

Classics: Classical Greek

Advanced Subsidiary GCE H040

Advanced GCE H440

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

HX-CLAS/R/11

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 2011

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)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	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

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

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

F371 Classical Greek Language

General

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

Section A – Question 1

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

Section B – Question 2

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

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

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

Section B – Question 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section A: Prescribed Prose Literature

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section B: Prescribed Verse Literature

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

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

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

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

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

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

F373 Classical Greek Verse

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

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

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

Section A: Prescribed Literature

Some general points about approaches to literary questions:

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

- There is no requirement to analyse passages line by line, but candidates, unless very adept, tend to write better structured answers this way and to avoid missing important points. They are also in a better position to trace the sequence of thought through a passage or demonstrate their knowledge of the context of their citations than those who look – for example – for instances of ‘emphatic positioning’ of words throughout the passage, and then start again to look for something else. This year, a number of candidates chose on Q.1(a) to deal with all of Hippolytus’ lines together, then all of Theseus’ lines. This was in all probability an attempt to impress the Examiners by avoiding the obvious line-by-line structure, but those who did this (apart from the very sharpest) did not give full value on the way in which each character’s lines pick up on what was said by the other character in the previous lines.
- Coverage of the whole passage (which is not the same as ‘making every possible point the Examiners thought of in their Mark Scheme’) is important. Making brief notes on points to refer to in an answer, or highlighting important points on the question paper, might well be helpful. Some candidates start well, write very fully on the first half of a passage, and then run out of steam, or time. What happens at the end of a passage may be at least as important as what happens at the beginning. The Examiners do not expect absolutely every line or sentence to be commented upon, but they will look for coverage of most of the passage and the majority of its most salient points or examples when deciding how many marks to give, and the shorter the passage involved the more important this will be.
- A list of points shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures (for example) do not just happen to be there; they are supporting some important point, which should be mentioned as the reason for their use.
- Unless otherwise specified, answers should make reference to both content and style. Although some like to make out that Greek and Latin are directly comparable in every respect, Greek on the whole tends to be less ‘rhetorically dense’ than Latin on a line-by-line basis, and even within Greek some passages, necessarily, will contain fewer potential ‘style points’ than others, but nevertheless answers which concentrate wholly on the one to the exclusion of the other will not reach the top level. (See the Marking Grids in Mark Scheme: ‘Characteristics of Performance’.)
- Technical terms should be used with care. Examiners have (regrettably) come to acknowledge that ‘alliteration’ and ‘assonance’ are apparently indistinguishable from one another, and that nearly every vocative provides an example of ‘apostrophe’; but the wrong use of a technical term may spoil an answer which is otherwise going in the right direction. If a candidate notices that several clauses begin with the same word, thinks it is significant, and quotes them and says so in straightforward English, this is better than calling it by the wrong name.
- Candidates should make sure that the literary devices they discover in passages actually work. A plural genitive absolute, for example, is quite likely to have several words ending in *-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 is always ‘emphatic position’, which (apparently) can be either (1) the beginning of a line, or (2) the middle of a line, or (3) the end of a line. Not everyone can be right: the fact is that a word in ‘emphatic position’ is a word where one wouldn’t expect it to be – which may be by no means easy for the average A-level candidate to spot; so this, like all other ‘rhetorical devices’, has to be handled with care.

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

Q.1(a)/2(a)

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

By and large, candidates understood the point and the humour of Q.2(a) very well. Most candidates got at least the broad gist of Q.1(a), although there were some misunderstandings which kept coming up:

2 οὐς σέβω was often – particularly by the 'bitty citers' referred to above – taken to refer to Theseus rather than the gods, which the context makes clear is not the case.

4 μάρτην was often ignored. Many candidates waxed lyrical about Hippolytus' piety but failed to realise that this was a somewhat different (more practical) point, 'I wouldn't persuade those whom I needed to persuade in any case, and would (therefore) break my oaths *in vain*.' Instead, translations like 'I wouldn't break my oaths' were seen.

6 Some candidates seemed not to realise that although this line is expressed in the form of a question, it is not straightforwardly thus but really a strong command in disguise.

Q.1(b)/2(b)

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

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

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

Section B: Language

Q.3 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

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

1 The prefix of *ἄπειμι* was often taken as privative, 'I am not', or confused with Latin *aperio*, 'I am open'. Others knew the basic meaning of the verb but thought that here it applied figuratively, 'I'm not with you', ie 'I don't understand'. Despite the masculine ending, *μῶρος ἦν* was often translated as 'it was stupid' ('it was stupid of me' being a more acceptable variant). *πάλαι* was sometimes mixed up with *πάλιν*. *κλύων* was occasionally thought to be from *κρύπτω*.

