the issues discussed into context, and those who confined themselves largely to the texts provided and were less certain of the broader context. Weaker answers often devoted considerable space to repeating what was in the passages without adding much that related to the question.

Essay length varied considerably: there were only a few brief responses and the majority of answers were developed in reasonable detail. The strongest answers were not only fully-developed but also well-structured, so that it was easy to follow the direction of the argument. Weaker essays often tended towards description. For example, in **Question 1** there were a number who related the contributions of Solon and Cleisthenes to the development of democracy in Athens, but did not make the discussion relevant to the question. In a similar way, some **Question 2** responses spent too long setting out the narrative of the Jewish rebellion without relating the detail to the question.

For the most part, essays were well-presented and spelling of classical names was good (though 'Peloponnesian' continues to prove challenging). A small number of candidates wrote rather long essays which would have secured a higher mark with greater focus on the question.

Few candidates evaluated the sources they used (whether the passages given or those drawn from memory), even in **Question 1** which explicitly raised issues of reliability.

Some candidates drew on a wide range of broader reading, including works of other ancient writers (such as the Old Oligarch) and modern scholars, sometimes with relevant material directly quoted or paraphrased. Direct quotation is not required to demonstrate appropriate understanding of the evidence for the period studied.

Weaker responses often demonstrated an uncertain grasp of what happened during the periods studied, and this impacted on their discussion of issues. Knowledge of historical detail is an important element in this paper, as is the ability to place material in context effectively. Weaker responses to **Question 1** were not clear about the changes to the democracy during the Peloponnesian War, though there were some excellent analyses of the way the sources dealt with later events.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The best answers communicated an excellent understanding of the broader context. This was often demonstrated by a clear sense of the chronology of the period, which enabled a well-judged discussion of the development of the democracy during the fifth century and the limitations of our sources for this period. By comparison, weaker responses sometimes resorted to narrative with relatively little focus on the issue of the reliability of the sources. The majority of candidates made some use of the Hansen passage and there

were some interesting challenges to the issues that he raised. Many candidates contrasted the democracy which can be drawn from the Aristophanes and Thucydides passages. However, only a few stronger responses placed these passages convincingly in context. Although most recognised the satirical nature of Aristophanes' work, relatively few made use of the competitive aspect of Athenian comedy, which suggests that Alcibiades had to appeal to his audience in some way. Not all candidates placed the Thucydides passage in context within Pericles' Funeral Speech, and this led some to enthuse about the historian's partiality for democracy in Athens. Relatively few commented on the generally negative accounts of democracy from the fifth century, though there were some excellent contrasts made between the impressions presented in the two passages.

Question 2

This was attempted by significantly fewer candidates. In general, the *Cambridge Ancient History* passage was not used very effectively. Some answers were admirably supported with references to the archaeological record which allowed a broader view of the impact of Roman conquest on local religious practices. There were some effective discussions of the differences between the Jewish situation and elsewhere in the Empire. Less strong responses tended towards a narrative approach without significant argument.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/41

Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

It was good to see that candidates were usually able to make at least some reference to all passages on the question paper; the majority of candidates kept to the question that had been asked; the majority also had some sort of plan and usefully kept to it. Most responses were complete, with few showing signs of running markedly out of time; and a particular pleasure this year was the reduction in the number of narrative lists as responses. One persistent nagging feature is the widespread misspelling of even the most straightforward and key classical names; *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Aeneid* were regular victims, as were the names Odysseus, Agamemnon, Achilles, Aeneas – only Dido escaped unscathed.

General Comments

There was a generally consistent pattern of candidates engaging with the questions as asked. The majority of candidates focused at least to some extent on revenge, for **Question 1**, or relationships of heroes with other men and with women, for **Question 2**. It was also welcome to observe the very large majority of candidates making reference to all the passages printed on the question paper, which enabled many to begin their arguments on a good footing.

Many candidates began by making plans, and responses which followed these often displayed good structure and were often more coherent, with a clear line of argument. Few candidates seemed to be short of time (or left with an excess of it), and so a brief time spent on a plan would seem to be good practice that candidates might want to replicate in future years.

Very occasionally a candidate would answer the question on the option they had not studied. Inevitably this approach was unsuccessful. Obviously this is not recommended, candidates will always do better to answer on the topic they have studied.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Few candidates responded to this option, but where they did they showed considered engagement with the question. There was a potential for focusing on violence at the expense of revenge, which was the key word, but in the end this was not apparent, improving on a similar problem observed on **Question 2** the previous year. Effective comparison between plays was convincing and demonstrated that the candidate knew the material well and had engaged meaningfully with the material.

