

GCE

Classics: Classical Greek

Advanced GCE **H440**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H040**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H440)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Classical Greek (H040)

EXAMINER'S REPORT

Content	Page
F371 Classical Greek Language	4
F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature	7
F373 Classical Greek Verse	10
F374 Classical Greek Prose	13

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. Candidates achieved very high raw scores with a very small minority scoring lower. Q1 was well handled, 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 2, 8 and 12. Despite some early misunderstandings in section 2, candidates recovered well, and the overall response was not adversely affected. Section 4 and 5 of Q2 featuring relative pronouns proved a challenge for many candidates. The steadily increasing number of candidates attempting Q3 scored at least comparative marks to those who attempted Q2. Centres should advise candidates not to attempt both options in Section B, as the few candidates who did this evidently rushed what could have been a thoughtful response and made avoidable errors. Once again, candidates are advised to avoid offering alternative translation versions in brackets, as the guidelines for marking specifically state that bracketed alternatives will be ignored. Finally, candidates who omitted words suffered; it is much better to take a calculated guess at the meaning of a word rather than leave a blank in an unseen, even if it makes for a clumsy translation.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1

Section 1: This was competently handled with the majority of the responses gaining full marks. 'Capturing' was not permitted for λαβῶν in this context since the men were on Phillidas' side, so candidates are advised to choose the most suitable meaning in the context and allow enough time to go over and check their answers.

Section 2: This section offered a good opportunity for differentiation, as it caused some problems initially with the meaning of κόψας. The translation 'having cut down' was not allowed, since it is unlikely that Philidas and his men used axes or saws. Hence candidates are advised to select the most appropriate meaning of words in their context. The indirect statement with the optative was often confused with one with the infinitive, although the mistaken indirect question 'what he wanted' was treated as a consequential error in such cases. Candidates are reminded not to translate the optative in historic sequence as 'might'. The meaning of the preposition παρὰ was also often mistaken.

Section 3: This section was well rendered although some doubt was caused by ἐτύγγανε which some candidates translated as 'met'. Candidates are advised to include every single word as sometimes ἔτι or μόνος were omitted. μόνος was further mistranslated as an adverb. The preposition μετὰ was also often mistaken for 'with'. The word παρεκάθητο was not in the DVL and was therefore ignored along with its neighbouring word ἐργαζομένη.

Section 4: This section was well rendered with the exception of the small number of candidates who rendered οἱ as singular. Some candidates assumed the subject of ἐκέλευσε was feminine, which was allowed given that the last subject mentioned in section 3 was γυνή, despite the further clue of the masculine νομίζω. The infinitive εἰσιέναι was well handled with the exception of some responses that mixed εἰσ- with ἐξ-.

Section 5: This section was almost always successfully rendered with the exception of a small but significant minority who disregarded the plural number of the verbs. This did not have too adverse an effect, as more than one error of the same nature was treated as repeated, but given

that there were four clues in the section, candidates are advised to be more careful about the basic verb endings.

Section 6: This section was well rendered. The only problems were caused by the middle form of εὐρήσονται, which was occasionally translated as passive, which would be impossible in the future tense. The conditional was also sometimes made more complicated than it was, with some candidates translating it as a 'remote' type.

Section 7: This section was usually faultless. ἐπέπρακτο was accepted as an active following the subject 'he' or 'Phillidas', so hardly any candidates lost marks in this section. The DVL derivative δεσμωτήριον was universally accurately translated.

Section 8: The indirect statement in this section caused some difficulties for candidates who took δεῖ as governed by ὅτι. Candidates are advised to take note of word order, as this mistake could have been avoided by noting the optative ἄγοι. Once again, candidates are advised not to translate the optative in historic sequence as 'might'. The preposition παρὰ was more consistently translated than in section 2, although when the same mistake was made, the repeated error was not penalised.

Section 9: This section was well-handled. The only consistent error which did not cause loss of marks if it was the only error in the section was an uncertain knowledge of ὡς which some candidates failed to recognise as a conjunction. A minority of candidates also mistranslated the verbs in this section in the singular.

