OCR

RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

GCE

Classics: Classical Greek

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H040**

Advanced GCE **H440**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

F371 Classical Greek Language

General Comments

Overall the standard of responses this year was very high and centres should be congratulated for preparing candidates so well. Q1 was well attempted, with several candidates scoring full marks, while still providing good differentiation in its more challenging sections. The most challenging sections of Q1 proved to be sections 6 and 7, where the speaker made a link to the kings of old. The opening section of Q2 proved a challenge for most candidates – unnecessarily so, since those who opted for a linear translation grasped the meaning best. The relatively small, yet pleasingly growing, number of candidates attempting Q3 scored comparative marks to those who attempted Q2. Centres should remind candidates to follow the rubric in writing their unseen translations on alternate lines. Equally, candidates are advised to avoid offering alternative translation versions in brackets or with slashes.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

(i): The genitive absolute Κόδρου γὰρ βασιλεύοντος was generally well rendered in a variety of subordinate clauses. The impersonal verb ἔδοξε was occasionally mistranslated as the personal 'he thought'. Finally, some candidates did not render the aggressive sense of 'against' in ἐπί.

(ii): The imperfect ἠρώτων was often confused for a present participle by candidates who missed the temporal augment, while λήψονται was often predictably confused with a form of λείπω.

(iii): Frequent rendering of the conditional clause in the passive meant that candidates lost marks if they did not supply the agent.

(iv): This section presented some problems with the vocabulary of ἱερεύς, πυθόμενος, χρηστήριον and the indefinite article – all in the DVL.

(v): This was generally well done, with the occasional mistranslation of the οὔτε... οὔτε clause as depending on the participle λιπόντες rather than the main verb παρέδοσαν. παρέδοσαν was occasionally confused with προδίδωμι.

(vi): This proved one of the most challenging sections, with many candidates omitting altogether the participle ὄντες, while many did not seem to notice the passive form of ἐπολιορκοῦντο. The ensuing participle with the definite article οἱ τότε βασιλεύοντες caused further problems, while many candidates missed the result clause altogether and translated οὕτως as 'thus'.

(vii): ἡροῦντο was rarely rendered as the correct 'chose' but was more frequently translated as 'asked' or the more understandable passive 'were asked'. Further problems were caused by this second instance of a participle and definite article τῶν ἀρχομένων, with many candidates translating this as an active or middle participle. The contracted infinitive ζῆν was generally well identified.

(viii): This was usually excellent, with the occasional candidates mistaking the easy present tense of λέγουσι – not an historic present in this case. γουν was sometimes translated as '*indeed*' or '*therefore*'.

(ix): The first half of this section was usually excellent; the second half caused some problems for those who missed the genitive absolute, while some candidates also ignored the numeral δυοῖν.

(x): This section was a challenge for those who did not realize the subject of ἀπέκτεινε was Kodros, usually because they had missed the genitive absolute in the previous section. ἕτερον was sometimes confused with ἕταιρος, while the perfect passive participle with the definite article ὁ δὲ καταλελειμμένος proved a challenge for at least half the candidates.

(xi): This was usually excellent, except for those who thought that νομίσας meant '*seeming*'.

(xii): This was usually well done, especially if candidates opted for a linear translation, although δοῦναι was too often confused with the infinitive of δύναμαι. Candidates are therefore reminded to revise the few forms of the irregular verb δίδωμι still in the syllabus.

(xiii): This was usually excellent. The only frequent problem was the rendering of the pronoun τοῦτον as a neuter instead of the correct masculine.

(xiv): The aorist participle γνόντες was usually well recognised, though some problems were caused by those who failed to identify the indirect statement with ὡς. Candidates should remember to connect clauses where connectives exist in the Greek, even though it is not necessary to render every instance of μὲν… δε as '*on the one hand…but on the other hand*'.

Question 2

(i): This proved the most challenging section of the whole paper: although there are at least three potentially challenging forms (οἷς - χρῆσθαι – παρεσκεύασται), the best responses were achieved by the candidates who stuck to a linear translation and rendered every word in order with its precise ending. The majority of the mistranslations occurred in the perfect passive form of παρεσκεύασται, which was usually taken to be an imperative or infinitive of some sort. Candidates should also remember that χράομαι takes the dative and should not omit 'small' words like the relative pronoun. They should also remember that a neuter plural subject takes a singular verb.