Question 2

Virtually all candidates addressed the relationship of heroes to women, rather than simply writing on women, and very few did not also compare these with relationships with other male characters. Some candidates chose a narrow interpretation of the word 'relationship', but these were in the minority. Some candidates would also try to expand the category of women and include goddesses, but unless clear distinction was made between these groups this was not successful, and even then was not necessary to answer the question fully – there were enough women to choose from, and in fact Dido was often ignored altogether. The relationship between Turnus and Camilla was frequently overstated, a number of candidates making

them betrothed or siblings. While inevitably some candidates lumped all relationships together (and this was not always ineffective), the stronger responses had a finer and more subtle grasp of the material and were able to distinguish between Homeric and Virgilian epic, and the relationships of different heroes. Typically candidates would treat an epic at a time, referring to the excerpts as the starting point for the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*, and pull things together at the end (sometimes fairly cursorily); this was effective and reliable, but more sophisticated responses would explore relationships with women in the three epics and then with other men, allowing for a more coherent argument based on the themes of the question and more detailed and specific comparison of the poems. On which note – a large number of candidates still seem unaware that the epics are poems, referring to them as books – potentially confusing – or novels.

What was particularly impressive was that almost all candidates clearly attempted to construct an argument, only a very few resorting to the narrative list of examples that leaves very little room for analysis and evaluation. There was also a reduction in the number of responses which were based on Hollywood rather than the classical world, though some candidates do still appear to substitute the film *Troy* for the epic the *Iliad*, with predictably disappointing results – where teachers quite sensibly use such aids it is advisable to be very clear about where they differ from the actual text. One distinguisher between generally stronger and weaker responses was the extent to which they treated the texts as literature. Stronger responses would show an awareness of the works as poems and discuss the authors' hands in them. Weaker ones would often fail to mention Homer and Virgil at all, and show little or no discussion or awareness of literary features, in some cases effectively treating the epics as documentary accounts of actual events.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/42

Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

It was good to see that candidates were usually able to make at least some reference to all passages on the question paper; the majority of candidates kept to the question that had been asked; the majority also had some sort of plan and usefully kept to it. Most responses were complete, with few showing signs of running markedly out of time; and a particular pleasure this year was the reduction in the number of narrative lists as responses. One persistent nagging feature is the widespread misspelling of even the most straightforward and key classical names; *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Aeneid* were regular victims, as were the names Odysseus, Agamemnon, Achilles, Aeneas – only Dido escaped unscathed.

General Comments

There was a generally consistent pattern of candidates engaging with the questions as asked. The majority of candidates focused at least to some extent on revenge, for **Question 1**, or relationships of heroes with other men and with women, for **Question 2**. It was also welcome to observe the very large majority of candidates making reference to all the passages printed on the question paper, which enabled many to begin their arguments on a good footing.

Many candidates began by making plans, and responses which followed these often displayed good structure and were often more coherent, with a clear line of argument. Few candidates seemed to be short of time (or left with an excess of it), and so a brief time spent on a plan would seem to be good practice that candidates might want to replicate in future years.

Very occasionally a candidate would answer the question on the option they had not studied. Inevitably this approach was unsuccessful. Obviously this is not recommended, candidates will always do better to answer on the topic they have studied.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Few candidates responded to this option, but where they did they showed considered engagement with the question. There was a potential for focusing on violence at the expense of revenge, which was the key word, but in the end this was not apparent, improving on a similar problem observed on **Question 2** the previous year. Effective comparison between plays was convincing and demonstrated that the candidate knew the material well and had engaged meaningfully with the material.

Question 2

Virtually all candidates addressed the relationship of heroes to women, rather than simply writing on women, and very few did not also compare these with relationships with other male characters. Some candidates chose a narrow interpretation of the word 'relationship', but these were in the minority. Some candidates would also try to expand the category of women and include goddesses, but unless clear distinction was made between these groups this was not successful, and even then was not necessary to answer the question fully – there were enough women to choose from, and in fact Dido was often ignored altogether. The relationship between Turnus and Camilla was frequently overstated, a number of candidates making

them betrothed or siblings. While inevitably some candidates lumped all relationships together (and this was not always ineffective), the stronger responses had a finer and more subtle grasp of the material and were able to distinguish between Homeric and Virgilian epic, and the relationships of different heroes. Typically candidates would treat an epic at a time, referring to the excerpts as the starting point for the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*, and pull things together at the end (sometimes fairly cursorily); this was effective and reliable, but more sophisticated responses would explore relationships with women in the three epics and then with other men, allowing for a more coherent argument based on the themes of the question and more detailed and specific comparison of the poems. On which note – a large number of candidates still seem unaware that the epics are poems, referring to them as books – potentially confusing – or novels.