Section 10: This section was handled very well by the majority of candidates with the exception of a significant minority who translated τούτους as a subject. Candidates are advised to note basic case endings carefully.

Section 11: This section was well-handled. Pleasingly, the idiomatic phrase ἐκ τούτου was accurately rendered in a temporal or causal sense, with only occasional responses of the very literal 'from this'.

Section 12: Several candidates rendered the genitive absolute ὡς τῶν τυράννων τεθνεώτων accurately, which offered a useful opportunity for differentiation. This proved the most problematic section, as there was general uncertainty about the form of τεθνεώτων and the absolute construction.

Section 13: This section was competently handled with the exception of some mistranslations of ἕως as until.

Section 14: This section was competently handled. The only challenge was the easily confused word ἐβοήθουν which was occasionally mistranslated as 'shouted.'

Question No.2

Section 1: Candidates mostly scored full marks in this section. There was universal ignorance of ὄσοι, which was often translated as 'many' or 'so many'. Conversely, γνόντες was well known. Some ignored the genitive partitive of the prepositional phrase with the definite article.

Section 2: This section proved challenging for those who disregarded the contrasting οἱ μὲν... οἱ δὲ and treated the contrasting groups of people as the same group. There was also significant ignorance of εἰδότες as a form of oida and γοῦν was sometimes translated as 'voûz.'

Section 3: This was a long section with four verbal forms offering plenty of opportunity for differentiation. ὅτι was sometimes mistranslated as 'because'. The aorist tense of ἐψηφίσαντο

was sometimes ignored, while οὐδέν was taken as masculine or an adverb. βουλευόμενοι was sometimes confused with βουλόμενοι and the gender of προσταχθέντα was sometimes ignored.

Section 4: This section together with the next proved the most challenging in Q2, as several candidates failed to see that χειροτονῆσαι depended on παρήγγελο – both of which were glossed. αὐτοῖς was usually translated in the wrong case or omitted. The greatest challenge was the relative clause introduced by οὗς which was either mistranslated or omitted. As last year, the advice to candidates regarding relative clauses is to stick to the word order of the Greek, as this will usually result in a more correct translation. The irregular εἶλετο also caused some problems. Candidates are once again guided to learn principal parts of common words in the DVL.

Section 5: This section proved challenging for several candidates, particularly if they omitted the relative clause in section 5. The word καθεστηκότες was frequently translated as an infinitive rather than a perfect participle, although most knew the meaning of the stem. The phrase ἐκ τῶν παρόντων was well-translated with a few exceptions where it was confused with a form of παρέχω. Finally, there was confusion of ὑμετέραν (translated as ‘our’) and only the most discerning candidates recognised ἑώρων as the imperfect of the contracted verb, with frequent mistranslations as a present participle or a genitive plural.

Section 6: The result clause in this section was well-translated by the majority of the candidates. The most challenging elements here were the two verbs: ἠπίσταντο was taken for a form of ‘I trust’ and ἤδεσαν for a form of ‘I respect’. The rough breathing of αὐτῶν was sometimes ignored and πραχθήσασθαι was sometimes rendered in the past. πρότερον was sometimes translated as ‘at first.’

Question No.3

Section a: This sentence was well-translated, with several candidates successfully choosing an absolute construction.

Section b: This was a very successful sentence, although pitfalls included mixed indirect statements with ὅτι and the infinitive.

Section c: The result clause was well handled by all candidates. Common errors included a third declension ending to ‘citizens’.

Section d: The conditional was also handled very successfully. Some common errors were the accusative after ‘attack’ and a masculine ending for ‘walls’.

Section e: The purpose clause was well-answered. A few candidates did not know the nominative of ‘Zeus’ or the accusative of ‘great’. There were many pleasing variations from the future participle to subjunctive and optative forms in the subordinate clause.