(ii): This was usually excellent, except for those who confused the comparative with some form of '*sailing boat*'. The indirect statement with the accusative and the participle was usually very well translated, although the future tense of the participle was not always rendered. Occasionally, fifteen days turned into fifty.

(iii): This was usually well done. The vocabulary of ἱκανόν was usually well known this year. Occasionally, candidates lost easy marks by failing to notice the personal ending of δυναίμεθα.

(iv): This was pleasingly well done, although some candidates lost marks by omitting μηδὲν… ὕστερον was sometimes translated as '*after*' and taken with the participle instead of '*later*'.

(v): This was also well done, including the unusual word ἄοινος with its privative α. Occasionally candidates mistook this for an adverbial form.

(vi): This was often well done, but many candidates missed the exhortation in ἀρχώμεθα and most did not know the future form of πεισόμεθα, often translating it as '*we will obey*' or '*we will be persuaded*'. Occasionally, candidates also mistook ποιοῦντες for a participle of πίνω.

Question 3

This question was very well attempted, and most candidates correctly identified the constructions tested.

(a) A large number of candidates did not know that προσβαλλω takes the dative.

(b) There were some imaginative renderings of the genitive of time, while the word νυξ was often treated as masculine.

(c) '*Judges*' were occasionally treated as a feminine word, or given a 3rd declension ending. The indirect statement with the accusative/infinitive and the impersonal verb were very well done.

(d) The result clause was very well done, although the passive form of πειθω proved more challenging. ῥητωρ was often spelt with omicron.

(e) The remote conditional in the past was very well translated. The passive form of νικαω was often translated with an additional intrusive 's' in its ending, presumably the legacy of the paradigm 'παυω' in 'Greek Beyond GCSE'.

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General Comments

Examiners were pleased to report that most candidates seemed well prepared for this paper and were able to demonstrate a very good grasp of the two set texts. In some cases the change of format of the paper for online marking proved a little challenging, but this did not seem to prove a significant problem.

Although the standard of work remains very high, some questions on this year's paper appeared to have caused more trouble than expected. For example, Q2(b) was a relatively straightforward question, where candidates need to paraphrase the Greek text fairly closely. It became clear during standardisation that for some reason candidates were dropping more marks on this than would usually be expected. On both translation questions there were fewer scores of 15/15 than there have been in the past. It cannot be stressed too highly that candidates need a confident grasp of the two set texts for this paper. Many of the questions depend on precise selection of relevant material, and those who know their texts well are always in a better position to answer these more analytical questions as well. Where candidates rely on a translation that is either old-fashioned or somewhat literary, they may be led astray by their memory in the exam.

Examiners frequently comment on the quality of presentation of an answer. This year this proved more challenging because of the switch to online marking. For some questions the space allocated in the main part of the paper was relatively limited; for many candidates this proved an advantage, as this meant they did not try to write too much. However in some cases candidates either tried to cram in rather too much into the space, which affected legibility, or put further material on additional sheets. This works fine, as long as candidates make clear that they are using additional material and label their extra work clearly. This sometimes proved a challenge. However candidates should be encouraged to use the additional sheets provided, especially if they have larger handwriting, as long as this does not lead to excessively long answers to shorter questions.

When answers are presented clearly and structured effectively, examiners find it easy to apportion the marks deserved. For many questions where a number of points are expected (as set out in the question), separate paragraphs makes the marking much more straightforward. Where candidates present their work in a single long paragraph, the examiner is forced to make judgments about the organisation of the answer; weaker responses are often difficult to mark because the separate points are not articulated clearly and related to the context within the passage. In some cases, less confident candidates did not always make clear what the Greek text they were using (whether quoted or not) actually meant, and too often also failed to demonstrate its relevance to the question set. There seemed to be fewer candidates this year who made extensive use of abbreviated quotations which obscured their understanding of the Greek: examiners were pleased that quotations were generally short and to the point, though regrettably on many occasions it appeared that candidates consider the use of breathings and iota subscripts to be optional.

