

Classical Greek

General Certificate of Secondary Education GCSE 1941

Report on the Components

June 2008

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 syllabus 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 2008

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Classical Greek (1941)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
1941/01 Paper 1 - Language	1
1941/02 Paper 2 - Verse Literature	6
1941/03 Paper 3 – Prose Literature	11
1941/04 Paper 4 – Greek Civilisation	15
1941/05 Coursework	18
Component Threshold Marks	21

1941/01 Paper 1 - Language

General Comments

Both candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on a large number of very accomplished performances: preparation for this examination was clearly very thorough. The vast majority of candidates scored high marks on this paper, producing lucid and fluent translations of stories they had clearly enjoyed reading. As always, some candidates lost their way, however, for the most part, they managed to recover themselves a sentence or two further on. There was evidence that some Centres had had less time to prepare for the examination: this became obvious when able candidates had command of syntax, but their recall of vocabulary failed them. In general, though, they used their common sense and did not alter the structure to accommodate an educated guess. Very few candidates attempted Section D. Most of those who did tended to perform well.

Most candidates present their work clearly. However, in a few cases they seem to be on a mission to save paper, which results in the various Sections being crammed tightly together with no room for the examiner to record the marks. It is always helpful if candidates can write reasonably legibly on alternate lines, leaving a gap of several lines between Sections.

Very few candidates left blanks this year, but those who did obviously paid the penalty.

As every year, there was a tendency for candidates to offer alternative translations for words, leaving the examiner to choose according to preference. Unfortunately this always results in the loss of a mark, unless both options are equally valid. Similarly, parsing a word but not translating it is insufficient to gain any credit.

Vocabulary

Common Confusions

Candidates still have a tendency to confuse pairs of words such as *ἔπειτα* and *ἐπεὶ*. *ἔδωκεν* was sometimes confused with *ἔδοξε*, *δεῖ* with Latin 'deus' or 'dea', *ἔτη* with *ἔτι*. A few were convinced that *πάσης* was somehow part of *πάσχω*, which led to some interesting juggling to make it fit, although those who knew the story of Demeter's search for Persephone made convincing work of a 'suffering earth'. *εἶναι* was frequently confused with *ἰέναι*, with *ἐν Αἴδου* consequently being given as 'into Hades'.

Prepositions and Prefixes

Candidates should also familiarise themselves with prepositions, their attendant cases and their meanings as prefixes to verbs. A large number of candidates this year experienced difficulties with the meanings of *διά*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*, *ἀπό* in their own right and the force of the prefixes in *ἀπαγαγών*, *κατήγαγεν*, *ἀναπέμπειν* and *ἐξῆλθε*.

αὐτός still causes problems every year. One or two candidates simply appended the word 'self' every time *αὐτός* occurred in any case or gender.

Participles

Aorist and Present Participles

In general it is perfectly acceptable for an aorist participle to be rendered in the English present tense; however, the reverse is not true. Too many candidates were sprinkling their translations with 'having become angry' for both *χαλεπαίνουσα* and *ὀργιζόμενος*, 'having become hungry' for *πεινῶσα*, 'having eaten' for *ἐσθίουσα*, 'having carried' for *φέρουσα*, 'having trusted' or (worse) 'having persuaded' for *πιστεύων*, 'having used' or 'having tied her up' for *χρώμενος*, 'having helped' or 'having been helped' for *βοηθούτων*.

Reversal of Verb and Participle

Another area where candidates tend to trip up is in the reversal of verb and participle - for example, 'Battos assembled many citizens, sailing to that country.' (*καὶ Βάττος, πολλοὺς πολίτας συλλέξας, ἔπλευσεν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν χώραν.*) The main clause in a sentence must not be demoted to subordinate status. Another example of this is in the sentence *χρόνῳ δὲ πεινῶσα καὶ ἐσθίουσα αὐτὸν ᾠῶτο ὑπο τοῦ Ἀσκαλάφου*, which candidates had a tendency to render 'At last she was hungry and ate it, seen (or 'which was seen') by Ascalaphus.'

Genitive Absolute

The genitive absolute made only two appearances this year - once disguised as a comprehension question and once in all its glory at the end of Section C. In both cases, though, it led to some interesting variations: the most foolproof way to translate it is 'with' + noun/pronoun + participle, although more confident candidates are equally happy with versions such as 'with the help of the Libyans' or 'helped by the Libyans'. Four marks are always available for this construction: one for the noun/pronoun doing its appropriate job, one for the verb itself, one for its correct application within the genitive absolute and one for making it fit into the rest of the sentence. This year's versions were enlivened by the usual confusion between *βοηθέω* and *βοάω*.

Expressions of time

Candidates are required to be familiar with relatively few numbers, so they should ensure that words such as *δευτέρος* and *τρίτος* are well known. The accusative of time 'how long', the genitive of time 'within which' and the dative of time 'when' are also essential. This year, candidates struggled with *τὸ τρίτον μέρος* ('for the third part'), which was often rendered 'in the third part' or 'for three months'. Closely allied to these expressions are the adverbs *τότε*, *ἔπειτα*, *ἕστερον*, *πρῶτον* and *τέλος*, most of which can cause trouble.

