

**GCE**

**Classics: Classical Greek**

Advanced GCE **H440**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H040**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2014**

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.

© OCR 2014

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)**

### EXAMINER'S REPORT

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
F371 Classical Greek Language	1
F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature	4
F373 Classical Greek Verse	7
F374 Classical Greek Prose	9

# 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 5 and 12. The opening two sections of Q2 proved a challenge for many candidates. 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 and write their unseen translations on alternate lines. Equally, candidates are advised to avoid offering alternative translation versions in brackets, as these invariably had a counterproductive effect.

## Comments on Individual Questions:

### Question No.1

Section 1: The indefinite construction was well rendered by most candidates. The possessive pronoun *ἡμετέρα* and *ἡμετέρω* caused some problems, often mistranslated as 'my' and occasionally as a form of 'day'. Candidates should be reminded that ἦν can mean 'there was' as well as 'he/she/it was'.

Section 2: The possessive dative and the relative clause were well rendered by most candidates. Some completely ignored the relative pronoun, and candidates should be reminded that every word counts in unseen translation. They should also be reminded not to add the definite article where the Greek has none.

Section 3: The indirect statement was well rendered by most candidates. Candidates should be reminded that the most appropriate meaning in context must be selected for their translation. *ἔμελλεν* might have meant 'he was intending' in section 2, but in section 3 it had to mean 'she was about'. The passive form of *ἀδικεῖσθαι* was occasionally missed, even though candidates realised there was an agent with *ὑπὸ* + genitive in the sentence. Many candidates missed the apposition of *φίλην*, translating *ταύτην* and *φίλην* consecutively.

Section 4: This section was well rendered, with the exception of the small number of candidates who changed the tense of *ἀδικοῖτο*. There was also occasional confusion over who the pronouns referred to.

Section 5: This section offered plenty of opportunity for differentiation. *πειθεσθαι* was occasionally translated as Active, *δύνασθαι* was often translated as Future and *φαρμάκω* was usually translated as the object of *ποιῆσαι*. *ἐκείνη* was often taken to agree with *φαρμάκω* ('that poison'), despite the difference in gender, and the balance of *ἐκείνη* and *ἑαυτῇ* was often missed. Once again, candidates should be reminded to observe differences of gender, case and number in their translation in order to establish the correct agreement between nouns and adjectives/pronouns. *Δύνασθαι* was occasionally rendered as Future.

Section 6: This section was well rendered. *ἠρώτα* was occasionally translated as a participle. Candidates should also be advised to learn the infinitive form *δοῦναι*.

Section 7: This section was well rendered. *Τάχιστα* was usually translated 'as quickly as possible' instead of as a straight superlative. *οἶμαι* was ignored by the markers, as it does not appear in the DVL, although most candidates rendered it successfully.

Section 8: This proved one of the most successfully rendered sections, with the occasional exception of those candidates who rendered *ἔτυχε θύων* as 'he met with the concubine sacrificing'. As this was a minor error only, it did not usually affect candidates' score.

Section 9: This section was well rendered. Occasional mistranslations of *ἐβουλεύετο* as 'she wanted' did not affect candidates' score.

Section 10: This section was well rendered by the candidates who identified the indirect question. Candidates occasionally omitted to translate *ὁπῶς*, which resulted in a serious error as a missed construction.

Section 11: This section was well rendered by the candidates who knew the meaning of the irregular comparative *ἄμεινον*. Candidates should be directed to revise irregular comparative and superlative adjectives. Many showed flair and ingenuity in rendering *ἄμεινον* as a form of *μένω* with the privative *α*.

Section 12: Once again, this section was well rendered by the candidates who knew the irregular comparative *πλέον*. As above, candidates should be reminded to revise those irregular adjectives and adverbs and be warned against easily confused words. Creative translations rendered *πλέον* as a participle from *πλέω*. Conversely, *μᾶλλον* was usually known. *οἰομένη* was ignored by the markers, as the word was not in the DVL, although most candidates translated this accurately. *ἴσως* was occasionally not known or translated as 'equally'.

Section 13: Once again, this section was well rendered by the candidates who knew the irregular comparative *ἔλασσον*. Some candidates translated this as an imperfect verb, which usually ruined the sense.