There has often been comment in this report in previous years on the problems caused by excessive reliance of technical terms. This was noted as problematic again this year. Examiners are very happy to reward clear engagement with text, but are much less likely to be impressed by a string of abstract terms which do not appear to be understood and which do not contribute to the answer given. In Q1(f), for example, a number of candidates made reference to rhetorical questions but then did not always provide examples or explain how these contributed to a 'sense of urgency': a little more development would have ensured a point well made.

Examiners were encouraged by the overall quality of work and were pleased to see the interest and enthusiasm of candidates reflected in some high quality work.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Prescribed Prose Literature

Question 1

(a) This question proved more challenging than anticipated, as the versions of the relevant material presented by some candidates were not closely related to the text.

(b) This question proved generally accessible, though there were some very short answers, and some candidates were unclear about the references to 600 and 6000 in the passage. A few candidates appeared to confuse Artagerses with Artaxerxes.

(c) This proved a reasonably straightforward question, though some candidates needed to explain their chosen selection more carefully. One popular point was the use of direct speech (Τὸν ἄνδρα ὁρῶ), but this was not always properly explained. Some candidates identified διασπείρονται without suggesting how it made the fighting vivid (as a vivid present tense or by its emphatic positioning early in the clause). Some candidates need reminding that they must select something relevant and then explain it clearly. While it is not essential to translate the Greek used, candidates are expected to demonstrate their understanding by precise selection and comment (and translation can often be helpful for weaker candidates).

(d) The translation question was generally done very well, but a larger number of candidates than usual made mistakes that result in the loss of a mark or two. Some of the errors were understandable: for example, this second reference to Ctesias in the passage was not accompanied by the explanatory ὁ ἰατρός, but some candidates added it in. There were some omissions (αὐτός in line 15, ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ in line 16).

(e) This was generally well answered.

(f) This question was generally effectively answered, though there were fewer scoring 8/8 than is usually the case. Many candidates identified the rhetorical questions (e.g. Τί κατάκειμαι; in line 1), and there were some good discussions of phrasing and the use of superlatives. However there were an unusual number of challenging responses where the context and meaning was not conveyed clearly enough to examiners to make the awarding of two marks clear cut. In some cases there were confusions over technical and grammatical terms (e.g. asyndeton/polysyndeton, superlatives/imperatives).

(g) The essay question was in many cases very successfully attempted, with a good many scores of 7+, though perhaps not as many 9+ as expected. The essays were not always clearly structured, but there were some excellent discussions of Xenophon's personal role. Some answers focused too much on the passages on the paper, though better answers were able to make effective use of other parts of the text, such as the arrival at the mountain top and the games on reaching the sea. Some essays became rather a list of episodes, but without much development of any one example.

Section B: Prescribed Verse Literature

Question 2

(a) This question was generally well answered, as there was some flexibility in the mark scheme.

(b) Although in the end most candidates scored well on this question, this was partly because of decisions taken at standardisation to be more flexible about each element. Quite a few candidates made slips of detail here.

(c) Most candidates answered this very effectively and showed an excellent understanding of the text. Some popular choices seemed less effective, but were credited: Achilles may well appear authoritative when ordering the slave girls to wash the body, but the passage offered rather stronger answers to the question than this.

(d) The translation was generally very well done. A number of candidates inserted ἐΰννητον (from line 10) to describe χιτῶνα in line 18, and a number omitted αὐτὸς or ἀείρας in line 19.

(e) This proved quite a challenging question, where candidates were required to think about the situation and the significance of what was said. Weaker answers focused too much on Priam and Hector, but the strongest answers conveyed effectively why Achilles felt the need to apologise to Patroclus for returning the body to his father.

(f) There were some excellent responses to this question, which was generally answered more effectively than the corresponding question on Xenophon. There were some good style points made. All the elements of the mark scheme were covered. There were some good discussions of σιδήρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ, and there were some interesting analyses of the relationship between men and gods based on the last lines of the passage. There were a few overly long answers to this question.

(g) The essay was generally of a higher standard than the essay in Section A, although a few did show signs of time pressure. Only a few candidates attempted a clear chronological sequence including the development of the relationship; most offered a selection of character traits with illustrations for each. Some were very sophisticated and well constructed, but a larger number were (rather like the Xenophon essay) a bit more list-like. Most answers were effective, though relatively few scored full marks.