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General Comments:

The standard of the candidates remains high. The paper is demanding in terms of time and candidates do very well to complete the paper. There was some evidence of candidates being short of time by the final question but most manage to complete and write extensively on the essay questions. On the 'context' type questions (1 (c) and (f); 2 (c) and (f)) there was a tendency to quote less Greek than was ideal, sometimes not to translate it, and to use omission marks (...) rather than give the complete quotation. This can lead to loss of marks as the examiner wishes to see the key words and an understanding of them as a basis for each part of the answer. The essay questions often appeared like a list of points strung together-very often full and accurate. Few essays showed development of individual issues or real insight into aspects of the text.

Comments on Individual Questions: Lysias

Question No 1

(a) and (b) Few problems here. All answered well.

(c) There were several opportunities to choose appropriate Greek and comment on it. As a rule it is always better to include more Greek to ensure the point is fully illustrated. It should also be translated. There is a danger in leaving gaps in quotations (...) that key words which the examiner wishes to see are omitted and credit may not be given. The point about μεθυσοντες was commonly used but it was necessary to link this with potential violence to receive full credit. Adding έκπηδωσιν ἐφ ἡμας to the point made it more secure. The point about Simon's friends not wishing to 'join in his wrongdoing' was well made by many and some linked this as a contrast to Simon and his other named friends. The list of names was successfully used as most candidates made the point about 'polysyndeton' and linked in the fact that Theodotus and the speaker were outnumbered. Many candidates used αἰσχυρομενους without adding the point about 'meeting other people' which was necessary to make the answer complete. The actions of Theodotus and the speaker were often used successfully as long as the quotation was accompanied by a statement of their reason for their action-Theodotus fleeing through fear of the attack from Simon and the speaker withdrawing to avoid confrontation with him.

(d) The standard of the translation was high but there were some recurring errors: (i) οὕτω σφοδρα should be treated as one sense group. (ii) κἀνταυθα μὲν ἵνα was often translated as 'then when' rather than 'there where'. Some candidates added an extra 'nor anyone' (iii) the set text has ὡς ἔγω but the mark scheme has ὧν ἔγω. Credit was given for both translations. It was felt that 'those who were present' and 'as witnesses' were necessary for full credit.

(e) Several candidates thought that what was required here was a statement of what the witnesses said, not seeing that the passage continued after the witnesses. It may be that the capitals used for ΜΑΡΤΥΡΕΣ caused this misunderstanding.

(f) Quite often there were not enough Greek words used to make the points fully. Attempts to link τα δίκαια and ἀδίκως needed supporting vocabulary to make the point successfully. The 'dangers' and 'services' needed both elements plus comment to get full credit. Answers on the sentence about being 'responsible for no wrong' were often short of detail often missing out reference to αὐτή – for the state- and often reference to 'ancestors' was not linked into this sentence. Several candidates thought ἀγαθων δε πολλων described ancestors which may be attributed to the use of an incorrect translation which was available on the internet. ἐλεθεινην was often used on its own without reference to 'you and others' and without connecting it to the

following clauses ‘not only if...’ and ‘but also that...’ Not many candidates made use of the significance of τοιούτων – τοιούτους to make the point that the speaker was indignant at having been compelled to face a trial at all.

(g) The essay question was generally well-answered and the vast majority of candidates clearly knew the set extract well. Most could bring out a marked difference between the two protagonists and illustrate it accurately. Some answers tended to concentrate on general themes rather than on details from the text. Good answers made the point about the four-year delay in Simon bringing the case. Almost all the answers highlighted the differing treatment of Theodotus and the contrast between the public services of the speaker and the unruly behaviour of Simon when on active service. The various misdemeanours of Simon were generally well documented. It was felt that, possibly because of the lack of time, a lot of answers looked very much like prepared lists, not always delivered in a logical order. These sorts of answers could score high marks but the top two marks needed to add an extra dimension to the answer, either in terms of a fuller development of one or more points or by looking at aspects of the case, were perhaps not immediately obvious. Very few candidates mentioned the charge that was being brought against the speaker and only a few mentioned the scene outside Lampon’s house where the alleged assault on Simon took place. Candidates might have looked at the speaker’s version of this and treated it with some scepticism. Or they could have gone into the speaker’s detailed list of reasons why it was very unlikely that he would have done the things he was accused of (especially chapters 29, 33 and 34)-very little of this was seen in the answers. Few, if any, candidates made the point that, as this was a speech for the defence, there was presumably a case for the prosecution, which would presumably have made Simon’s case stronger and attacked the case of Lysias’ client. Sophistication is not always easy when time is so short but it was felt that very high marks should be assigned to those answers that attempted a more sophisticated approach.

