

GCE

Classics: Classical Greek

Advanced GCE **H440**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H040**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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 2016

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 10 and 11. Question 2 (Lysias) proved a fairly accessible piece of rhetoric, with the majority of the candidates scoring full or nearly full marks. The pronouns in the second unseen proved a challenge for many candidates and centres should remind candidates of the importance of accuracy in gender. The steadily increasing number of candidates attempting Q3 scored at least comparative marks to those who attempted Q2. There continues to be a steady proportion of candidates who attempt all three questions. 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. Equally, alternative variants cannot be taken into account.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1

Section 1: This section was well handled. Most candidates dealt well with genitive absolute. The most common recurring problem was translating the optative in the indirect statement as 'would reveal'. Another common error was confusing 'prophet' with 'oracle'.

Section 2: This section was well handled. Most common errors were taking ἔτι with 'said' or 'appeared' instead of the correct 'more terrible'.

Section 3: This section was well handled. The only recurring problem was the use of τις, which was often mistaken to agree with the object.

Section 4: This section was well handled with the exception of the future tense of γενήσεται which was often translated in the past. A minority of candidates confused it with a form of 'knowing'. The genitive absolute was well handled, except for the occasional mistranslation of ἐρομένων as a future form of 'speaking'.

Section 5: This section was almost universally correctly translated. Once again, the optative κελεύοι was occasionally translated as 'would order' instead of a plain past within indirect speech.

Section 6: This section was well handled. The only error was general ignorance of the numeral τεσσαράκοντα. ὥς was glossed, and the examiners expected it to be translated as glossed.

Section 7: This section was usually faultless.

Section 8: The comparative in this section was well rendered, with only a minority of candidates opting for forms of 'sailing' to translate πλέον. The most frequent error here was mistranslation of the imperative νόμιζέ, which was rendered as 'I', 'you' or 'he' in the indicative. Candidates are directed to revise the imperative and take note of personal endings.

Section 9: This section was overwhelmingly completely correct.

Section 10: This section in conjunction with the next section proved one of the most challenging. Some candidates thought ὅτι was introducing an indirect statement, while a significant majority did not know the meaning of ἤδεσαν and confused it with forms of 'being pleased.' τοῦ Κινάδωνος was frequently translated as part of the next section following οἱ συμπράσσοντες and ἐβούλοντο was often mistaken for 'planned'. Some candidates did not recognise the aorist infinitive ending in ἀκοῦσαι.

Section 11: This section was often mistranslated in conjunction with the previous section. οἵτινες was often mistaken for 'some men' or 'whoever' and εἶεν was often completely omitted or merged with οἱ συμπράσσοντες ('who were acting with...'). In such cases, the definite article οἱ was also omitted. Candidates are reminded to revise the use of the definite article with the participle. πρὶν was sometimes translated in the wrong order, or mistranslated as 'until' or 'beforehand'. αὐτούς was sometimes rendered as object. The meaning of αἰσθέσθαι was often not known and μεμῆγνυται was translated in the wrong voice, tense or person, despite being glossed. Candidates are reminded to observe voice, tense and personal endings when translating verbs.

Section 12: The purpose clause in this section was generally well handled, as were the passive verbs.

Section 13: This section contained one overwhelmingly common error, however this did not cause candidates to lose marks if it was the only error in the section: τί βούλοιτο ταῦτα πράσσω was more often than not translated as 'why he wanted to do these things'.

Section 14: The comparative in this section proved a challenge for the majority of the candidates who failed to recognise μηδενός as a genitive of comparison.

Question No.2

Section 1: Candidates mostly scored full marks in this section. Problems included translating ἐμήν as '[and] me'.

Section 2: This section proved challenging for those who did not know the meaning of πυθομένη, confusing it with forms of 'persuading' or 'obeying' and for those who introduced an indirect statement after πυθομένη. ὡς αὐτῷ ἐδόκει was generally well translated, with a small minority mistaking it for a form of 'giving'.

Section 3: This section offered some opportunity for differentiation as a large number of candidates translated τῷ ἀδελφῷ as 'sister' and τῷ ἑαυτοῦ as 'my'. αἴτιος was usually well known, but sometimes mistaken for 'worthy'.

Section 4: This section was well handled by those who knew the meaning of τιμωρεῖν. Due to general confusion about the use of 'avenge' in English, centres are guided to advise candidates to learn the much more straightforward meaning 'punish'. Versions such as 'avenge Agoratus' or 'avenge on Agoratus' were marked as wrong, as they convey the wrong meaning in English.

Section 5: This section was pleasingly well handled. Most common misunderstandings included variations of 'what happened', 'events' and 'happenings' to translate τῷ γενομένῳ. Most candidates however realised that this referred to the child.

Section 6: This section caused few problems. Repeated misunderstandings of $\tau\mu\omega\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ were not penalised.