F373 Classical Greek Verse

General Comment

Four years into the specification, candidates seem to have become much more used to the way in which literature and language elements are now combined in the two A2 papers, and have been increasingly skilful in executing answers which will maximise the numbers of marks they achieve. There were very few indications of candidates who may have had a problem with timing: many wrote at great length on the set text questions and did good work on the language sections. For the most part the standard of responses was extremely high, and candidates are to be commended on their ability to write in such depth in a relatively short space of time. Because of the revisions to the question paper format necessitated by the change to online marking, one cannot now say with certainty whether candidates preferred to begin with Section A, the unseen section, or Section B, the set text section (although one suspects that most just followed the order of questions in the question paper). Examiners could tell, however, if a candidate chose to attempt the set text commentary question, 2/3(a), before the commentary and essay question, 2/3(b), or *vice versa*: only a handful attempted (b) before (a), and these were usually candidates whose knowledge of the set text was somewhat shaky playing their better hand first. As one would expect, there was by and large a good correlation between performances on the two sections of the paper, although a weaker performance on A was not infrequently bolstered by a half-grade or so by thorough knowledge of the set texts in B.

Approximately one-eleventh of the candidature answered B questions on Aristophanes (a slight increase on previous years), and the rest answered on Sophocles. The Aristophanes answers were consistently good, and there did not seem to be any recurring trends or problems. Given the larger entry, there was a greater variation in quality in the Sophocles answers, although there were significantly fewer weak scripts than in the previous three years.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Language

Question 1 Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

(a)(i) Judging by the responses, this was the most difficult question on the paper. Candidates did not use the Greek word order to help them (translating, e.g., '*even if it is not a just cause*', *vel sim.*, rather than '*not even if it is a just cause*', *vel sim.*), and got tangled up as a result.

(ii) On the other hand, nearly all candidates managed to achieve two marks on this question, in a pleasing variety of ways.

(b) Candidates also did well (usually 6 marks, or at least 5) on this question. The most common misunderstanding was thinking that κἀγὼ τοιοῦτος meant '*I am such as to make war on the Argives*' rather than '*I am, like you, one who does not want there to be war between me and the Argives, (but even so)...*'

(c) There were plenty of very full and satisfying answers on this question, though some were a little disappointing, particularly in light of the often outstanding examples of literary criticism found on Questions 2/3(a) and (b). Far too often candidates resorted to commenting about words positioned at the start/end of a line, which, although factually correct, did not go deep enough; other weak answers included references to use of the negative οὐκ being an indication of hostility/conflict, which seemed far too vague. Common errors: ἄπει taken as

imperative; εἴσομαι translated as 'I will go'; μὴ τολμήσῃς translated as 'you would not dare' rather than 'do not dare'.

(d) Very few candidates scored under 4 marks for this; if they made any error at all, it tended to be in the word κήρυκα in the first line, giving it a short rather than a long upsilon.

(e) (*Numbers refer to the seven sections into which the passage was divided.*)

Relatively common errors:

(i) The tense of ἥξω, or confusing it with ἄξω.

(ii) Translation of μυρίοι as '*walls*' (think Latin!) and ἀσπιστῆρες as '*trustworthy*' or, more logically, '*untrustworthy*'.

(iii) Translation of ἐσχάτοις as '*each*', or occasionally '*a hundred*' or '*hearth(s)*'. Very few candidates got τἀνθένδε precisely right, and many did not link it to καραδοκῶν.

(iv) Usually well done, apart from a handful of weaker candidates who took ἀκούσας as second person indicative rather than a participle referring to Eurystheus, or who thought that φανήσεται meant '*will slaughter*'.

(v) Usually well done, though some candidates looked a gift horse in the mouth (not believing that it was just a line of well-known dative nouns and pronouns) and, e.g., tried to make γῆ ... τῆδε genitive.

(vi) Some candidates did not know κεκτήμεθα and thought it meant '*we (would) have destroyed*'.

(vii) Not everyone realised to whom the participle referred, and it was frequently mistranslated as '*honouring*' or '*fearing*' (think Latin again). Accurate translation was also compromised, examiners noticed, by the candidates not knowing the difference between '*avenging*' and '*taking vengeance on*' in English: where it was felt that the mistake was purely one of poor English, it was treated as a minor error.