Question No. 2 Homer

(a) Some answers did not mention that Hector had thrown his spear and it had hit Achilles’ shield but most were accurate and full.

(b) Very well-answered generally but some candidates missed out the point about the gods calling him to his death.

(c) As in the other questions of this type, there was a tendency to leave out key Greek words either in the need to be brief or because they were included in omission marks (...). Several candidates were talking about death and not using the word θάνατος. The good answers took in all the elements from νυν δε το ουδ’ αληη. There was some confusion over the word φιληρον which does not mean that Zeus and Apollo were more well disposed towards Hector and it meant that παλαι was often mistranslated. Quite often the point about Hector wishing to die nobly was understated as μη απολοιην was often omitted and sometimes mistranslated. Good answers here combined all the elements of the last two lines (9 and 10)

(d) Mostly answered well. The simile of the eagle was generally well illustrated. There were a lot of answers that tried to equate the eagle’s victims, lamb or hare, with Achilles. This precise definition is always rather dangerous with epic similes. The other two marks came in various ways but several answers concentrated on Hector’s sword, which could be illustrated very strongly from the numerous references to it in these lines. It was felt that the ‘eagle descending through black clouds’ symbolising death was a sound idea but not, on its own, worth two marks.

(e) The translation was answered well. Common errors: (i) ωρμηθη was not always translated very well although lots of leeway was allowed. (ii) the adjectives accompanying the shield and helmet ‘beautiful’ and ‘shining’ were sometimes omitted especially as a translation of δαιδαλον could be ‘beautifully-wrought’. Lots of variations for ‘four-crested’ were allowed. ‘Four-horned’ was a popular choice. (iii) Many variations on the translation of περισσειοντο were accepted ,

although it was disappointing that many translations didn't show that it was a passive verb. A lot of candidates translated $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\iota$ as 'crest', which will not work as 'crest' is required for $\lambda\omicron\phi\omicron\nu$ in the next line. A common translation of $\theta\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ was 'close-set', which it was decided not to accept.

(f) There were some excellent answers on the Andromache question but also some missed opportunities. It is not out of place in these answers to state the obvious. Very often it needed to be said that she did not know that Hector was dead/was outside the walls/was not going to return/was 'far from baths', rather than suppose the examiner knows it without being told. Many answers lacked the extra dimension, which would have been provided by making the obvious point. Andromache's pursuit of her everyday tasks needed to be contrasted to what was happening to Hector, which she did not yet know about. Once again giving rather more than the bare minimum of Greek works very well. Very few answers linked Andromache's instructions to her maids to warm water for Hector's bath when he returned from battle to (1) he wasn't going to return as he had been killed by Achilles and Athene; and (2) he was 'far from baths'. In the last two lines it was possible to achieve two different points and some candidates did this excellently; but to talk about the noise of grieving without mentioning $\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$ was not wise. In fact the point about her physical reactions was not really complete unless the fact that she had heard the wailing was included.

(g) The Homer essays were generally better organised than the Lysias ones, possibly because there is a chronological sequence to follow. However, the same comments apply. It was felt that the very top marks should go to those essays that achieved more than the feeling of a prepared list even though essays of this kind could score very highly and some gave so much detail that it was impossible to deny them the top marks. Several essays devoted quite a lot of space to talking about epithets and similes, which can be relevant but need to be taken in context not just used for the sake of saying something 'Homeric'. Most essays were very strong on the reactions of Hector's family and people. In fact some gave so much detail in these areas that it was almost unnecessary to include much more. Fewer essays really did justice to the conversations of Hector and Achilles, which take up a lot of the early part of the set extract. A development in these areas tended to make essays stand out. More attention was given to Hector than Achilles which is understandable but good answers gave a more balanced view and added the extra dimension to the ruthlessness and savagery of Achilles by including his feelings for Patroclus. Developments in this area tended to make essays stand out.