Section 14: This section was well translated by most candidates. *ἐμπεσῶν* proved a challenge for some who confused it with a form of *πάσχω*, while *νόσον* was at times translated as 'island'. *εἴκοσιν* was frequently not known, and candidates should be reminded to revise the ordinal numbers in the specification. *ἀπώλετο* was usually well rendered.

## Question No.2

Section 1: This section provided plenty of opportunity for differentiation. *ἐπιδείξας* was often mistranslated as a form of *δέχομαι*, and *τὰ γεγραμμένα* was occasionally glossed over as 'the terms'. Candidates should be reminded to revise the use of the participle with the definite article. Some candidates were unsure about what the 'seal of the king' was, occasionally translating it in apposition to Tissaphernes. The idiom *εἶχε δὲ ὡςδε* was not usually known, and candidates rendered *εἶχε* as a form of 'spoke'.

Section 2: This section was well rendered by those candidates who identified the indirect statement and the neuter form of *δίκαιον*, rather than rendering it as an adverb or as agreeing with the king. The genitive partitive *τῶν νήσων* escaped the notice of all but the most observant candidates.

Section 3: This section was well rendered. *αὐτονόμους* was usually well rendered.

Section 4: Candidates scored high marks in this section, as *ὥσπερ τὸ ἀρχαῖον* was ignored by the markers since *ἀρχαῖον* was not in the DVL.

Section 5: This section was well answered. *ὁπότεροι* was occasionally not known.

Section 6: This section was well answered. The greatest challenge here was *μετὰ τῶν ταῦτα βουλομένων*, which candidates often translated as ‘after these plans’. The distinction between the meanings of *μετὰ* when followed by the accusative or the genitive should be reinforced to candidates. Likewise, the distinction between *βούλομαι* and *βουλεύομαι*.

### Question No.3

Section a: The expression of time was well identified. Examiners ignored renderings of ‘tenth’, since the specification expects knowledge of 1st-4th only for the sentences. The ‘priest’ was often given a 2nd declension ending. The declension of ‘year’ was not known.

Section b: The result clause was very well answered. ‘Disease’ was usually translated as a masculine, causing a consequential error in the adjective.

Section c: The indirect statement was very well answered, with candidates offering knowledgeable versions with the optative in historic sequence after *ὅτι*, or accusative/infinitive constructions.

Section d: The genitive absolute was duly identified and accurately translated by most candidates, with many offering an equally acceptable temporal clause.

Section e: The concessive clause was well answered. A few candidates ignored the participle construction, while the verb ‘suffer’ proved challenging for some.

## F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

### General Comments:

The performance of candidates on this paper continues to impress examiners, and there is pleasing evidence both of hard work by candidates on their two set texts as well as of stimulating classroom discussion. The vast majority of candidates showed a precise grasp of the material studied, and only a small number seemed ill prepared for the demands of the papers.

That said, there were some areas where the paper did not quite mirror previous years. The translation sections revealed fewer candidates with full marks, and there were some relatively poor answers: if candidates are not able to translate the texts, it is unlikely that they will be in a position to address the more demanding questions. The recall questions, which invite candidates to list details from the immediate context of a passage, either just before or immediately after, also proved a challenge for some.

There was once again considerable variation in the two essay questions. Some candidates did not address the question set, and did not illustrate the points they made with precise detail from the specified section of text; a very few spent time on the broader context within the work as a whole, when this is not the purpose of the question. However there were some excellent essays, which used the set text to good effect and interpreted their examples effectively so as to address the question set. Some candidates also drew on the passages on the paper to good effect, especially to illustrate relevant issues of style.

The questions requiring commentary allowed candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the Greek text. Examiners were pleased to reward candidates who organised their answers clearly, setting out relevant points in paragraphs with clear use of the text from the passages. A few candidates are inclined to make general references with ellipses, rather than selecting the text they are using to make their point, and in some cases it was impossible to award full credit as what was written was too vague. Some candidates did not demonstrate an understanding of context, either through translation or paraphrase, and there was a tendency to fall back on weak generalisations (such as repetition of 'and', or first word/last word in sentence or line) with little justification. On some occasions potentially good points were rendered less effective by significant errors in the understanding of the text (as demonstrated either by translation or by the commentary).