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

Section B: 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. It was felt by examiners this year that far more candidates had got the approach right than in previous years. Candidates are not explicitly asked to translate the texts in the examination papers, of course; 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. The first vice, failing to 'match collar and cuffs', 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. The other is 'bitty citation', when candidates tend to cite and then spin comments (often tenuous) around familiar words and short phrases, without giving a clear sense that they know what the words actually mean in their context. Candidates are far more likely to make convincing points if they base their discussion on whole phrases, clauses or sentences. The worst kind of 'bitty citation' is a comment that starts like this, 'The author uses words like …', and then quotes a number of

words from different parts of the passage (often but not always tenuously linked) which give no sense of context or overall meaning whatsoever. The good news is that examiners felt that there were far fewer candidates who succumbed to either of these vices this year.

- 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. The underlying reason *might* be an attempt to impress the Examiners by avoiding the obvious line-by-line structure (rather than an attempt to camouflage a relatively weak knowledge of the text), but those who do this do not always give a full sense of the way in which the passage develops. Relatively few candidates took the latter approach this year, presumably acting upon the advice given in previous Reports to Centres. Interestingly, most of the remaining candidates, the ones who chose not to follow the sequence of the passage, actually made a better job of it than their counterparts in previous years.

- Coverage of the whole passage is important. (This is *not* the same as 'making every possible point the Examiners thought of in their Mark Scheme' – they are only there to illustrate the range of points that could be made.) 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. For example, in Q.2(a) this year, the main stages by which Oedipus' speech develops were lines 1-10 (accusing Creon of conspiracy and Teiresias of corruption), 11-19 (undermining Teiresias' ability as a prophet, with reference to the Sphinx incident) and 20-23 (restating the conspiracy and threatening of Teiresias), and one would expect an answer receiving full marks at least to have touched on all three of these stages.

- A list of 'style points' shows some knowledge, but no more: rhetorical figures, for example, do not just happen to be there; they will be 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 (at least slightly) spoil an answer which is otherwise going in the right direction. This year (as in others, but less so) the term 'polyptoton' was applied to refer to all parts of speech, and even to words which were merely cognate, as opposed to being different forms of the same word, which is the correct usage with inflected languages. If a candidate notices that, for example, several clauses begin with the same word, thinks that this is significant, and quotes them and says so in straightforward English, this is better than calling it by the wrong name (although it is certainly a bonus if the candidate does use the term 'anaphora').

- 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.2(a)/3(a)

The level of detail in many answers was simply outstanding, and showed that candidates had enjoyed studying the texts despite their different challenges and complexities. The questions seemed to enable candidates of all calibres to get their teeth into the text. Those who did best were able to work through the extract from start to finish, focusing on the stylistic features of the Greek and quoting frequently. Those who approached the questions from a more thematic angle were less able to include the amount of detail seen in other answers.

Q.2(b)/3(b)

The essay questions seemed to have stretched all the candidates but to have been enjoyable to answer. There was a higher concentration of 'virtuoso performances' on Aristophanes rather than Sophocles, but relatively few weak performances anywhere. Few candidates had problems judging how much to write on the printed passage and how much on the rest of the play. However, the weaker answers on Q.2(b) did make insufficient use of the passage and lost marks as a result, which was a shame, as it served to help with a complex question. The better answers argued a balanced view and highlighted the role played by fate or the gods in Oedipus' story. Most candidates seemed to like Oedipus and sympathise with him.

Nearly all the answers would have benefited from the inclusion of more (or, in some cases, any at all) direct textual reference outside the passages printed on the paper, i.e., quotation (either in English or Greek) or other 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 random Greek words (unless in themselves significant) is completely pointless. The vast majority of this year's candidates quoted in Greek when citing the passage printed on the paper, and in English when using material from the rest of the play (whether it was the portions prescribed for reading in Greek or parts they had only read in English).

F374 Classical Greek Prose

General Comment

As usual, the overall standard was extremely high. A larger proportion this year took the Prose Composition option in Section A, and their work especially frequently reached a high degree of excellence; those who did the Unseen and Comprehension generally understood the passage, but were more often found wanting on the shorter questions designed to examine detailed linguistic knowledge. In Section B, more candidates opted for Herodotus than Plato: both groups did well, but it is worth observing that those who did Plato sometimes found it easier to write about the more blatantly rhetorical speech of Protagoras than those who were asked to comment on the more diffuse Herodotus.