Constructions

Indirect Statement

For the most part, candidates deal with these very proficiently. This year, however, the sentence *ἐνόμιζε τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἐκτελέσαι* taxed a large number of candidates, purely because the nominative was not expressed and so the aorist infinitive went unnoticed.

Relative clauses

Most candidates dealt efficiently with the relative clause in Section A, but a few confused *ὅς* with the idiom *ὁ δέ*.

Result clauses

For some reason, these are always less well recognised than other constructions. This year's πάντες οὕτω δεινῶς ἔπασχον ὥστε ἐπειρῶντο εἰς θήραν ἐπανελθεῖν was no exception. There was a tendency for the ὥστε to be rendered as if it were a ἵνα.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

This was generally very well translated. Knowledge of the story in advance was not necessarily an advantage, however, as some candidates who found themselves in difficulties tried to incorporate extraneous information.

Paragraph 1: There were some difficulties with vocabulary: ἔκλεψεν and ἔμαθε were not always recognised. As regards grammar and syntax, candidates commonly interpreted ἡμέρας as accusative plural and also then made νυκτός plural. In the main, however, this paragraph was well managed.

Paragraph 2: In τότε...θυγατέρα the combination of indirect command and prolative infinitive tested a few candidates severely. κόκκον was often translated as plural, possibly because candidates were familiar with the story from elsewhere, and πινά found its way over to ῥοιᾶς. In a few cases, the purpose clause was distorted by confusion between μένοι and μέντοι and mistranslation of μετά as 'after'. The stronger candidates, however, wrote fluent and accurate translations.

Paragraph 3: Muddles between ἐθέλουσα and ἐξήλθε resulted in versions such as 'Persephone didn't want to eat, she wanted to carry the seed.' εὐθύς was mostly known, but occasionally omitted, while τοῦτο was sometimes 'infected' by French to mean 'everything'. ἐκάστου was often omitted.

Paragraph 4: In this final sentence, most candidates achieved a good translation, although a surprising number thought it sufficient punishment for Ascalaphus to be perched on top of a big rock - not a very big one, though.

Section B

Candidates responded well to this passage, although it was clear from some scripts that they did not always read through the questions before beginning to answer: in several cases, candidates found themselves having to repeat information which they had already given gratuitously in answer to an earlier question.

- (a) (i) This was mostly well answered, although a few candidates omitted 'by the king'.
(ii) This was well answered.

- (b) (i) This was well answered.
(ii) There were sometimes vocabulary problems here: sometimes Aegeus simply left and sometimes he left a random sword other than his own.
(iii) Again there was sometimes confusion, with either Aegeus or Aethra hiding under the rock. However, most candidates managed to gain at least 2 marks here.
- (c) (i) A number of candidates either did not recognise *ἐάν* or translated it as 'when'.
(ii) This was well answered.
(iii) This question proved difficult for many candidates, especially those who did not recognise *εἰδότης*.
- (d) (i) This was well answered.
(ii) This was also well answered.
- (e) (i) Vocabulary problems dogged a number of candidates here - both *ῥαδίως* and *ἐκτήσατο* were often not recognised.
(ii) Most candidates scored at least two marks here, but a number did not recognise the comparative adjective.
- (f) This was well answered.
- (g) (i) Most candidates answered correctly.
(ii) Again, most candidates answered correctly.
- (h) (i) Those candidates who tripped up here tended to render *παρασκευάσας* either as a middle or as 'provide' or 'invite': they were tentative about suggesting that the king cooked the meal himself.
(ii) Those candidates who did not remember *μέλλων* struggled with this question. Some used the answer for (iii) and were then short of material for the next question. However, those who used their knowledge creatively here were rewarded.
(iii) Those who had not remembered *ξίφος* in earlier questions were not penalised again. In general this was well answered.
- (i) Some candidates struggled with *ἠρώτησε* and *τίς*. They tended to apply the indirect question to the sword rather than its bearer. Most, however, answered accurately.
- (j) The prefix to *καταβαλών* was a problem here, as was confusion between Athens and the Athenians.
- (k) *ὡς τάχιστα* was not always dealt with adequately, but otherwise candidates generally understood what happened at the end of the story.

Section C

There were some excellent, fluent renditions of this passage.

Paragraph 1: Areas of difficulty here were *μισοῦσα*, which was translated by some candidates in the passive, *ἀδίκως*, not always recognised as an adverb, *ὡς*, erroneously linked with *κάκιστα*, and *πιστεύων*,

ἔπεισε...Θεμίσωνα...ὑπισχνεῖσθαι πράξειν. Candidates struggled with this entire sentence, largely because they confused πιστεύων and ἔπεισε and then found themselves unable to manage the infinitives, in particular the future infinitive. βούλοιο was also sometimes rendered 'planned'.

Paragraph 2: The mention of τὴν παῖδα only once in the early part of the sentence often led to translations of παρέδωκεν and καταποντίσαι as passives - this was fine as long as the agent was expressed each time. The biggest challenge in this paragraph, and possibly in the whole passage, was the sentence καὶ ἐν πλῶ...ἐκτελέσαι: whether it was because some of the vocabulary was unfamiliar or whether it was because candidates lost control of their English syntax, many struggled here - some had Phronime tied up in a single rope and then the rope dipped in the water and pulled out before Themison thought about fulfilling his promise. It was common both to miss the indirect statement altogether and to confuse the noun ὑπόσχεσιν with the verb ὑπισχνεῖσθαι. The strongest candidates, however, gave no sign of a struggle in their translations.