Examiners would like to remind candidates that it is helpful to present the Greek text clearly and accurately. For many, the use of breathings appears optional; in some cases, the Greek was very hard to read or did not appear to support the point being made at all. It cannot be stated too often how important it is for this paper to have a sound understanding of the specified sections of the texts.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question No. 1a

Examiners were surprised by the number of unexpected errors in this exercise. There seem, in recent years, to be fewer candidates scoring full marks. The first section caused relatively few problems, but in (ii) too many translations were unclear about the reference to 'enemies', and translations of *οἱ ἐκ τῆς καιομένης χώρας* were too often unclear. The final section also exposed some misunderstandings of what exactly was happening.

Question No. 1b

The majority of candidates were able to identify relevant aspects of these lines, though there were also some vague references to comparatives, and some translations of phrases were misleading. A number of candidates commented on the significance of the repeated *ἀεὶ*, but were not always able to explain its significance in the phrases *οἱ ἀεὶ ἐπιόντες* and *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀεὶ βοῶντας*. The majority of candidates picked out the significance of the phrase *θάλαττα θάλαττα* and used it to good effect.

Question No. 1c

This question was generally well done, but rather too many candidates misconstrued *δακρύνοντες* and did not explain what was happening clearly enough.

Question No. 1d

The questions involving recall of text can be problematic. This one worked reasonably effectively, and most candidates were able to offer relevant detail in return for the three marks on offer.

Question No. 1e

There were some excellent responses to this question. Most were able to identify the dramatic arrival of the rider *ἀνὰ κράτος* and the urgency of his shouted warning *καὶ βαρβαρικῶς καὶ ἑλληνικῶς*. However, vague references to "polyptoton" were not credited: the context needs to be explained. Examiners are generally unwilling to give much credit for 'repetition of *καὶ*'.

Question No. 1f

Essays varied considerably. The best showed a great command of detail and made some, limited use of the passages on the paper, often to make salient points about Xenophon's style. Weaker answers tended to be very general and make limited use of detail from across the set text. Some responses lost sight of the question (about what the Greek army experiences), though the majority of answers were able to put the examples they chose into context. The arrival at the mountain top and the celebratory games figured strongly in answers, as did the army's travails in bad weather.

Question No. 2a

This passage proved generally successful: there were some excellent answers that demonstrated a good understanding of the Greek text. The significance of *κακὴ βούβρωσις* was often noted, and also the impact of Zeus' gifts: *οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν*.

Question No. 2b

There were some excellent answers here, though again some comments betrayed uncertainty over detail. In a phrase such as *ὄλβω τε πλούτῳ τε*, it is better to focus on the impact of the nouns, or perhaps the position of the phrase within the sentence, rather than the repetition of *τε*. A few answers were very unbalanced in their discussion of Peleus' good and bad fortune, though this was not problematic; more serious was the failure by some to address issues of style.

Question No. 2c

This translation question again threw up more issues than anticipated. Examiners were careful to allow an appropriate range of versions. A number of phrases were omitted (e.g. *ἐντὸς ἔεργει, υἰάσι, πῆμα τόδ'*) and a very few translations were incomplete.

Question No. 2d

This proved a more challenging recall question than the corresponding Xenophon question (1d). Some candidates were clearly unable to place the passage precisely in context.

Question No. 2e

This question was generally very well done. Candidates were able to find a very good range of examples from the passage, and write clearly and effectively about them. It was good to see some candidates commenting on the effectiveness of the dual here (*τὸ δὲ μνησαμένω*), and there were some effective discussion of the scene (e.g. *ἀψόμενος δ' ἄρα χειρὸς ἀπόσατο ἦκα γέροντα; προπάροιθε ποδῶν Ἄχιλλῆος ἐλυσθείς*), as well as Priam's speech.

Question No. 2f

There were some excellent essays that addressed a wide range of relevant material. A very few were rushed for time, and most candidates appeared to have dealt with this question last. There were some interesting differences of opinion about Achilles' behaviour, though most were prepared to allow that he behaved acceptably under the circumstances. A few weaker essays focused too much on Priam, rather than Achilles. But the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate an excellent grasp of the material in the specified text, and marshalled it effectively, whether they emphasised the negative aspects of the presentation of Achilles or were prepared to adopt a more positive approach.

