

Classics: Classical Greek

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H040**

Advanced GCE **H440**

Report on the Units

June 2010

HX/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics Classical Greek (H440)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics Classical Greek (H040)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Component	Page
Chief Examiner's Report on the Specification 2010	1
F371 Classical Greek Language	2
F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature	4
F373 Classical Greek Verse	7
F374 Classical Greek Prose	11

Chief Examiner's Report on the Specification 2010

Most candidates at AS and for the new A2 Greek specification continued the tradition of their predecessors in producing work of a high standard and gaining high grades.

At AS, the language paper (F371) was found to be a little more challenging than in the previous year, especially the Lysias unseen, but nevertheless most coped very well. A minority of candidates attempt the English-Greek sentences, but those who do usually do very well, and there is no reason why this option should be regarded as beyond the scope of the average student. In the literature component (F372), most knew their texts well, and the only overall cause for concern is that of timing: there is a lot to do in this paper, so it is important that the texts *are* thoroughly known, so that candidates can complete the translation and context questions efficiently (and not write at excessive length on the latter), so as to leave plenty of time for the 10 mark 'essay' questions.

The new style A2 papers, F373 (Verse) and F374 (Prose) also contain more things to do than the old style ones, but it was encouraging that here timing did not seem to be a problem for the great majority. Some pursued a policy of doing one of the literature questions first, then the language section, and then the other literature passage, or in some cases of doing the language section first, which seemed to work well. The translation elements of the language sections were done as well as in previous years, though some would be well advised to think more carefully about the shorter questions and what they are actually asking for. On F374, the composition option was taken by a (substantial) minority, and these were very successful: it was good to see that this was regarded as a viable option and, as at AS, larger numbers might well consider attempting it. In the literature sections, candidates obviously relished the opportunity to write extensively and in depth on quite long passages from their texts; some indeed, wrote at enormous length, which is not necessarily a guarantee of success: more concise responses were sometimes better focused, and gained higher marks. It must again be emphasised that although translation of texts is not specifically required, detailed knowledge of the Greek is essential, and answers must both quote the relevant Greek and translate it accurately.

F371 Classical Greek Language

General comments

Most candidates tackled the unseen translation in Section A very successfully and were able to cope with both the overall storyline of the passage and the grammatical points contained within it. The fact that the passage consisted almost entirely of direct speech did not cause any noticeable problems. A minority of candidates scored less than half marks, but overall there was a large number of excellent scripts.

There was, once again, a significant preference among candidates for the unseen translation in Section B over the sentences – more than three quarters of candidates opted for the former. The Lysias unseen was found by candidates to be more challenging and there was a greater spread of marks here than for the Xenophon unseen; the Examiners were therefore careful to give credit for partially correct work, rather than solely penalising errors. There was less variation of marks from candidates who chose to do the sentences; the vast majority gained at least two thirds of the available marks and many scored significantly higher. Overall, it seems that the two options in Section B provided a pleasing level of differentiation between good and excellent candidates.

Section A: Xenophon

The vast majority of candidates had several sections where they understood the passage well and translated very accurately; the same sections – such as the conditional clause – tended to cause problems across the board.

Line 1 *καὶ...ὥδε*

The first sentence was translated very well indeed by most candidates, as was the introduction to Seuthes' speech, providing a positive start to the passage for the vast majority of candidates. *πῶς* was occasionally translated as 'why' and a few candidates omitted *ὥδε*.

Lines 2-4 *Μαισάδης...βασιλεῖ*

The deceptively simple structure of *ἐκείνου δὲ ἦν ἀρχὴ* caused some confusion, but the Examiners accepted a variety of ways of denoting Maisades' rule over the tribes, which encompassed most candidates. Vocabulary proved a problem in *ἐκβληθεῖς*, as well as the separation of *τῆς χώρας* from *ἐκ ταύτης*, but the rest of the sentence was understood very well.