There was some evidence that time was short for some candidates and the essays are generally remarkable for what they can achieve in such a short time.

F373 Classical Greek Verse

General Comments:

Candidates should again be congratulated on the strength of their performance on this paper. Examiners noted that the points they had 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 had obviously been read, considered and acted upon by the vast majority of the candidates, who came over as academically strong and as having 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 determination as to provide an element of discrimination. For less successful candidates, it was usually the case that performances in both sections were weaker.

In the section that follows, references will of course be made to things that candidates did less well. Any such criticisms should be seen against a background of general admiration on the part of the examiners for candidates who have, with no little success, undertaken to translate and perform stylistic 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 confused $\delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$ with *doceo* in Latin, or translated it as though it were first person singular.
- 1(a)(ii) Examiners exercised a degree of discretion with $\xi\nu\nu\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$, provided that the translation accurately conveyed the tone in which the word was used.
- 1(a)(iii) There were some confusions between $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\omega$. $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ was sometimes ignored and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ translated as a straight dative.
- 1(a)(iv) This was generally handled well, though occasionally the tense of $\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma'$ was wrong and $\delta\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}$ was confused with $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\omicron\nu$. At times $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ was omitted. Candidates were also confused by $\gamma\grave{\eta}$, thinking that Paris ($\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$) had fallen 'onto the land'.
- 1(a)(v) A surprising number of candidates did not use the proper name glosses on the paper and decided that Menelaus had come for someone called 'Lacaina'. A mark was often lost on $\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega\nu$ because of failure to convey accurately its tense or sense of purpose.
- 1(a)(vi) This was probably the most difficult section, but it was translated accurately by a large number of candidates.
- 1(a)(vii) Candidates generally handled well the adjective $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$, but some made $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\theta\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ active rather than passive, and again a surprising number ignored the gloss and translated Τρωάδων as just 'Trojans' rather than 'Trojan women'.
- 1(a) Fluency. The majority of candidates made a solid attempt to improve upon 'translationese' and received 2 marks.

- 1(b) Few candidates had a problem here, although many created extra work for themselves by translating or paraphrasing οἴπερ γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐξεμόχθησαν δορί ... ἐμοί νιν ἔδοσαν, which was not necessary to answer the question (so erroneous versions of it were ignored by the Examiners).
- 1(c)(i) A mark was sometimes lost here because of a failure to take δοῦναι into account, 'to hand/give her over to (be) kill(ed)'. More unnecessary work was created by a failure to observe the lemma: translation/paraphrase of ἐμοί δ' ἔδοξε τὸν μὲν ἐν Τροίᾳ μόνον Ἑλένης ἔᾶσαι was unnecessary. (Some candidates did not quite grasp the poetic sense of ναυπύρω δ' ἄγειν πλάτη, believing that Menelaus literally planned to pull Helen to Greece with an oar.)
- 1(c)(ii) Very few candidates scored full marks on this question: they tended to ignore the attracted relative ὅσοις which gives the sense that Helen's death would be compensation for those whose loved ones died at Troy, and a significant number also confused ποινὰς with πόνος.
- 1(d) Few candidates failed to achieve the maximum 4 on the scansion question..
- 1(e) Most candidates mentioned the imperatives in lines 17 and 18, although the word εἶα was usually inaccurately classified as an imperative, too (much in the same way as the Latin ecce often is). Many candidates said something intelligent about the superlative in line 18, even if they did not translate it with full accuracy, and most made a useful point about Menelaus' eagerness to set out as soon as favourable winds came. There were also some references to the harsh brevity of Menelaus' words πέμψομέν νιν Ἑλλάδα and his use of the future indicative.
- 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. Candidates are now a lot better 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, though 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. This occasionally left the examiners in some doubt as to just how well the text was actually known by the candidate – particularly if the features cited were rather obvious ones, such as 'the word is emphatic because it is at the beginning of the line'.