## F373 Classical Greek Verse

### General Comments:

Candidates should be congratulated on the strength of their performance on this paper. For the second year in a row Examiners noted that Centres had obviously digested and acted upon points made in previous Reports to Centres about common flaws in scripts and ways in which candidates could maximise the number of marks they might achieve.

By and large these candidates were academically strong and seemed to have work ethics commensurate with a high level of ambition. For this reason, there was *relatively* little to distinguish between them in their performances on Section B, Prescribed Literature: the vast majority had evidently worked extremely hard on their set texts and knew them in considerable detail. It was often left to Section A, Unprepared Translation and Comprehension, to make the final determination as to whether candidates achieved A\*, A or B. At C grade and below, it was usually the case that performances in both sections were weaker. On the other hand, to prove the folly of generalisation, one script was found in which the candidate offered a very strong Section A but had clearly managed to put very little work into the set texts.

The criticisms below should be seen against a recognition on the part of the Examiners that these candidates have, with no little success, undertaken to translate and perform literary analysis upon an unseen verse text in a complex foreign language, as well as to study difficult set texts to a remarkable level of detail.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question No.

- 1(a)(i) This section posed relatively few problems for candidates, though some did not know *πόσις*, and a small number confused *σαφῶς* with *σοφῶς*. Some also seemed a little thrown by the fact that *δυσθυμίας* was plural, though this did not usually prove detrimental to their translations.
- 1(a)(ii) In this section many candidates showed that they were actively trying to produce good English by giving *παθών* concessive force. *δράσας* however, was taken by a number as second person singular.
- 1(a)(iii) A gratifying majority spotted that *σαφέστερον* was comparative. The apposition in the second sentence caused problems for many, as did the exact force of *ἐπί*. Examiners exercised appropriate discretion here.
- 1(a)(iv) A significant number were, predictably, uncomfortable with *που* ('where hasn't he dared ...?') but most translated the superlative appropriately.
- 1(a)(v) Some did not spot that *οἱ πρό τοῦ φίλοι* was a prepositional phrase, and the sense of this sentence was therefore mangled. Not all knew (or correctly guessed) *ἄτιμοι* ('blamed' was a frequent mistranslation).
- 1(a)(vi) This was the most difficult section. *πότερον* was often translated as 'before' or 'previously', *ἐρασθεῖς* was often taken as second person, *λέχος* was often taken as the object of *ἐρασθεῖς* as well as *ἐχθαίρων*, and many translated *ἔρωτα* as if from *ἐρωτάω* ('you're asking a lot', 'that's a big question').

- 1(a)(vii) A large number knew *ἔφθ* (in contrast with previous years), but *ἴτω* was often translated as second person imperative, and quite a few did not know what verb it came from. Some were a little confused by the *-περ* in *εἴπερ*.
- 1(a) Fluency The majority of candidates made a solid attempt to improve upon ‘translationese’ and received 2 marks.
- 1(b) Most candidates earned 2 marks, though some did not explain what ‘take marriage of tyrant men’ actually meant.
- 1(c) Very few candidates failed to achieve the maximum 4 on the scansion question.
- 1(d) A gratifying number of candidates scored 2 on this question, though some (predictably) did not know *συγγνωστά* or confused it with other words.
- 1(e) Few problems were posed by this question.
- 1(f)(i) A large number of candidates were successful here, though some translated *πρός* as ‘to’ or ‘in addition to’.
- 1(f)(ii) Most knew *εἶ* a small number took *Ἰάσων* as its object.
- 1(g) This was usually well done, though occasionally a candidate would translate ‘he wishes her to endure it’.
- 1(h) Most candidates achieved 5 marks or above on this question, but a relative minority managed the full 8: too many answers made a meal of rather obvious points based on the glossed words in lines 20-21.
- 2/3(a) *Commentary question on Sophocles/Aristophanes.* As stated above, the vast majority of candidates had worked hard on their set texts, and they demonstrated their knowledge in great detail. They are now more effective at displaying their knowledge in a way which maximises their marks. There were relatively few instances of the sort of tentative ‘bitty’ citation, commented upon in previous reports, which suggests that a candidate is not wholly comfortable with the detail of a passage. Nevertheless, there were still one or two candidates who were happy to provide lists of stylistic features without making much attempt to relate them to the content of the passage, which occasionally leaves Examiners in some doubt as to just how well the text is actually known by the candidate. Even minor misunderstandings of the texts were fewer on the ground than in previous years, though in the Sophocles some candidates thought that *κόλλος* referred to Corinth rather than to Oedipus himself. One weakness from previous years still very much in evidence, though it did not end up costing the candidates marks, was the loose or incorrect use of technical terms: ‘tricolon’ was an over-used word, and ‘polyptoton’ was seldom used in its precise Classical sense, and often (as in line 14 of the Sophocles) where ‘figura etymologica’ might have been a more appropriate term.
- 2/3(b) *Essay on Sophocles/Aristophanes.* Most candidates managed to write well-rounded essays; the quantity and quality of appropriate direct textual reference was the main distinguishing factor. Some candidates lost a little on their mark for AO1 by ignoring, or at least giving short shrift to, the stimulus passage printed in the paper.