What was particularly impressive was that almost all candidates clearly attempted to construct an argument, only a very few resorting to the narrative list of examples that leaves very little room for analysis and evaluation. There was also a reduction in the number of responses which were based on Hollywood rather than the classical world, though some candidates do still appear to substitute the film *Troy* for the epic the *Iliad*, with predictably disappointing results – where teachers quite sensibly use such aids it is advisable to be very clear about where they differ from the actual text. One distinguisher between generally stronger and weaker responses was the extent to which they treated the texts as literature. Stronger responses would show an awareness of the works as poems and discuss the authors' hands in them. Weaker ones would often fail to mention Homer and Virgil at all, and show little or no discussion or awareness of literary features, in some cases effectively treating the epics as documentary accounts of actual events.

CLASSICAL STUDIES

Paper 9274/43

Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

Key Messages

It was good to see that candidates were usually able to make at least some reference to all passages on the question paper; the majority of candidates kept to the question that had been asked; the majority also had some sort of plan and usefully kept to it. Most responses were complete, with few showing signs of running markedly out of time; and a particular pleasure this year was the reduction in the number of narrative lists as responses. One persistent nagging feature is the widespread misspelling of even the most straightforward and key classical names; *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Aeneid* were regular victims, as were the names Odysseus, Agamemnon, Achilles, Aeneas – only Dido escaped unscathed.

General Comments

There was a generally consistent pattern of candidates engaging with the questions as asked. The majority of candidates focused at least to some extent on revenge, for **Question 1**, or relationships of heroes with other men and with women, for **Question 2**. It was also welcome to observe the very large majority of candidates making reference to all the passages printed on the question paper, which enabled many to begin their arguments on a good footing.

Many candidates began by making plans, and responses which followed these often displayed good structure and were often more coherent, with a clear line of argument. Few candidates seemed to be short of time (or left with an excess of it), and so a brief time spent on a plan would seem to be good practice that candidates might want to replicate in future years.

Very occasionally a candidate would answer the question on the option they had not studied. Inevitably this approach was unsuccessful. Obviously this is not recommended, candidates will always do better to answer on the topic they have studied.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Few candidates responded to this option, but where they did they showed considered engagement with the question. There was a potential for focusing on violence at the expense of revenge, which was the key word, but in the end this was not apparent, improving on a similar problem observed on **Question 2** the previous year. Effective comparison between plays was convincing and demonstrated that the candidate knew the material well and had engaged meaningfully with the material.

Question 2

Virtually all candidates addressed the relationship of heroes to women, rather than simply writing on women, and very few did not also compare these with relationships with other male characters. Some candidates chose a narrow interpretation of the word 'relationship', but these were in the minority. Some candidates would also try to expand the category of women and include goddesses, but unless clear distinction was made between these groups this was not successful, and even then was not necessary to answer the question fully – there were enough women to choose from, and in fact Dido was often ignored altogether. The relationship between Turnus and Camilla was frequently overstated, a number of candidates making

them betrothed or siblings. While inevitably some candidates lumped all relationships together (and this was not always ineffective), the stronger responses had a finer and more subtle grasp of the material and were able to distinguish between Homeric and Virgilian epic, and the relationships of different heroes. Typically candidates would treat an epic at a time, referring to the excerpts as the starting point for the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*, and pull things together at the end (sometimes fairly cursorily); this was effective and reliable, but more sophisticated responses would explore relationships with women in the three epics and then with other men, allowing for a more coherent argument based on the themes of the question and more detailed and specific comparison of the poems. On which note – a large number of candidates still seem unaware that the epics are poems, referring to them as books – potentially confusing – or novels.

What was particularly impressive was that almost all candidates clearly attempted to construct an argument, only a very few resorting to the narrative list of examples that leaves very little room for analysis and evaluation. There was also a reduction in the number of responses which were based on Hollywood rather than the classical world, though some candidates do still appear to substitute the film *Troy* for the epic the *Iliad*, with predictably disappointing results – where teachers quite sensibly use such aids it is advisable to be very clear about where they differ from the actual text. One distinguisher between generally stronger and weaker responses was the extent to which they treated the texts as literature. Stronger responses would show an awareness of the works as poems and discuss the authors' hands in them. Weaker ones would often fail to mention Homer and Virgil at all, and show little or no discussion or awareness of literary features, in some cases effectively treating the epics as documentary accounts of actual events.