On the other hand, while it has been commented in previous reports that candidates who do not follow a passage through from beginning to end but try to pick out themes or gather together examples of stylistic features are not always as successful as the other candidates in communicating an overall appreciation of the passage, the examiners felt that this year the candidates who *had* adopted that approach were a lot better at it than usual. Nearly all candidates writing on Sophocles, for example, analysed intelligently the parts of the speech where the Priest was trying to flatter Oedipus, to evoke his pity, to use his past services to Thebes as an encouragement or as emotional blackmail, and so on.

Candidates had clearly done their homework: there were very few mistranslations or misunderstandings of the texts. The most common one was taking σκληρᾶς in line 6 of the Sophocles as agreeing with δασμὸν rather than αἰδοῦ.

Technical terms were, as in previous years, often applied loosely: *caesura*, *tricolon* and *hyperbaton* were bandied about particularly indiscriminately this year. Another much-loved phrase was ‘the *promotion* of X for emphasis’, where X was a word at the beginning or end of a sentence or line; such points were not always very convincing.

2/3(b) *Essay on Sophocles/Aristophanes.* Most candidates managed to turn in well-rounded essays; the quantity and quality of appropriate direct textual reference was the main distinguishing factor, though a few distinguished themselves further by an impressive depth of analysis and articulacy. A few candidates lost marks for AO1 by ignoring, or at least giving short shrift to, the stimulus passage printed in the paper. Surprisingly, there were some candidates who did not seem to realise that Socrates was not himself a Sophist.

F374 Classical Greek Prose

General Comments:

The standard of performance on this paper, as has come to be expected, was generally extremely high, with evidence of very hard work having been put in by candidates and their teachers, particularly to study of the set texts. The highest-achieving candidates treated these in a level of detail impressive for such a relatively short exam, and even those who did not attain the highest marks showed genuine engagement with and enjoyment of their reading. The language section, whether prose composition or unseen and comprehension was chosen, was mostly treated systematically, although some candidates were let down here by a lack of knowledge of basic grammar, such as the cases of αὐτοῖ or ἐκείνων. Candidates should be reminded to look carefully at the glossed words and to use them! The standard of prose composition was generally good, with some stylish versions. Candidates should be reminded that although style is important, there is no need to strive for over-complicated methods of expressing the English. A few candidates were badly muddled over grammar or syntax, but these were in the minority and examiners continue to be impressed and delighted that candidates choose this option and that centres teach it.

A note on legibility: now that scripts are marked online, it is even more important to encourage candidates to write neatly and legibly. It improves legibility if candidates do not complete their prose composition in pencil first and then ink over it.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1a) Very few candidates scored highly on this question: the word τειχομαχεῖν caused difficulties: perhaps the excitement of this being the first question prevented candidates thinking clearly about the two halves of the word (wall+fight), which should have made it easy to interpret. πολιορκίας μακρᾶς καθεστηκυίας also caused difficulty, with few candidates recognising the number and case of the words.

1b) This question was more successfully treated than 1a, although not everyone noticed the clause of fearing, or recognised the significance of the τι.

1c) Not all candidates recognised the cases of the words μόνους τῶν ξυμμάχων, which led to mistranslations such as ‘the allies alone’, and many did not realise that this referred to the Athenians.

1d)i) Most candidates recognised this as a genitive absolute, or translated it correctly. Many cannot spell genitive, however.

1d)ii) A good number of candidates identified this correctly, but a significant minority misidentified it as either a dative participle or dative noun.

1e)i) There was a wide variety of answers here, with a significant minority misidentifying it as aorist.

1e)ii) Most candidates correctly identified this as present.