2 *οὔ* was sometimes translated as 'where' or 'where to'. *πρίν* was not infrequently treated as an adverb: 'you would have spoken before'. *βραχύ*, 'briefly' also became 'heavily' (as if *βραδύ*) and 'deeply' (as if *βαθύ*).

3 Some did not know *σιγηλός*, and *λέγ'* was not infrequently translated as 'I speak'.

4 This line did not seem to pose too many problems.

5 'Do you know where ...?' was a common translation of *κάτοιθα δήπου*.

6 *ἀγνοῶν* was often taken as 'recognising' rather than its opposite, presumably thanks to the influence of Latin *agnosco*. *ἤνπερ* was sometimes rendered 'if'. When, in addition to that, *ἀγνοῶν* was confused with *ἀγών*, translations such as 'you see the possibility of conflicts' were the result.

7 The tense of *ἔφασκες* was the only recurring error on this line.

8 *πόθεν* was sometimes confused with *ποτέ*: 'who on Earth?' Very occasionally *μολῶν* was confounded with *μαλθακῶς* or, more likely, Latin *molliter*: 'whence did she softly go?' 'To you alone' was an occasional mistranslation of *μολῶν σοὶ*.

9 *μαρτυρήσει* was commonly taken to be from *ἁμαρτάνω*, *κλύειν* to be part of *κλείω*, or *παρών* to be part of Latin *paro* or *pareo*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F374 Classical Greek Prose

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

Section A: Prescribed Literature

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

Plato: 1(a)

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

Plato: 1(b)

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

Thucydides: 2(a)

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

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

Thucydides: 2(b)

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

3: Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

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

1 ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπεπόνθει caused problems, but candidates could gain half the marks for the section even if they got it wrong; it should in any case have been evident that ἐπεπόνθει is not the main verb.

2 περί ... ἐποιεῖτο was also troublesome; in this case, misunderstanding sometimes led to problems with the following syntax, which were regarded sympathetically by the examiners. Translation of τιμωρήσασθαι as 'fear', however, was not. ὅτι δύναίτο was often well done.

3 Many had 'at dawn' for ἅμα ... ἔσρι and thought that συμπληρώσας meant 'sailed', which made ἔπλευσεν hard to do. Most, though, had the sentence largely correct.

4 Again, there were many good versions: τὴν παραθαλαττίαν ἐκακούργει was regarded as something of a test of ingenuity, and candidates generally either did it imaginatively and well or got it wholly wrong.

5 An easy section: but παρακελεύομαι does not just mean 'order'.

6 Mostly correctly done.

7 Sometimes καταλιπών was given the wrong sense of 'leave'; for the somewhat pleonastic ὄχετο ... ἀποπλέων 'he sailed off home' was considered sufficient, but ἐπ' οἴκου caused trouble.

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

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

(d) (i) Usually right.

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

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

(ii) Generally identified as in indirect statement.

(f) (i) Mostly well done.

(ii) Mostly not, with many unlikely variations.

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

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

4: Prose Composition

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

1 There were some complicated Genitive Absolutes with passive verbs for 'when he heard this'; they were not penalised, but candidates might remember that Greek is easier than Latin when it comes to such things. There were some good versions of 'the authorities'.

2 Some linked this to the first section by 'saying that...' or 'in which he said that...' which, like all appropriate subordination, gained them a style mark. 'Betray' was encouragingly well done. Some had more 'hims' than Greek would use, making for a pedestrian, though not wrong, version. Almost everyone simply, and of course correctly, used ἀποκτείνω for 'put to death'. Some good subordination, again, was used: 'that it was necessary for them, having seized him to put [him] to death', though those who did this sometimes confused themselves over the case of 'seized' in the process.

3 'To try to save' was difficult, and good attempts duly rewarded. μωρότατόν τι was good, and got a style mark, as did 'alarmed' as a participle.

4 'Keep secret' was one of the very few vocabulary problems in the piece, and made for some periphrases, some of which worked better than others. τά was simple and effective for 'the contents', and encouragingly common.

5 Many used εἶπε(ν) with the direct speech, but were not penalised.

6 The future conditional was well done.

7 Most knew a word for 'show', but not many realised that it needed to be followed by a dative, and some attempted to do 'can be captured' by an optative, rather than δύναμαι or οἶός τ' εἰμί.

8 Not many knew ἐπεὶ πρῶτον or ἐπεὶ τάχιστα for 'as soon as', but if they said 'when Astyochnus received it, he immediately passed it...' this was considered satisfactory.

Examiners' Reports – June 2011

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

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 2011