Paragraph 3: This paragraph was largely well translated. Apart from a few candidates, who thought that Battus was hearing voices, most were confident with the two purpose constructions in this paragraph. There was, however, confusion with οὕτως translated as if it were τοῦτο.

Paragraph 4: This final paragraph provided a challenge to candidates and many met that challenge with flair. Those who struggled, however, found difficulty with the result clause, with the adverb δεινῶς and, surprisingly, with οἱ ἐν Θήρᾳ. The last four words also proved too much for some, with both the time expression and the verb ἦρχεν causing problems.

Section D

Most candidates who offered Section D as an alternative to C did so with great success.

- 1 This was well managed.
- 2 Candidates had forgotten the word for 'letter', but were quite able to form the subjunctive and the future indicative.
- 3 This was well managed.
- 4 The strong aorist ἔπαθον was sometimes formed incorrectly, but otherwise candidates were confident with the indirect statement.
- 5 Some had forgotten γέρων and were forced to improvise - largely with success.
- 6 Problems were encountered with the tense of προσβάλλουσι and the fact that it takes the dative case.

This summary of the various areas of confusion is intended as a guide to students for the future and not as a criticism of this year's candidates. In general there was a very high level of performance in this paper.

1941/02 Paper 2 - Verse Literature

General Comments

The overall standard was again high. As usual, Homer was a more popular option than Euripides by approximately 3:1. Candidates seemed to find the Euripides option more testing, particularly the second passage of stichomythia where the continuity of thought and idea was not always appreciated. Many of the stronger candidates wrote very full, lengthy, impressive answers, which suggested that time was not an issue, although it was disappointing to see few signs of revision and checking of work. Some questions required a clearly argued response which was lacking in a number of weaker scripts. There were also examples of poor English: as well as an indifference to 'there/their' and 'to/too' etc., there were several instances of incorrect usage e.g. 'welcome' not 'welcoming' for *ποθεινός*, and odd turns of phrase such as 'complexated' (= 'complicated?'), 'responsible of' and 'point of you'. Candidates should also be strongly reminded about the need to read questions carefully, especially where lines references are mentioned or instructions such as 'in this passage'.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A Euripides: *Iphigenia in Tauris*

- 1 (a) & (b) There was a number of wrong answers here. Argos was a common error (for Aulis) and there seemed to be many instances of guesswork regarding the direction in which the fleet would sail to Troy.
- (c) The translation was handled well by most. *Αχαιοῖς* was sometimes omitted, and verbs were not always translated accurately e.g. *θέλω* 'he wished', and 'he avenged' for *μετελθεῖν* (instead of the infinitive and ignoring *θ'*). Some did not know the idiom *χάριν φέρων* and translated the phrase as 'bringing pleasure'.
- (d) Most were able to explain the reference *τούς θ' ὑβρισθέντας γάμους*, although a few omitted to mention that Helen was already married (to Menelaus).
- (e) (i) Most knew that Calchas was a seer/prophet (some wrongly gave 'oracle'), but some struggled to find any further information about him; there was a tendency to talk in general about what a prophet might do, which did not gain any marks.
- (ii) Again some wrote about prophets in general rather than Calchas in particular, but most answers were along the right lines.
- (f) A lot of good answers, mostly referring to *οὐ μὴ, σφαγεῖσαν* or the juxtaposition of *Ἰφιγένειαν Ἄρτεμις*, although other well argued points gained marks. Weaker candidates failed to show *how* emphasis was achieved.

- (g) τὸ καλλιστειῶν was understood by most (although sometimes carelessly translated as an adjective), but the irony was not always well explained. Some were led astray by the translation 'prize of beauty' which seemed to prompt thoughts of the beauty contest for the golden apple and Helen's connection with the event.
- (h) Well answered by most, although 'skills' as a translation for τέχναις did not bring out the cunning of Odysseus, and some answers talked about him in a wider context and failed to focus on his specific role in luring Iphigenia to Aulis.
- (i) Most answers were clear and accurate about Iphigenia's rescue from sacrifice.
- (j) The idea of sympathy for Iphigenia was handled well, with most candidates able to make three points clearly with good supporting examples. Weaker answers failed to offer specific examples to support an idea and/or wandered from the text; there was a tendency to talk about her life in Tauris, which falls outside the passage.
- 2 (a) There were many good translations. Most frequent errors were: failure to recognise the present tense of ἐρωτῶ; δὲς came out strangely, suggesting that some did not understand the sense of the whole second half of line 1; some missed the remote conditional (γελάμεθ' ἄν) in line 2 and translated as 'I/we will . . .'; ἢ was wrongly translated as 'or'; the idiom of φρονεῖς . . . μέγα was missed. Many of these language points are dealt with in the notes of the prescribed edition of the text.
- (b) (i) The scansion question was handled better than the alternative. Candidates should be advised to mark the final syllable as unresolved ('x'); a few lost a mark by scanning the last syllable incorrectly.
- (ii) This question, although tackled by the majority, was not well answered. Most commented on the contrast of τὸ σῶμα . . . τοῦ, but had difficulty finding a second good point.
- (c) (i) Most gave an accurate translation of the phrase to bring out the causal sense in ὡς and the future tense of the participle.
- (ii) There seemed to be some uncertainty over the interpretation of this question (asking for an explanation of the events which caused Orestes to say this), or at least candidates tried to play safe by covering much more of the story than simply his capture and readiness for sacrifice (some went as far back as Agamemnon's murder).
- (d) Mostly well answered, although the idea of surprise was not always evident.
- (e) The compressed ambiguity of φεύγω . . . οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐκὼν is fairly typical of Greek tragedy. This sentence requires some thought as to its meaning and it was pleasing to see that many candidates had clearly studied the line and even read the notes from the recommended edition of the text. Those candidates who were apparently considering the line for the first time in the exam usually struggled to write a clear, coherent answer.