Comment on Individual Questions

SECTION A

Question 1 Unseen Translation

(a)   Many candidates did not give full value to αὐτόν in line 1 ('around this time', etc), and the article ταῖς in the same line was quite often omitted: the translation preceding the passage was intended to help with this. The numbers, here and later in the passage, were better done than has sometimes been the case. παρασκευασάμενοι was sometimes translated as passive, and some did not know (προσ-)πληρόω. The comparatives in line 3 caused problems: some thought πλείονας was something to do with sailing, and by no means all recognised ἐλάσσονες as a comparative at all, which made τῶν … νεῶν difficult. The ὥστε clause, of course, indicated result rather than purpose, though a number opted for the latter. Some candidates would be well advised to pay more attention to the structure of their sentences in translation: in many cases 'they anchored by Erineos' was stuck on to the end of the sentence without regard for the overall syntax, or for the fact that it was the main verb. There were few problems with the first sentence of the second paragraph. In the second, ἡσύχαζον was not well done: most knew that it has something to do with remaining quiet, but here it was the Corinthians' inactivity that was in question, rather than how much noise they were making. ἀρθέντος in line 7 was difficult (some did not help their cause by translating ἔπειτα as 'when', which left the absolute nothing to do), but many realised that it was aorist passive and were thus able to cope. The progress of the battle was generally followed, though ἄπλοι ἐγένοντο made candidates think, as it was intended to. ἐμβαλλόμεναι needed to be more specific than just 'damaged'.

(b)(i)   Full sense depended on knowing ἑάλωσαν: even those who did not could gain three of the four marks if they were careful with the rest.

(b)(ii)   A few made this unduly difficult, when all that was needed was reference to the three negatives in the sentence.

(c)   Almost everyone got this right: again, it was an easy question to anyone thinking sensibly about what was happening.

(d)(i)   Many had no problems with this; those who started by saying 'the Corinthians thought they would win' created a difficulty for themselves which they found hard to get out of, though some credit was given to answers that were consistent with themselves ('the Athenians thought they would win…') though ultimately wrong.

(d)(ii) Even those who could not wholly understand the Greek could mostly see what Thucydides is up to here, and there were some excellent answers: in general these were the more concise ones which homed in on the required points, quoted the Greek, and said what it does; the more rambling the answer, the less effective it tended to be.

(e)(i) Many thought this was part of the genitive absolute, which made the next question hard. One or two candidates just said 'genitive', which is not an answer to 'explain the case of...'

(e)(ii) Apart from those who used up the answer on the previous question, most got this right.

(f)(i) Normally right; occasionally ἀποπλεύω or ἀποπλείω.

(f)(i) Almost always correct.

Question 2 Prose Composition

There were a number of first-rate versions of this piece. Everyone who attempted it showed at the very least a creditable knowledge of Greek: many demonstrated a high level of grammatical understanding allied to a sense of style and produced passages that frequently read like real Greek.

Not many candidates had specific vocabulary problems, and were thus able to concentrate on getting the grammar right. Most of the grammar, for the most part, *was* right: everyone knew how to do purpose sentences, result clauses, indirect statements, etc; problems they had tended to be with particular parts of verbs. For example, it is all very well to see that '*to obtain*' (line1) is a purpose sentence, and everyone did: but then there is a decision to be made; in this case, the future participle of κτάομαι might well have been easier to use than (say) the subjunctive, and wise candidates recognised this. It is also worthy bearing in mind that aorist optatives and subjunctives are often easier to form than present ones, where either might stand.

There were, intentionally, plenty of places where the English could be adapted to make it more Greek-like, and a style mark gained accordingly: no one failed to secure one or two of these, and many easily reached the maximum of seven. Examples (not exhaustive) included: '...ordered Callicratidas *having sailed* to Lydia to obtain...'; 'he asked the slave *the one* guarding the door...'; 'Cyrus cannot see you now: *for* he is drinking.' Candidates are more likely to gain style marks for such reshaping, or for the use of a meaningful connecting particle, than they are by sprinkling random particles such as δή or γε: μέν and δέ, correctly used, will qualify, but they are harder to use than they seem, and candidates would be well advised only to use them when two clauses are directly balanced. Particularly appropriate vocabulary might also qualify: for example διαλέγομαι for '*speak to Cyrus*', rather than simply λέγω, or suitable reshaping in 'when he was again refused admittance': here some used κωλύω, some creditably knew the aorist passive of ἐάω, and others did something like '*when the slave again did not let him come in*'.