## F374 Classical Greek Prose

### Section A: Language

#### Question 1: Unprepared Translation and Comprehension

- 1(a) (i) The first clause was almost always correct; in the second, *xun-* on *xunkomísantej* was not always translated. *épi ... húlisanto* was beset by vocabulary problems: *purá* as ‘fire’ (not a seriously damaging error, except for those who did not know or could not work out *épiqéntej*), and *húlisanto* not known at all, which caused problems with *áutoũ* (‘they buried *them*’, for example).
- (ii) Mostly good; *ústeráia* sometimes just ‘later’. A few inexplicably ignored cases and started with ‘the Syracusans’ as subject.
- (iii) Almost all correct except (predictably) the numbers; ‘620’ was quite common, and at least preserved the prefixes *dí-* and *éx-*, but there can be no excuse for candidates at this level not to know basic numerals.
- (iv) Some did not know *óstã*; *sfetérown* was accepted only as ‘of their own men’, not just ‘their’; not unreasonably, some of those who did not know *óstã* thought that *xunélexan* was something to do with ‘speaking’. Many well translated *écontej* as ‘with’.
- (v) There were one or two ‘storms’ here, but more destructive was failure to translate *oũpw* at all, or to confuse it with *oũtw*, *õpwj*, *oũtoj*, *ktl.*, which generally at least reversed the sense. Not everyone spotted that the sense of *édókei* was incomplete without *dunatón*.
- (vi) Some ‘horses’ here, and plenty of ‘Athenians’, but mostly not a problem for those who knew *metapémpw*.
- (vii) *pantápasin íppokratũntai* needed some imagination, and was often thoughtfully done, but not all recognised that *õpwj mh* was a purpose structure, though in this case the negative was generally rendered somehow. The last clause was often not tied into the syntax (‘... and they collected money from there’).

The standard of English translation was, on the whole, better than in some past years, and even candidates who struggled with the Greek tried nevertheless to write decent English. There were fewer wholly correct versions this year, however.

- 1(b) Almost always well done.
- 1(c) Almost always very badly done. *óudenòj ãttwn* should have been an obvious point, but was often ruined by attempts to take *óudenój* as nominative. Attempts at the rest of the question often foundered because candidates did not work out what the Greek meant.
- 1(d) Generally at least half right: *éqársune* was sometimes taken as if intransitive.
- 1(e) Again mostly good, sometimes with *pánta* as if *pántej* (‘they all voted...’).
- 1(f) (i) Nearly everyone knew it was a participle, but many said ‘aorist’.
- 1(f) (ii) There were some convoluted explanations: ‘purpose’ was quite sufficient.
- 1 (g) (i) Usually right; sometimes *pleuw*.
- 1 (g) (ii) Also usually right; *áiréw* was accepted as well as *áiréomai*.

#### Question 2: Prose Composition

- 2(i) ‘Having gone out’ was a welcome re-shaping, and such subordination gained a style mark, here and elsewhere, as in this section did *éspiptw* and *fréar ti*. *Pote* was sometimes put at the beginning of the sentence, but not penalised as a result. ‘Sky’ caused surprising problems, and produced periphrases such as ‘the home of the gods’, ‘the things above’, etc. The oblique cases of the glossed *fréar* caused trouble. Here as elsewhere more attention needed to be given to articles: ‘the philosopher’ is not ‘a philosopher’, and ‘a well is not ‘the well’.