- (f)(i) & (ii) The better candidates knew the meaning of *ποθεινός*. The weaker ones did not, which obviously made it difficult to answer (ii) effectively. Even so, some did not realise that Iphigenia was looking forward to hearing some news from home (again explained in the notes of the recommended edition).
- (g) (i) Many answers suggested that Orestes was being negative because he did not want to be reminded of the past, although here he is clearly reacting to the idea of Iphigenia being happy that he is in Tauris.
(ii) There were lots of good answers, but weaker candidates tended to translate without any explanation. For this type of question a translation is likely to be given some credit, but it will not gain full marks.
- (h) Almost all saw a valid connection between Iphigenia and Helen.

Section B Homer: *Iliad* 1

- 3 (a) Well answered by most, although 'gifts' was not accurate enough for *ἄποινα*.
- (b) Again very well answered by most. Weaker candidates for no obvious reason selected vocabulary from line 3.
- (c) The translation question was handled well. Most frequent mistakes were: *ἰόντα* translated as 'going' rather than 'coming'; *ὑστερον* translated as 'tomorrow'; *μη* translated as 'or'; and 'gods', plural instead of singular (sometimes caused by wrong use of the apostrophe).
- (d) Answers were generally along the right lines, but sometimes did not contain enough information to gain full marks; there was a tendency to omit Calchas' announcement. Some thought Agamemnon would not change his mind about releasing Chryseis until she reached old age or until he received recompense.
- (e)(i) & (ii) Almost all correct, and remarkably few spelling errors with Chryseis' name.
- (f) Lots of very good answers, with far more to say than was needed for the 3 marks. Weaker answers tended to want the Greek quotations and/or translations to speak for themselves, and a number erroneously referred to the first half of line 8 in their analysis.
- (g) (i) Fewer candidates opted for the scansion question, although it was generally handled better. Difficulties usually centred around: wanting to scan *μ* ' as an extra syllable; uncertainty over the number of syllables in *νήηαι*.
(ii) The meaning of the line was clear to most, but candidates had difficulty using the Greek 'arrangement or choice of words' to show how the meaning was emphasised.
- (h)(i) & (ii) Both parts were generally very well answered, although some thought *ἀκων* meant 'grieving' or had some connection with 'hearing'.

- (i) The wording of the question ('events which follow') was intended to guide candidates towards Apollo's part in the plague inflicted on the Greek army. Most answers were along the right lines but included insufficient detail to warrant full marks. Some answers went off at a tangent and wrote about the description of Apollo with his weapons, etc.
 - (j) Almost all knew accurately what Chryses' wish was, even though the answer was not contained in the passage given.
- 4
- (a) The correct answer is 'Calchas' (the opening words of the speech are 'prophet of evil'), although the plural verbs at the end of the speech indicate that Agamemnon is addressing the whole gathering. Many wrongly answered 'Achilles'.
 - (b) A straightforward question which produced mostly full marks. *φύην* does not mean 'nature' here (see recommended edition vocabulary), and *ἔργα* requires a more positive sense (e.g. 'accomplishments', 'handiwork') than simply 'work' or 'deeds'.
 - (c) This was well answered by most, as long as candidates did not simply expect the quoted examples to speak for themselves without relating them to Agamemnon being a responsible leader.
 - (d) The translation question was again handled well by most. Apart from the relative few who were reduced to little more than guesswork, the most common errors were: adding 'all' to 'the Achaeans'; *ἄλλη* translated as 'to another (person)'; the complete omission of line 8. Also *ἀγέραστος* would have been better translated as 'without a prize' (to reflect the repetition in the Greek) rather than 'without one' (or less acceptably 'dishonoured').
 - (e)(i) & (ii) Most knew the meaning of *φιλοκτεανώτατε* and were on the right lines regarding the tone, although some were too tentative (e.g. 'the tone is negative'), and others thought that because Homeric society was materialistic the comment was a compliment.
 - (f) Not always well answered. Many failed to mention the obvious point that Agamemnon needs a prize to replace the one he is about to relinquish, and not enough candidates seemed to be aware of the Homeric value system whereby prizes equate to status, although credit was given for noting Agamemnon's position as commander-in-chief, etc.
 - (g) A straightforward question since those who knew the text could gain full marks simply by translating/paraphrasing the lines given.
 - (h) (i) Most gave more than enough information to gain full marks.
(ii) Few picked up on the idea of Agamemnon fearing loss of face or an undermining of his status, although credit was given for those who mentioned his concern about being cheated/deceived by Achilles. Some wrongly thought he was afraid that he would never receive another prize or that the replacement would not match up to Chryseis.
 - (i) There was a wealth of material to draw upon here and many candidates wrote lengthy, well argued answers which were worth far more than the

Report on the components taken in June 2008

5 marks on offer. A few candidates limited themselves to a discussion of only one character (usually Agamemnon) and thus lost the element of comparison, although the most common fault was to turn the question into a character sketch of Agamemnon without necessarily considering his relationship with Achilles, but rather focusing on his treatment of Chryses and Calchas.