1f)i) We allowed ἐπικαλέω here. It is perhaps worth pointing out that candidates only need give the exact information asked for by the question – they do not need to use precious time giving longer answers which will get no more marks than the single word required.

1f)ii) Most candidates correctly identified this.

1g)i) Problems with this section included not knowing the meaning of ἀξιώσαντες and not appreciating the force of εὐθύς ἐπειδῆ.

1g)ii) The first half of this sentence proved tricky for many, a chief difficulty being the failure to notice that τὴν γενομένην agrees with ξυμμαχίαν, leading to attempts to translate it as a separate noun such as ‘what had happened’ or ‘the event’. There was also uncertainty as to who ἐκείνων referred to.

1g)iii) δεκάτῳ ἔτει caused some difficulties, either of vocabulary or identification of which type of time expression is being used. The best candidates translated ξυνέβησαν as ‘came to an agreement with’ or similar, and we were pleased to see that.

1g)iv) A number of candidates translated ἐπιβήσονται αὐτῆς as ‘attack them’ or similar, reinforcing the importance of concentrating on learning basic grammatical material, such as declensions.

1g)v) Some candidates did not take enough notice of the separate groups suggested by αὐτοὶ καὶ παῖδες καὶ γυναῖκες, particularly the first καὶ. That αὐτοὺς is the object of both δεξιόμενοι and κατώκισαν, and that κατώκισαν is a transitive verb, were not always appreciated either.

1g)vi) A few candidates did not realise that Μεγαρεῖς is nominative.

1g)vii) Many candidates did not translate the definite article, or realise that τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη is plural. Few appreciated the significance of the repeated article.

2i) A surprising number of candidates struggled to express ‘at that time’ neatly and correctly.

2ii) Some did not fully convey ‘some OF his generals’. It was regarded as a good style point to turn ‘to advance’ into a participle.

2iii) Not enough candidates remembered that the best way of expressing ‘a’ in Greek is to use τις.

2iv) The conditional was generally translated well here, although some candidates made things harder for themselves than was necessary by treating it as an unfulfilled rather than an open conditional.

2v) Style marks were awarded for those candidates who stressed the ‘dare’ by placing it at the end of the sentence.

2vi) There were a number of impressively inventive ways of expressing the idea ‘who knew the character of Alexander’.

2vii) Style marks were awarded to those candidates who promoted ‘this’ to the beginning of the direct speech.

2viii) There were a number of acceptable ways of expressing this idea, but few candidates appreciated the necessity to include the ‘and’ as well as the ‘indeed’ in the last part of the sentence.

3a) Candidates clearly enjoyed the tension and insult-trading that happens in this passage. There were very few problems and generally differentiation was merely a question of how much detail the candidate had time to go into. A few candidates did not quote specifically enough from the Greek, either quoting too much at a time/relying on ellipsis or relying on isolated words, but in general quotations were both relevant and specific.

3b) The first half of this passage, dealing with the Persian messenger system, was generally covered better than the scenes in Sousa that come in the second part. Here candidates did not always deal adequately with the detailed contrast between the two scenes.

Throughout the literature section, there was a tendency at times for candidates to comment on stylistic features without necessarily making it clear how they contribute to the passage and many candidates did not know the difference between alliteration and assonance. Candidates should also be encouraged to have the confidence not to write, for example, 'thus the passage is made lively' at the end of each paragraph, but to let their points speak for themselves.

4a) Candidates enjoyed talking about the mythos and the characterisation of Epimetheus. The balanced phraseology of the section dealing with the distribution of attributes was not always treated in sufficient detail, and candidates tended to tail off towards the end of the passage, but in general this question was answered well.

4b) Most candidates summarised the argument well although not all made it sufficiently clear that Protagoras is talking about the Athenians specifically at the start of the passage. There was some evidence of reliance on the translation rather than the Greek (eg διδακτόν translated as 'teaching' and δῆλον translated as 'clearly') but many candidates wrote an impressively detailed and systematic analysis of the passage.

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

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 2015