Lines 4-7 *ἐπεὶ...ἀποβλέπων*

The phrase *εἰς ἀλλοτρίαν τράπεζαν ἀποβλέπων* provided good differentiation, particularly with candidates who thought the participle was part of *βλάπτω*. Weaker candidates had the adjective agreeing with the speaker, which was concerning, and many candidates incorrectly put the participle at the end of the sentence. The Examiners were generous in dealing with this phrase and sought to reward what was correct. The construction after *δοῦναι* caused some difficulty, with a significant proportion of candidates thinking that *δυνατὸς* and *ἄνδρας* were in agreement.

Lines 7-11 *ἐκ τούτου...βούλομαι*

The majority of candidates coped very well with the first two sentences here; there was a pleasing variety of renderings for *ἡμέρα γένηται*, but some confusion over the tenses of *ὄψεσθε* and *ζῶ*. Many candidates were unsure of the precise meaning of *παραγέννοισθε* but there was much ingenious guessing.

Section B1: Lysias

There is no doubt that candidates found this second unseen harder than the first, as it was designed to be, but there was a very wide range of marks and several really excellent scripts.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Lines 1-2 Ἀμαζόνες...σιδήρω

The majority of candidates did well or very well here, although there were vocabulary problems with *πάλαι* and *ὀπλισμένοι*. Strangely, a significant number of candidates omitted *περὶ αὐτὰς*.

Lines 2-4 πρῶτον...γυναικες

Almost all candidates grasped the idea of the Amazons mounting horses, and pleasing differentiation between good and excellent candidates was provided by *οἷς ἤρουν*. There was some confusion over the cases of the participles and the voice of *ἐνομιζοντο*.

Lines 5-6 ἀκούουσαί...ἀπέθανον

ποτε was frequently mistranslated or omitted here, and there was a disappointing tendency to consider *δόξαν* a verb. The majority of candidates understood that many of the Amazons died after encountering good men, and the Examiners accepted a wide range of responses for *τυχοῦσαι*.

Lines 7-8 δοῦσαι...κατέστησαν

Many candidates found this final paragraph more challenging, as is fitting for the last sentence of the harder unseen. The majority of candidates understood the idea that the Amazons had made an immortal memory of Athens, but fewer understood the effect on the Amazons' own country. Despite the DVL's statement that candidates should be prepared to tackle Greek words which have an obvious English meaning, *ἀνώνυμον* caused some difficulty, although a pleasing number of candidates worked it out.

Section B2: Sentences

There was a range of marks received here, although many candidates did very well indeed. It was noticeable that most candidates got the breathings totally accurate or repeatedly had them wrong or absent.

- (a) This sentence was translated very well by the vast majority of candidates; although a significant number incorrectly wrote *τόν ναυτικόν*.
- (b) The construction after *ἐλπίζω* was not universally known, and many candidates wrote *οὐ* instead of *μή*.
- (c) Not all candidates correctly translated the purpose clause and there were problems with the ending of *ἀσφαλῆς*.
- (d) A large number of candidates employed a genitive absolute successfully and the second half of the sentence was translated very well.
- (e) There were some vocabulary problems with 'old man', but it was pleasing to see that very many candidates were familiar with *καίπερ* and the participle.

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General comments

In the second year of this specification, most candidates showed that they had responded well to the literature they had studied, and were able to demonstrate a commendable grasp of detail of the set texts. They coped very well both with the questions focused on recall of detail and with those focused on the style of the author. Candidates had a good deal to say; for a few, this caused problems at the end of the paper.

The translation sections were generally completed to a very high standard. Some candidates omitted or transposed words, but in general the translation were clear, and it was easy for the examiners to feel convinced that the translation reflected what the Greek said. Detailed knowledge of the text was equally important on other questions, some of which (e.g. 1(c)) required close knowledge of what the passage said. One significant issue arose with the Homer translation: a number of candidates translated lines 1-5 of the first Homer passage, rather than the second. While in this case examiners sought to ensure that no candidate was disadvantaged, candidates should be familiar with the layout of the paper: the questions for each passage are placed directly underneath the relevant section of text.