1941/03 Paper 3 – Prose Literature

General Comments

Again, this year, candidates performed extremely well on this paper. The vast majority of Centres had opted to study the Herodotus, which the candidates clearly enjoyed as much as ever; meanwhile those few candidates who had prepared the Anthology texts responded with sensitivity to some thought-provoking passages. The balance of performance across the two Sections was very even.

There was no evidence that any candidate had struggled to finish the paper within the time allocated, and in fact many candidates wrote at great length in response to the final question on each passage. However, there were one or two candidates who had obviously revised one text more thoroughly than the other and found themselves at sea on their second question. This was very disappointing and frustrating to see, as their completed questions revealed very accomplished responses to the texts.

Two general points which arise each year involve the instructions given on the examination paper. Candidates who insist on writing their translation on every line, despite instructions given in bold type, make it more difficult for the Examiner to annotate their scripts. Similarly, some candidates have a tendency to ignore the line references given in a question and to use material outside the expected passage: this cannot, unfortunately, be rewarded.

The quality of translation was a little variable this year, with numbers of candidates from the same Centre tending to make similar mistakes. In preparing their translation, candidates need to use the vocabulary at the back of the book and to take account of any notes on the text. They should also consider verb tenses very carefully when formulating their translations and take care in general to be as precise as possible. Occasionally superlatives were ignored and frequentative verbs rendered simply as unadorned aorists.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1 (a)** This was generally well answered, but it was a little disappointing to find so many candidates mis-spelling 'Apries' and 'deposed'.
- (b)(i)** This was very well done by almost all candidates. The only confusion which arose was between feelings of hatred and feelings of contempt.
- (ii)** This was not a difficult question, but large numbers of candidates lost marks by failing to select the appropriate Greek word: too many copied out the entire sentence and expected the Examiner to choose from what was on offer.
- (c)(i)** This was well answered.
- (ii)** Candidates had a tendency to write simply 'guests' rather than 'dinner guests'.
- (d)** Although many candidates translated very accurately indeed, lack of precision was in evidence in a lot of scripts. *οὐδὲν* was often omitted, *τοῦτον* translated as 'it', 'made it into' used instead of 'made out of it'. *ἐπιτηδειότατον* also caused problems, in that it was often rendered simply by a positive or by a word like 'convenient' or 'prominent' instead of 'suitable'. The combination of

φοιτῶντες and ἐσέβοντο invited either an imperfect or an expression like 'frequently' or 'to and fro', but too often candidates did not bring out this flavour. *μεγάλως* was often changed into an adjective or an adverb of an entirely different meaning.

- (e)(i) Many candidates answered well here, but a large number had problems extracting the new information from the sentence in front of them. This then affected their answers to (e) (ii).
- (e)(ii) This question produced some of the least satisfactory answers on the paper. Those who had not selected the new information in (e) (i) were at an immediate disadvantage here. However, even those who had selected the detail about the vomit did not necessarily realise either its shock value or its potential for humour. Many candidates began to anticipate their answers to (f).
- (f) This was generally very well done, but not all candidates compared the bowl and Amasis directly at each stage in order to gain full marks.
- (g) Candidates thoroughly enjoyed themselves here. Large numbers of them were disapproving of Amasis' wish to drink all afternoon and lark about with his friends. However, many candidates took the opposite view and felt that Amasis had a good 'work/life balance'. Either viewpoint was entirely acceptable, as was failure to reach any clear conclusion: candidates needed only to make three discrete points and support them with evidence from their reading.
- 2 Responses to this question were varied. Most candidates performed well, although it became clear that some could not visualise the situation being described here with the river Euphrates and Cyrus' trick.
- (a)(i) This was almost universally well answered.
(ii) Again, this was almost universally correct.
- (b) This was not an easy section to translate, but many candidates rose to the challenge admirably; in fact, the results here were more gratifying than in Question 1. Areas which caused difficulty were the *οἵπερ*, which was often omitted, the pluperfect *τεταγμένοι ἦσαν*, which was often ignored, the perfect active participle *ὑπονενοστηκότος* and the preposition in *κατὰ τὸ ῥεῖθρον* - this last needed to be 'along' or 'by' the stream, not 'across' it.
- (c) Candidates enjoyed this question, often adding gratuitous detail about what the Babylonians could have done to the Persians. The key here, though, was that the Babylonians needed to 'find out' (*ἔμαθον* and *προέπυθοντο*) rather than to 'know', and the object of their enquiries needed to be what Cyrus was actually doing, not what was being planned by either him or the Persians. One other problem lay in *περιδόντες*, which many candidates were convinced meant 'watching' or 'seeing': they had not realised that the Babylonians could have *allowed* the Persians entry before killing them.
- (d)(i) Answers to this question revealed what candidates could picture in their mind's eye; and too often this was a main gate set into the city walls at the entrance and the exit to the city. The notes in the textbook are very helpful here.
(ii) This was well answered.