SECTION B

Question 3(a) Plato

How Plato 'maintains the reader's interest' is, of course, to a degree subjective: some may think it is more interesting to depict Epimetheus as not very bright and scratching his head because he's used up all the attributes than it is to enliven a list of foods appropriate to different species by means of repetition or *variatio*. Accounts with different emphases, therefore, are to be expected, and welcomed. But a successful commentary will show awareness of this, and aim at a balanced account: reasonably enough, some candidates pointed out that there is humour in the picture presented of Epimetheus; but undue emphasis on one or other aspect which ignores others (or which fails to provide adequate coverage of the passage set) is unlikely to score top

marks. It *is* amusing to observe Epimetheus 'escaping his own notice'; but it isn't *that* funny, and it's only one angle amongst many.

Question 3(b)

A question such as this requires a slightly different approach than one such as 3(a): straight commentary questions such as the latter are (experience suggests) much better done by those who go through the passage from end to end picking out salient points whilst keeping an eye on the narrative drive of the extract; in ones such as this, some candidates successfully separate argument and content, dealing first with what Plato is arguing, and then moving on to see how he manipulates it by means of language. They are not asked to comment in depth on the thought, but many have clearly been enthused by Plato's methods and have percipient things to say about the validity of what he is saying; on the other hand, they can perfectly well score top marks just by stating clearly what Protagoras is getting at and showing how Plato clarifies this. Here, almost no one failed to explain the function of the flute-playing analogy, and there was plenty of opportunity for identifying places where Plato is clearly trying a bit harder.

Question 4(a) Herodotus

Herodotus was more popular than Plato, as was Thucydides in the past few years. This is understandable, in that those who study Herodotus probably have an easier ride during the period of preparation; but the blatant rhetoric of Protagoras' speech in the Plato is perhaps, in an examination, easier to pick out and write about than Herodotus' more diffuse, and less obvious, methods. Question 4(a) provided a good example of the flexibility needed to comment effectively on Herodotus. Though a speech (which, as some said, is in itself significant), it is by no means all rhetoric; certain parts of the extract had little to write about in terms of use of language (though other parts did, and could not be glossed over: τὸ γάρ ... ἐκείνων (lines 3-5), for example, cried out for comment on the balance and contrast of the words; but it is stretching the bounds of likelihood to see a 'tricolon', in any significant rhetorical sense, in the mention of Megara, Aegina, and Salamis in lines 12-13: Herodotus needs Themistocles to mention places of strategic significance, and there happen to be three of them. There are plenty of ways to 'convince an audience', and a speech which concentrates only on (say) logical argument might well be missing a trick. Thus the best answers took into account Themistocles' confidence, his strategic and tactical acumen, his awareness of the demands of logic and the emotional, and his use of the religious.

Question 4(b)

This is a lively and entertaining piece, and produced some lively and entertaining answers. There were, however, both here and in Question 4(a), some answers which cast doubt on how well certain candidates knew their texts, both in detail and as a whole: it is hard to feel confidence in a candidate who has supposedly prepared a text over a year or so but who thinks that the mysterious boat that confronts Adeimantos '*fell from the sky*' (as more than one did), or that its occupants threatened to take the admiral hostage and put them to death; or that στρατηγίς means '*general*'. Many candidates showed a commendable understanding of the background to the story in the continued hostility of Athens and Corinth, though one or two distracted themselves by going on about this at excessive length. The majority accepted that the story is in doubt, though not all pointed out the strength of the last sentence in establishing the doubt: καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Ἑλλάς was one of those linguistic uses that cried out for comment but did not always receive any; another was surely the first word of the passage Ἀδείμαντον: nearly everyone remarked on his characterisation as ἐκπλαγέντα τε καὶ ὑπερδείσαντα, and some made great (too great, sometimes) play with the humour with which his flight is depicted and his apparent arrant cowardice, but not many observed that, having seen him before, we know immediately when he turns up as the first word of a new story that we're in for some fun; or that, by the end, our view of him is subtly changed. The Athenians weren't always right.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001