Candidates did not always organise their responses as clearly and effectively as they might. Answering questions for 8 or 10 marks in one long paragraph can make it more difficult for examiners to identify the different points made. If questions call for a number of separate points, these are best presented in separate paragraphs, preferably with a line between. Where the question asks for reference to the Greek, it is important to quote specific phrases from the Greek in support of what is being said. Most candidates did this very effectively, but some revealed a lack of detailed knowledge by inaccurate quotation, and others obscured their meaning by the use of an ellipse (e.g. *ὥστε ... πεπολήκε* (Lysias 34)), especially if the words they were discussing were not included in the quotation. Examiners are looking for effective communication of the answer to the question.

Some candidates make excessive use of technical vocabulary; this only impresses the examiners where it is used to make a clear and concise point. In too many cases, the technical term communicates very little because it obscures, rather than clarifies, what the candidate is trying to say. It is much more important to discuss the example chosen in context, and the examiners will credit responses that concentrate on the text without resort to complex language (in some cases, misunderstood). Imprecisely used technical vocabulary does not impress.

A very few candidates left out individual questions. This can have a significant impact on the final total for a paper, so candidates should always check that they have answered every question. This is more difficult for those who choose, perhaps for good reasons, to answer the questions in an order other than the one they appear on the paper.

As was noted last year, examiners do not expect candidates to include accents on any Greek they quote, but they should include breathings. It was disappointing to see that a relatively large number of candidates, under the stress of exam conditions, did not consistently do this.

Q.1(a) Most candidates were able to identify the immediate context of the passage and kept their answers to an appropriate length. There were relatively few overly long answers. Candidates who did write excessively in this and 2.(a) could put themselves under time pressure by the end of the exam.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Q.1(b) This question was answered well.

Q.1(c) The best answers focused precisely on the demands of the question, but there were some responses that were rather over long: the line references were designed to guide the candidates towards the relevant section of text, but in some cases uncertainty over the meaning of the lines resulted in less precise answers. There was no requirement here to refer to the Greek text, and candidates who did so lengthened their answer considerably.

Q.1(d) The translation question was generally answered very well, with very many candidates producing an excellent version, though some made a minor error. A variety of translations were accepted for *ταῦτα διανοηθείς*, and a number of candidates omitted *ἔδει με*.

Q.1(e) The majority of candidates demonstrated an excellent understanding of the passage linked to the question.

Q.1(f) This proved a much more demanding question, and it was clear that many very good candidates were not always sure when they had made effective points in response to the question. The very best answers were concise and clearly laid out, but candidates whose responses were less confident were still able to secure full marks. Most candidates heeded the injunction to refer to both the content and style of the Greek, though there were some who made limited reference to the Greek text in their answer: this limited the effectiveness of their answer. Many were able to identify Lysias' use of rhetorical questions (especially the one word *ἀπειψηφίσασθε*; (line 2), though fewer commented on his use of antithesis in this passage (*ἢ ὥς ... ἢ ὥς* (line 3)), or on the emphatic position of *ῥαδίαν* in line 4. Many candidates used *πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ἀσπῶν καὶ τῶν ξένων* to good effect. A number of candidates latched on to the word *τύραννοι* (line 8) but misinterpreted it in context. The end of the passage was misinterpreted by some.

Q.1(g) There were some very good responses to this question, though many of these, though scoring effectively, were relatively unstructured. The very best candidates organised their answers and imposed a clear structure on what they wanted to say. The relatively short time available to produce an answer was a significant factor here, though this was more an issue in the corresponding question on Homer (2(f)) There were some good discussions of the introduction, though not many were able to give a succinct summary of what was included there. The best candidates were able to show how Lysias used his references to the 30 to implicate Eratosthenes in all aspects of their activities, and engage the sympathies of the jurors by linking their experiences with his. Many used the cross-examination of Eratosthenes as a good example of a different approach in the speech. The majority of candidates made use of the Arginousae incident, though they could perhaps have made more of it, and there were some effective discussions of the impact of the description of the removal of Polemarchus' wife's earrings and the impact on an Athenian audience of the neglect of burial customs.