- (e) Some candidates struggled here, simply stating that the subject comes at the end of the sentence. Some explanation of the effect of that position was essential. On the other hand, some very strong candidates wrote lucidly on the use of *νῦν δέ* at the beginning of the sentence to contrast fantasy with reality.
- (f) Again, candidates responded to this question with particular relish. Clearly they felt great sympathy for the Babylonians who were having their party ruined by a selfish, deceitful Cyrus. Some of the strongest candidates picked out individual words and phrases for comment - for example *εἰ μὲν νῦν...διέφθειραν ἂν κάκιστα* - 'if only...would have'. Such analysis is heartening to read.

Section B

- 3 In general candidates were inspired by this story. They were able to empathise with Cleopatra and to appreciate the interplay between her and Caesar.
- (a) This was well answered.
 - (b) Again, this was well answered.
 - (c) Candidates responded well to this question, with interesting and varied answers. Particularly interesting were those where the candidate took time to explain why the various actions were seemingly innocent.
 - (d)(i) This was well answered, although we did not accept 'taste' for *λαβεῖν*.
 - (ii) Candidates clearly enjoyed this question, seeing exactly why saying 'they trusted him' meant that he was in fact untrustworthy.
 - (e) The translation was well done. Areas of difficulty included *ἔχουσα*, where candidates clearly visualised Cleopatra 'taking up' the tablet, *πλὴν τῶν δυεῖν ἐκείνων γυναικῶν*, which was often wrongly translated as 'except two of those women' rather than 'except those two women', and *θύρας*, which was often rendered as singular.
 - (f)(i) This was well answered.
 - (ii) This was almost universally correct.
 - (g) There were very few mistakes here.
 - (h) Candidates had really enjoyed and engaged with this story. Many could have written an essay on it, so it was frustrating to be restricted to three marks here. However, as long as a candidate made three separate points, each supported with evidence from the story, these did not need to be particularly sophisticated to gain the marks. Many answers, though, were a joy to read, with several candidates writing fluent, compelling prose.
- 4 In general this question was less well answered than Question 3. Some candidates seemed to find the strangeness of the story disconcerting. They were also confused by the place names in the passage.

- (a) This was generally well answered, although simply being a teacher of grammar was not sufficient proof of reliability in itself.
- (b)(i) This was fine.
(ii) This was mostly well answered, although some candidates were convinced that it was a contrary wind which dropped: had this been the case, the voyage would have been in jeopardy before this point in the story.
(iii) This was mostly correct.
- (c) The translation in this question was less accomplished than that in Question 3. Some candidates resorted to paraphrase, while others were merely inaccurate. Words such as ἔτι and καί were omitted; some cases and tenses were inaccurately rendered (especially the genitive καλοῦντος and the perfect δεδειπνηκότας). Occasionally the result clause was transformed into a purpose.
- (d) This was well answered, with a variety of good points made by candidates.
- (e)(i) This was fine.
(ii) This was mostly correct.
(iii) For the most part this was well answered, but there were candidates who did not realise that it was Thamus, not the passenger body as a whole, who would be doing the keeping quiet or announcing.
- (f) Candidates rose splendidly to the challenge posed by this question, although some did find a discussion of atmosphere quite difficult. Many, however, could easily have qualified for six marks rather than three, had those marks been available. Some of the strongest candidates were wondering precisely how much freedom Thamus and the passengers actually had, and clearly felt that the coincidences in the passage bore the marks of the supernatural. Many answers made for very interesting reading.

Centres and candidates should be congratulated once again on their thorough preparation for this paper. Much of the work was a pleasure to read.

1941/04 Paper 4 – Greek Civilisation

General Comments

The performance of candidates this year was again most encouraging in most areas. It was clear that centres had clearly explained the format of the paper to their candidates and thus there were relatively few rubric infringements, allowing candidates to focus on quality of answer rather than pressure of time. As is the case every year, the following report is compiled on the basis of a reasonable number of centres attempting a topic. Therefore where topics are omitted from the report it is due to insufficient candidate or centre entry on which to make valid comment.

Topic 1: Greek Religion

Section One

The majority of candidates answered **Question 1**. Most found no difficulty with **(a)** to **(c)** and most went into a fair amount of detail on the festival without necessarily explaining the importance of what went on. It was part **(d)** which differentiated candidates as, only the best could go beyond repeating in **(d)** what they had said in **(c)**. There was a general vagueness about anything other than the religious significance of the Panathenaia.

Question 2 was popular and virtually all candidates performed well on this topic area, although some were not comfortable in assessing the importance of the Sacred way in **(b)**. A few asserted a fairly modern perspective in terms of following what the oracle said meant that people were obeying 'god's word' which was not valid.

Question 3 was the least popular and was well done. Virtually all candidates recognised what Aesculapius was doing although a number did not know who his father was. Examiners credited consequential errors in **(b) (ii)**. There were the usual difficulties in **d)** where some candidates took the import of the question to imply that the ancient Greeks somehow bestowed a human form upon the gods which meant that they were wandering round on earth and so one had to be careful if one met a stranger in case it was a god in disguise. This was noted in the report last year but not universally acted upon or so it would seem.