- 2(ii) Again, 'being unable' gained a style mark. The syntax of *foβéomai* was well done, and it is encouraging that many candidates had no fear of subjunctives and optatives. 'Loudly' caused some thought: *megáλη φωνή* was one good idea.
- 2 (iii) 'A female slave' was a good opportunity for *tij*. 'Having heard' was effective subordination again, though some forgot the slave's gender, here and later (and were only penalised once, of course). There were good participial uses for 'what was happening', though *tà genόμενα* wasn't quite right, and those who used an indirect question usually did it well too.
- 2 (iv) 'Having found ... she asked' was the commonest structural alteration.
- 2 (v) There were thoughtful versions of 'He told her, and ...', such as *ἀποκρινάμενω ... εἶπεν ...*, and most negotiated their way well through the indirect statement and *καίπερ*, even to the extent of carefully positioning the latter. There was a strong tendency this year to use *αὐτόν/αὐτή* in the nominative for 'he/she', perhaps because of the presence of a female protagonist in the story.
- 2 (vi) There were also excellent versions of 'you are a mortal ... on the earth', with good use of participles, or a *μέν* to anticipate *δέ* in the next section. 'Mortal' caused unnecessary problems: *ἀνθρώποις* was quite sufficient. 'The things' produced a large number of *ταῦτα*.
- 2 (vii) Very well done by almost everyone.
- 2 (viii) Similarly: but 'ran away' seemed to give pause for thought (there was a tendency to mix up *apo-* and *ek-* compounds); *γέλῳ* was well used.

The composition option becomes more popular every year, and rightly so for those candidates with the time to practise it. Overall there were very many excellent versions, a number gaining full marks. Vocabulary was rarely a problem, and accident and syntax encouragingly good. The majority gained most, if not all, of the seven style marks, and very few breathings were omitted.

## Section B: Prescribed Literature

### Herodotus

#### Questions 3A and 3B

There was much good material in 3A on Themistocles' riposte to Adeimantos (including sometimes considerable detail on its structure *vis-à-vis* Adeimantos' jibe), and on his qualities of diplomacy in speaking *tóte ... ἠπίω* and with care in the presence of the allies. There was some confusion here as to the meaning of *kósmos*, however, which some thought was about orderly conduct (in a military sense). Most picked out the significance of the direct speech *ἐν σοὶ νῦν ...* but a surprising number spoilt this by saying that Themistocles is putting the onus on the generals (plural), which is exactly what he is not doing; some said the same about the second person singular verbs later in the passage. Not everyone seemed to know what the last sentence meant (whose fleet and land army?), or explained it badly if they did.

In 3B, Xerxes' famous *bon mot* received less attention than it might have done if it had come earlier in the passage: it is not essential to cover every word of a passage, but there will be salient details in any piece which will demand comment. In both these passages those who attended to the narrative flow of the Greek, rather than looking for (for example) instances of some particular rhetorical device, did much better. The best way is probably to follow the narrative closely, taking care about its precise meaning (some rely over much on translation, which can be problematic when they need to refer to a specific word or phrase), noting major features such as the use of direct speech or Herodotus' distancing devices (*λέγεται* and such: most could have said more about this), and then looking out for especially significant words or phrases, or figures of speech, that point up particular features.

Plato

Questions 4A and 4B

The *Protagoras* proved a more popular option than Plato has sometimes been in the past, and was generally well done. Plato's language, in the mouth of Protagoras, is generally not hard to follow, and the devices he uses so obvious that candidates often seemed to find it easier to write about than their fellows who offered Herodotus. Most wrote with evident enjoyment about Protagoras' *mũqoj* in passage 4A, and were good at picking up and following through the verbal reminiscences which inform the narrative. Occasional sections got less than their desserts: the *neĩmw* section, for example (almost all who wrote about it referred to the verb *neĩmw*, incidentally), and the uncompromising pronouncement of Zeus. But most accounts were sensible, and some highly sensitive.

4B required some account of the (not terribly complex) argument, and most were happy with this, though a few thought the passage was 'about' punishment and how to do it. Some drifted off into material only peripherally relevant: it does not seem, for example, to be especially significant that (as many said) Protagoras addresses Socrates as *ŵ Sŵkratej* from time to time. But again, there were very many excellent accounts which followed through the arguments and the way Plato's language reinforces them in great detail and with considerable subtlety.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2014