Q.2(a) This question generally produced full marks for candidates, though there were some very lengthy responses.

Q.2(b) There were some excellent responses to this question: a very few focused solely on content. There were some good discussions of *νήπιος* and its position, so too of *μέγ' ἀάσθη* (though there were also some mistranslations of this). Many candidates commented on *κῆρα κακῆν μέλανος θανάτω*, but failed to make it relevant to the question. The lines on Zeus (lines 5-8) were generally well used, though the analysis did not always focus on the question. Many emphasized the significance of the apostrophe in lines 9-10, as well as *σε θεοὶ θάνατον δὲ κάλεσαν*.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Q.2(c) There were some excellent answers to this question, and a number covered far more points than was necessary for the 10 marks available. Weaker responses sometimes quoted Greek at excessive length, without making clear how exactly the quoted text related to the point being made. Many noted the repetition of *τρίς* (lines 19-20), though not all commented on the significance here of *μὲν* and *δὲ*. There were some good discussions of vocabulary (e.g. *θῦεν* (line 16), *ἀπεστυφέλιξεν* (line 20), *ἀθανάτησι* (line 21)). Candidates often brought out the contrast between man and god, making good use of *δαίμονι ἴσος* (line 22), and the emphatic introduction of Apollo in line 17.

Q.2(d) The majority of candidates picked out the significance of *χάζεο* (though many did not transcribe it correctly). Some candidates here failed to observe the requirement to comment on both content and style.

Q.2(e) This translation was generally well done, though a number of candidates misinterpreted the paper and translated lines 1-5 of the first passage on the paper. One common error here was that a number of candidates translated *ὡς φάτο* (line 1) as if Patroclus had been speaking; a surprising number omitted *ἐκατηβόλου* (line 2). The examiners accepted a range of meanings for *μόνυχας* (line 3), though some candidates omitted it.

Q.2(f) Time pressure was an issue for some candidates; there were some short responses, and some that were a series of bullet points. Weaker responses generally showed a sound understanding of the set text, but produced something of an unstructured list, while the better candidates were able to organize their answer and make it very convincing. Knowledge of the text was very good, and some showed an impressive recall of detail. There were some excellent discussions of Patroclus' death and his earlier *aristeia*.

F373 Classical Greek Verse

Candidates appeared to have adjusted well to the new specification and to the way in which literature and language elements are now combined in the two A2 papers. There were very few or no 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. Nearly 40% of candidates 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 vastly outnumbered those who chose to answer on Aristophanes, so much so that there were 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 A-grade; perhaps Centres which have previously been shy about reading Aristophanes might be thus encouraged to give him a try next year. 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 have been well-informed and able, failed to do themselves justice because they did not make clear that they understood fully the examples they quoted. 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'. Take this example from an answer to Q.1(a):

This can be seen through the portrayal of the sea as 'foaming much' (*περιξ ἀφρονπολων* [*sic*]) intensified by the alliteration of 'p's to emphasise the size of the wave (*κυμα*) and drama is then raised through the fact that it is approaching (*χωρει*) the headland where the chariot (*ὄχος*) is.'

- The first citation (which is an example of mismatched 'collar and cuffs') includes the word for foam (*ἀφρόν*), to be sure, but as the candidate refers to 'foaming', the quotation needs to include *καχλάζον* to provide the verbal element. Similarly, as the candidate does not refer to *πέριξ* in his/her discussion, why include it in the citation? Is it because s/he is not fully in command of the text? The other bits of Greek quoted are all examples of 'bitty' citation – constructing a point using comfortable known words (especially nouns) rather than engaging with the text in the form of whole phrases, clauses or sentences: are the Greek words for 'wave' and 'chariot' really that significant on their own? An extreme example 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.

- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates who did this tended to write better structured answers and to avoid missing important points. They were 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 looked – for example – for instances of 'emphatic positioning' of words throughout the passage, and then started again to look for something else.
- 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 indicating 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.
- 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. Some passages, necessarily, will contain more of one than the other, but 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. 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 *-ων*, 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 this year – as every year – was '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)

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

The exact meaning of *ἀνοιδῆσάν ... φύσῃματι* (lines 1-2) and *φρικῶδες ἀντεφθέγγετ'* (line 7) often eluded candidates. Examiners saw frequent mistranslations and failures to match 'collar and cuffs' (see general points above), e.g. 'He first describes the wave as "swollen and seething foam" (*καπειτ' ἀνοιδῆσαν τε και περιξ ἄφρον*).' Why does the candidate include *κάπειτ'* in the

Greek quotation, as he does not discuss it, but not *καγκλάζων*, which would have done for 'seething'?

'*καρα θραυων τε σαρκας* – smashing his head against the rocks' was another even more blatant example of a candidate betraying an imperfect knowledge of the text by not accurately matching Greek citation to English translation/comment. Such mistakes will certainly affect the number of marks awarded to a candidate – not necessarily pulling him/her all the way down to Level 2, as suggested on the Mark Scheme ('inaccurate detail'), unless the mistakes are numerous, but certainly compromising the likelihood of achieving Level 5.

Candidates were usually struck by the nautical simile and metaphors (they rarely knew the difference between the two, by the way) in lines 12, 15 and 18. Those whose knowledge of the text was less sound than others used up a lot of space stating at great length how important sea metaphors were to the Athenians and elaborating upon their naval history. The other candidates simply drew attention to them and then moved on to the next point.

In line 20 candidates often translated *φόβω τέτρορον ἐκμαίνων ὄχον* as 'the horses, maddened by fear' rather than 'maddening [referring to the bull – the word *ταῦρος* immediately precedes this phrase] the four-horse team with fear'.

Q.1(b)/2(b)

Essays were generally competently done, though the best reads seemed to come from candidates writing about Aristophanes rather than Euripides. Candidates had almost no problems judging how much to write on the printed passage and how much on the rest of the play: the Principal Examiner found one example of a candidate who wrote about the character of Hippolytus in the printed passage and the rest of the play but virtually ignored the other characters, and that was it. On the other hand, nearly all the answers would have benefited from the inclusion of more (or, in many cases, any at all) direct textual reference, i.e., 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 in 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 important) is completely pointless, e.g. 'he wants to washout [*sic*] his ὄτα [*sic*], ears'.

Section B: Language

Q.3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) (Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Mark Scheme)

- 1 This was usually translated well.
- 2 This was usually translated adequately.
- 3 *βίαν* was occasionally translated as 'life'. *ἠγῆ* was frequently misinterpreted, usually as being from *ἄγω* (e.g. 'is it not shameful to lead him saying false things?'), or ignored.
- 4 This was usually translated extremely well, contrary to Examiners' expectations!
- 5 *ὅταν τι* frequently became 'whatever' rather than 'whenever ... something'.
- 6 *πρέπει* was often treated as part of *τρέπω* (e.g. 'he does not turn to hesitate'). *μολεῖν* was occasionally conflated with Latin *moliri*.
- 7 'Only he will take these bows to Troy', and similar, were common renderings.

Overall, though, the translation was well done, with a good number of correct or almost correct versions, and generally good use of English.

(b) (i) This question usually posed no problems.

(b) (ii) A not infrequent answer was 'Neoptolemus would not take Troy without Philoctetes, and Philoctetes would not take it without him', or similar. Examiners awarded one mark only for this rendering: *κείνων* and *ἐκεῖνα* must refer to *τὰ τόξα*.