Section Two

Both essay questions proved equally popular and the quality of answers on both was impressive. Most seemed to be able to go into a good amount of factual detail and the content of discussions on the importance of the Mysteries was varied and thoughtful as was the discussion of the case for 'State' versus 'the gods' in the question on sacrifice.

Topic 2: Home and Family

Section One

Question One was attempted by most candidates and there were few problems at this level.

Virtually all candidates attempted **Question 2** and with a good deal of success. This very mainstream area of the syllabus is well known.

The same cannot really be said about **Question 3**. Many did not latch on to the fact that question (a) went well beyond a wife's duties in the home. And many did not see the two questions about marriage, (c) and (d), as having different requirements in terms of content.

Section Two.

Essay 1 proved to be the least popular but produced some impressive answers which covered both factual detail and understanding of importance of the various areas in terms of what they revealed about family life in ancient Athens. Candidates again showed that they are becoming more familiar with the evaluation sections on the essay questions.

Essay 2 was also answered well, factual knowledge of Athenian education tended to be good though some candidates dwelt too long on one particular aspect and thus did not cover the topic fully. There was less detailed knowledge in the area of how the education fitted in with adult roles.

Topic 3: Greek Athletic and Theatrical Festivals.

Section One

The standard of responses overall in this topic was very good. All three Section One questions were attempted.

In **Question 1** there were no specific difficulties, although the concept of presentation to the people was often ignored in (c) and candidates simply talked about what happened at the festival. Candidates also need to be reminded that, if they repeat information already used in previous questions, they are unlikely to score well without considerable expansion and evaluation. This point was evident in many responses to (e).

There were very few problems with **Question 2**, although the ever present pitfall of not reading the question carefully enough was a problem for some; to be more specific, in (e) some did not base their answers around the plot element of the two types of play.

Question 3 caused few problems although the same warning about repeating information applied here too, especially in (e) and the idea of 'barbaric' was not always explored adequately.

Section Two

Examiners generally felt that these essays were handled well by the majority of candidates. Both proved equally popular and candidates managed to avoid the purely descriptive approach in favour of a discussion and thus they scored well on the whole.

Topic 4: Art and Architecture

Section One

Question 1 produced some good answers, showing a sound factual knowledge. Even at this level, however, the differences and similarities of the two temples were hit and miss. In (c) many talked about usage rather than structure.

In **Question 2** Candidates tended to produce some very vague answers, both in terms of what other areas of the frieze showed and the location and structure of the main decorative elements. They were much more at home discussing the skill aspects as revealed by the two structures.

Question 3 produced some very impressive answers with the exception of (d), guesswork came into play here. Otherwise it was pleasing to see that centres have clearly given thorough coverage to candidates' skills at evaluating these works of art.

Section Two

Essay 1 proved to be the least popular, in fact, in a topic which has relatively few entries it was attempted by hardly any, so no valid overall conclusions can be drawn.

Essay 2 then was attempted by virtually all candidates and the quality of response tended to be very good and showed that the candidates had an excellent knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.

Topic 5: Sparta and the Spartan System

Section One

Question 1 was answered by virtually all candidates and their performances showed a thorough knowledge of this area of the topic. This was an obvious improvement on the previous years and one wonders whether 'The Three Hundred' has made its mark in inspiring candidates. Weaker answers struggled in particular with (c) as they did not consider the practices of the 'Equals' and tended to go back to education

Question 2 produced some good responses although the values of Spartan society were often ignored in (a) in favour of an answer which wrongly implied that the Spartans were just too busy fighting.

Question 3 was generally answered well. At this level candidates are generally better at seeing the education system in Sparta as one organised in stages and each stage developing the young men in different ways. It was pleasing to see that candidates understood the roles of the less martial discipline in (e).

Section Two

Both essays produced some excellent answers and knowledge of both topic areas was thorough. It is clear that the interplay between the various sections of Spartan government is now being looked at by centres rather than candidates simply learning the responsibilities of each. The overall role of women seems clearly understood.

1942/06 and 1941/05 Coursework

General Comments

Coursework was submitted by approximately 128 centres for Latin and 24 for Classical Greek. The majority of centres opted for Type A (one piece of 2000 words) rather than Type B (two pieces each of 1000 words).

The work of all candidates showed some knowledge of the Greek and Roman world and an understanding of our sources of information. Many candidates also showed the ability to select and evaluate the sources. These three aspects of coursework (knowledge, sources and understanding and evaluation), are reflected in Assessment Criteria 1, 2 and 4, which carry the greatest number of marks. In addition, most coursework was well constructed with an introduction and conclusion and good use of sections and paragraphs.

Choice of Title and Selection of Material

Centres often submit coursework on a variety of topics, reflecting students' interests, or work on the same topic but with different titles. Many candidates wrote coursework on more focused titles, looking at particular aspects of a topic rather than trying to cover the whole of Roman entertainment, for example.