(c) Few candidates got this completely right. *θηρατέ* was treated as an imperative rather than a verbal adjective (a common answer was that Neoptolemus was telling Odysseus to get the weapon himself), and *εἴπερ ᾧδ' ἔχει* became 'if he has it' *vel sim*.

(d) *ἔρξας* was often labelled as second person singular future indicative. *φέρη* was constantly translated as 'bring' or 'carry' rather than 'win' or 'gain' ('bringing two gifts to Philoctetes'). *δωρήματα* was more than once described as 'a superlative', and occasionally translated as 'spear(s)', 'halls' and 'masters'. *ποιῶ* was not often commented upon – the Examiners did not expect this, as the question was about what Odysseus, not Neoptolemus, was saying – but more often than not when it was cited it was treated as being part of the verb 'to do'.

(e) Predictably, *ἵτω* caused problems, frequently being translated as 'I will go'.

(f) The most common errors were to scan *σάφ'* as long (did candidates think phi was a double consonant?) and to scan the last syllable of both lines as long, despite the fact that they ended in a first person singular weak aorist indicative active, the pronunciation of which should be reasonably familiar to candidates. In the latter case the Examiners applied their customary discretion and did not count them as errors.

F374 Classical Greek Prose

Candidates appear to have adjusted well to the new format, as exemplified in F374 and combining literature and language elements. There were few indications that time had been a problem, and many wrote at great length (and very well) on the set text questions, as well as doing good work on the language sections. Some decided to do the Unseen/Comprehension or Composition section first, or in the middle, between the two text passages, 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*. Rumours of the demise of prose composition (not to mention allegations of its assassination) proved to be premature; those who did it, as opposed to the unseen, were a minority, but a sizeable one, and their average mark was higher. Outcomes on the two texts were comparable, though the second Plato passage was of slightly different nature to the other three passages set. 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 apparently well-informed and able candidates failed to do themselves justice because they did not make clear that they understood fully the examples they quoted. 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 do not do well.
- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates who do this tend to write better structured answers and avoid missing important points. They are also in a better position to trace the sequence of thought through a passage than those who look – for example – for instances of 'emphatic positioning' of words throughout the passage, and then start again and look for something else.
- Coverage of the whole passage is important. Making brief notes on points to refer to in an answer, or indicating 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 may be just as important as what happens at the beginning.
- A list of points shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures (for example) are not just 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. Some passages, necessarily, will contain more of one than the other, but answers which concentrate wholly on the one to the inclusion of the other will not reach the top level. (see 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. But the wrong use of a technical 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.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

- 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 *-ων*, because that's the only way you can do it, so it is very unlikely to mean very much, in literary terms. A special favourite this year was 'emphatic position' which (apparently) can be either (1) the beginning of the sentence, or (2) the middle of the sentence, or (3) the end of the sentence. 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.

Plato: 1(a)

The characterisation of Thrasymachus as impatient, forceful, and abrupt was within the capacity of all candidates to grasp, and most wrote about him well; his attempts to interrupt and hijack the conversation, the 'wild beast' simile (not *similie*, please...); the exaggerated reaction of Socrates and Polemarchus; and his scathing attack on the way the conversation is being conducted. The best answers, however, saw more, and rightly pointed out that Thrasymachus' philosophical earnestness and his criticism of Socrates' methods lift him beyond the level of a one-dimensional bully or caricature of the nasty sophist.

Plato 1 (b)

This was a different type of question. It required that a candidate state the argument clearly, and show understanding of it, but it did *not* ask for a philosophical critique of the passage (nor will future questions on this text). Some candidates offered such a critique: of these, some found plenty of time to answer the question as well, so that they did not in the end disadvantage themselves except by using up time, but others did not, and could be given small credit, as they were not doing what they were asked to do. Some stated the argument first, at greater or lesser length, and then gave examples of how the language helps to clarify it, which was fine as long as the remarks on language were not reduced to an afterthought such as 'Plato repeats the word *ἰατρὸς* a lot and there are many negatives...' The most successful answers considered argument and language *pari passu*: for example, 'Plato is stating that *τέχναι* do not serve their own interests but that of something else; he gives the example of medicine, saying *οὐκ ... ἰατρικῇ ἰατρικῇ ... ἀλλὰ σώματι* [translation...]; he then adds another skill, horse-management, to strengthen the point, and repeats the grammatical terms exactly in the same order as before: *οὐδέ ... ἵππικῇ ἵππικῇ ἀλλ' ἵπποις ...*', etc.

Thucydides 2(a)

As the Mark Scheme shows, this passage is densely packed with evocative ideas and language; we did not expect candidates to pick out every conceivable point, although some did, and more – and achieved maximum marks as a result, provided that their analysis was as effective as their knowledge was compendious. But we do expect the passages as a whole to receive a reasonable degree of overall coverage, and candidates will not receive the highest marks if they omit major points of content. In this passage, these included: the reversal of the Athenians' fortunes; the effect on the soldiers of the sight and sounds of the unburied dead, and the living

wounded; and the helpless sympathy for the wounded and the fear of worse to come that make the departure so hard. Some candidates, perhaps doing this passage as the first job on the paper, set off writing at inordinate length on the beginning, often finding significance where there is none (*ἀπολελωκότες* is indeed a long word, but it's the one that means what Thucydides needs to say), and found that they then had to rush.

Thucydides 2(b)

Nicias' speech is less one-dimensional than some candidates would have it. To receive the highest marks, candidates needed to see not only the positive points he makes in the interests of energising his men, but also the negatives that he does not hide from them. A balanced answer needed to take into account: that there is reasonable hope that the god(s) may now be on their side; wherever they go, they are still a formidable fighting force; but they must maintain discipline, and it is the responsibility of every man to ensure this; speed is imperative, and provisions are short, but safety is within reach; in conclusion, this is no place for cowards – think of your homes, or of Athens: *ἄνδρες γάρ ... κτλ.* There was less to say on the language front in this passage, though there were important points (for example, the structure of the second sentence from *λογίζεσθε* to *ἐξανασηΐσειεν*: see Markscheme), and the best answers included these too. A common red herring was to point out that Nicias uses imperatives a lot, and addresses his men as 'you'...

Section B: Language

3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a) (Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Markscheme)

- 1 *οἱ μὲν* was often translated as 'the men', or the whole phrase as just 'the Thebans'. It was disappointing that *ὄρη* often appeared as 'shore', presumably as if Latin *ora*.
- 2 *ἐπειδὴ ... ἐγένετο* needed, and usually got, idiomatic translation. *τετρωμένος* was not easy, and frequently done as 'turned'; *προσηνέχθη*, though not universally known, usually made sense if kept as some kind of passive, though not all did this.
- 3 *προσελαύνω*, although common in Xenophon with the meaning 'ride', was allowed as 'drive'.
- 4 *ὄγδοήκοντα* produced the usual number uncertainty, though not as bad as usual. *ὄπλοις* was quite often 'hoplites'.
- 5 *πάντοσε* and *παντοίοις*, though probably not specifically known by most, were well done, especially the latter. *ἐπελάθετο* was not always known, but those who saw that *θείου* is not *θεοῦ* (the majority) had good suggestions for it.
- 6 *ἐάν* was very often confused with *ἐάν*, with disastrous effects on the syntax. Candidates are not expected to know the principles of accentuation, but it is expected that they are aware of different words that are accented in the same way, and think about which one they are dealing with. *εἶα* caused less trouble than *ἐάν*.
- 7 *προπέμψαι* was surprisingly often not recognised as an infinitive, perhaps because of the word order. In this section, as in section 3, there were some 'horses' rather than 'horsemen'. Some thought that *ἕως* can only mean 'while'.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Overall, though, the translation was well done, with a good number of correct versions, and generally good use of English.