Some candidates wrote comparisons between ancient and modern aspects of a topic, for instance the Olympic Games or the daily life of women. These are successful provided the modern comparisons remain subordinate to the Greek and Roman aspects. It is often preferable to restrict the title itself to the Greek or Roman life aspects, while encouraging candidates to use modern comparisons *selectively* in the course of their work to demonstrate understanding and evaluation.

This year, fewer candidates submitted work on literary topics. Literary topics are sometimes difficult to manage in such a way that they encourage research on the Roman life aspects of the literature while doing justice to the literature and avoiding duplication of work for the literature papers. Candidates should also avoid purely historical topics, as coursework is designed to assess knowledge and understanding of Greek and Roman life.

Centres in doubt about their candidates' titles, especially literary or historical titles, are reminded that they should write to OCR for advice. It is helpful if centres include a copy of this advice with the coursework when it is sent to the Moderators.

The Criteria

In general the coursework submitted showed awareness of the criteria.

AC1 Factual Content (12 marks)

Candidates' research is often evidenced by a good selection of facts. Lower-scoring work tends to be short on the details of factual content. Where candidates use secondary sources to broaden or add detail to the facts they have derived from primary source material, they should be encouraged to refer to the secondary sources in the text as well as listing the book or website in the bibliography. Direct quotation from sources should be in quotation marks, or a passage from a source may be summarised in the candidate's own words but credited in a note. Some candidates already reference their work punctiliously, and there has been a steady improvement over the years.

AC2 Use of Primary Source Material (8 marks)

Many candidates used primary source material successfully as a source of factual content and referenced this material accurately. Many distinguished between primary and secondary sources. Occasionally, candidates' use of diagrams or reconstructions was credited mistakenly by teachers as primary source material, instead of factual content. On the whole there has been a gradual improvement in candidates' use of primary source material, ranging from basic but useful observations to sophisticated interpretations. Candidates who wrote empathy pieces pretty consistently incorporated notes to indicate the sources of their information.

AC3 Organisation (4 marks)

Some candidates produced work that was far too long. The majority of candidates scored well on this criterion.

AC4 Understanding and Evaluation (14 marks)

Candidates demonstrated understanding and evaluation skilfully and often conveyed a refreshing element of personal response and enthusiasm. Teachers' comments show that credit is given for the ongoing understanding and evaluation of evidence revealed in observations on primary source material. Some candidates wrote about 'the Greeks' or 'the Romans', making little or no concession to the variety of lifestyles or to the biased or fragmentary nature of the sources, while others recognised differences between rich and poor women, for example, or the different life of slaves according to whether they were employed in the town or in the country.

This criterion carries more marks than the other criteria, since understanding and evaluation can be demonstrated implicitly in the whole piece of work. It is dependent on comprehension, engagement and critical reading of sources, skills that are also necessary for translation and appreciation of literature in other components of the assessment.

Quality of Written Communication (2 marks)

This criterion is common to all coursework and candidates generally gained both marks.

Marking

Marking was on the whole consistent and carried out in accordance with the criteria. Where adjustments to marks have been made, centres are advised to look again at the mark scheme and in future to use it also at the planning stage of coursework. Work was most commonly marked too generously on criterion 2 Use of Primary Source Material: there should be substantial amounts of material, used as the source of factual content and integrated, as described above.

Some coursework of a very high standard was too harshly marked by teachers, indicating that centres are deducting marks for minor imperfections or omissions, instead of marking positively what the candidate has managed to include within the scope of the component.

The Moderators were greatly helped by the thorough marking carried out by teachers and the detailed comments provided on coversheets.

Suspected malpractice

This year only a few candidates were referred for suspected malpractice. Unacknowledged copying from websites still occurs, and candidates should be aware that if they produce a close, unacknowledged paraphrase of a book or website they will be referred for malpractice.

Centres should be aware that giving excessive help to candidates in the form of 'writing frames' or scaffolding, is unfair, deprives candidates of the satisfaction of making their own selection of material and structure, and distorts differentiation.

Administration

The majority of centres supplied all documents and coursework on time and in accordance with OCR instructions. Centres are reminded that coursework and/or marks *must* be submitted on time by 15 May at the latest.

Conclusion

The coursework submitted this year has provided evidence of vigorous and enthusiastic study of ancient Greece and Rome. Teaching and learning focused on textual, archaeological and visual sources flourishes producing an outcome as satisfying for Moderators as for the centres.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Classical Greek (Specification Code 1941)
June 2008 Examination Series

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
01 Paper 1	100	77	66	55	45	34	24	14	0
02 Paper 2	60	42	36	29	24	19	14	9	0
03 Paper 3	40	30	26	23	19	16	12	9	0
04 Paper 4	40	27	24	21	18	15	12	9	0
05 Coursework	40	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	0

Specification Options

Option A (01,02,03)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	149	128	107	88	69	50	31	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		70	88.7	94.5	97.1	98.7	99.6	100	100	100

The total entry for the option was

Option B (01, 02, 04)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	200	164	144	124	105	86	68	50	32	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		50.9	72.5	83.0	93.0	98.2	98.8	100	100	100

The total entry for the option was

Option C (01, 02, 05)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	171	150	129	108	87	66	46	26	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	28.7	53.0	68.7	80.0	90.4	99.1	99.1	100	100

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	63.5	83.1	90.6	94.9	97.9	99.4	99.9	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 1247

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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 2008