(b) There was plenty to say on these lines, and most did not find it hard to make worthwhile points. Some, however, did not specify the Greek words their answers referred to, or did not translate them, which, as on set text passages, is essential for full credit.

(c) (i) 'with' for *συν-* was not accepted.

(ii) Some took *ὑπο-* as if it had been *ὑπερ-*.

(d) Numbers (ii) and (iv) caused most trouble: *πίπτω* was not enough, and many wrote *συνπίπτω*.

(e) (i) was correctly answered by almost all candidates.

(ii) was not: it needed to be specified that Agesilaos could have been top man *in Asia*, and that if he went home he would not only rule, but be ruled. Many conflated and confused the two clauses.

(iii) 'He uses *μέν* and *δέ*' is not sufficient answer to such a question: it is simple enough to state that these words contrast the two instances of *νόμιμα*, but many did not. Some said that *ἄρχεσθαι* is middle, but if the contrast with *ἄρχειν* was brought out, credit was given.

3 Prose Composition

(Numbers refer to sections as indicated in the Markscheme)

- 1 Usually good, but not all used the dative after *λέγω*. *χρήματα* was common instead of *κτήματα*, and was considered as a minor error only.
- 2 The opportunity for subordination in 'she led' was frequently taken, and duly rewarded. The dative, again, was not always used after 'showed', but most people knew a word for 'show' and got a correct aorist. Some, here and later, made the participle agreeing with Timokleia masculine: this was of course only penalised once.
- 3 'When' was often done successfully as a genitive absolute, and *πολιορκέω* well used, though sometimes put in the active.
- 4 The first clause was better done as accusative, as the Thracian is in fact the object (or may be made the object) of the verb 'push', but since Greek authors not infrequently do use the genitive absolute in these circumstances, this was allowed. Some good compound verbs were used in this section. Those who used *ἐξέρχομαι* for 'get out' sometimes got its parts muddled; *ἐκφύγω* was an effective word, and easier to use.
- 5 There was more opportunity for subordination here. 'Realised' caused some problems, not least in the formation of the correct part of *αἰσθάνομαι*.
- 6 *τούτῳ ... ἐρομένῳ* was excellent here, as was *ὁ δέ ... ἡ δέ*. A relative clause was, of course, fine for 'Theagenes who', but the examiners liked *τοῦ Θεαγένους τοῦ ... μαχεσαμένου*. The aorist of *μάχομαι* caused some problems in formation, as did how to say 'against', and 'for'. Some, unfortunately, got the word for 'Greece' wrong.
- 7 Two parallel participles, or *λόγους ... ἔργα* were looked on with approval here for 'words and what she had done'.
- 8 One or two candidates nicely used an active infinitive for 'to be set free'.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

The glossed words were not always used well: there were a number of 'Θρακοί' and 'τὸν φρεατα' (accusative singular) was quite common. Breathings were generally good, but there seems no reason why checking a composition through afterwards should not eliminate all, or almost all, errors in them. We did not insist on a connecting word at the beginning of the first sentence, but thereafter the omission of more than one was penalised. Candidates should be aware that μέν is not a connecting particle.

We do not expect candidates, with limited experience of Greek, to be able to write like Thucydides or Plato. 'Style' marks, therefore, are awarded for any reasonable and intelligent improvement on basic word order – or, indeed, on English word order. Subordination, appropriate connecting words when the English does not specify them, and usages such as some of those referred to above, will all earn marks for good style, and the passages are designed to encourage and elicit such improvements. Even less strong candidates generally gained some of the 'style' marks, and many easily got the maximum. It was encouraging to see that a good number of candidates opted for the composition as opposed to what is generally seen as the easier alternative, and mostly did very well, and it is to be hoped that this will encourage others to see that this option is by no means beyond their reach.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