Question No.3

Section a: The indirect statement was well handled. Common errors included the wrong aorist of 'sailed' and some third declension endings on 'sailors'.

Section b: The purpose clause was well handled. Common errors were misspellings of the passive 'was sent'.

Section c: The impersonal verb was well handled. Common errors were neglecting to use the dative after 'obey' and misspellings of 'just'.

Section d: The closed past conditional was universally successfully handled.

Section e: The relative clause was well handled. Some errors included ignorance of the relative pronoun and ignorance of the vocabulary for 'money'.

F372 Classical Greek Verse and Prose Literature

General Comments:

Once again, examiners have been impressed by the quality of work produced by candidates on this paper. The vast majority of scripts demonstrated a pleasing grasp of the material studied in class and a confident approach to the format of the exam paper. There were a few whose response to the set texts suggested a lack of preparation for the style of questioning on a paper such as this.

Candidates were generally well-prepared for the translation questions on the set texts this year, though there were some demanding sections. Examiners spent some time discussing the range of acceptable translations to ensure fairness for different approaches adopted in centres. As in previous years, where candidates struggle to translate the set texts, the other questions also prove a considerable challenge. This year a number of candidates also mistook the type of answer required, responding to a content-based question such as Q.1c or Q.2c as if it required a number of points linked directly to quotations from the Greek text. Examiners felt that the wording of the question paper was sufficiently clear to direct students when this approach was expected. The recall questions (Q.1a and Q.2a) proved challenging for some candidates, and there were some unnecessarily long answers that presented a compressed narrative (this was particularly the case for the Lysias question).

Once again the essays proved a problematic area for some candidates, though there were plenty of clear, fluent responses that demonstrated a good understanding of the relevant material. The best answers were clearly a response to the question set and good use was made of the key terms in the question to highlight how the central issues were being addressed. In many cases there was confident selection of relevant examples from the two texts and examiners were impressed by the facility with which many candidates were able to illustrate their response to the question with appropriate material. The passages printed on the paper were perhaps used to a lesser extent in the essays this year, and in general examiners did not feel that the essays set required details of the Greek text (though quotations or paraphrase were regularly used in a very helpful way to support assertions made by candidates).

The majority of candidates responded very effectively to the questions which required them to illustrate their answer with material selected from the Greek text. In the best answers the quotation of Greek was precise and focused, the meaning was conveyed in the analysis and the point was directly related to the question actually set; many of these were presented in such a way as to make the awarding of marks easy and straightforward, with clear paragraphs allocated to each point and, where required, issues of style were dealt with explicitly to ensure that access to the full range of marks was gained. But there were also some less clear attempts to respond to the questions, perhaps especially when there was a less than perfect grasp of the meaning of the set text. Less effective responses often fell back on generalisations about word order ('emphatic positioning') or significant word selection which examiners found difficult to credit in full. As in previous years a weaker grasp of the set text is often demonstrated very clearly in these questions where precise selection from the passage is key; where mistakes are made, it is difficult for examiners to give full credit for what might otherwise be an effective point.

In most cases, student handwriting was sufficiently clear for examiners to award marks with confidence, though there remain a few candidates whose work is very difficult to read. In some cases, the choice of pen also left something to be desired: online marking is not helped by ink that bleeds through the paper and so obscures what the candidate has written. The quality of Greek text presented varied considerably. It is perhaps too much to hope that the breathing can be returned to its rightful place, but it is important that short Greek quotations be presented legibly. The commentary questions where quotations are expected can be answered on the

basis of short, focused quotations, and in some cases, very long quotations (whether legible or not) were a sign of weakness rather than strength.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1a

This question required knowledge of the immediate context of the passage. While many candidates were able to do this effectively, there were also quite a few responses that presented a generalised summary of events leading up to the passage. In some cases, candidates wrote a good deal, but it was difficult to give credit because they failed to include the details from the immediate context.

Question No. 1b

The majority of candidates coped well with the translation question, though examiners decided to place limited emphasis on the opening of the final section (οὐ τοίνυν ταῦτα μὲν εἰκότα, ἄλλως δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν πέπρακται) as this seemed likely to cause considerable difficulty but many candidates produced an acceptable translation. In the middle section, πᾶσιν (line 2) was often omitted. Very few candidates set their translation out on alternate lines, as requested.

Question No. 1c

This question was generally well done, though some candidates attempted to respond to this question as if the Greek text were required.

Question No. 1d

This question proved slightly more challenging than expected. In many cases candidates did not deal in full with all that Simon was claimed to have done, though it was still possible to score full marks without that detail.

Question No. 1e

The majority of candidates picked out the two superlatives (τὸ δὲ μέγιστον καὶ περιφανέστατον πάντων) as a method used by Lysias to draw attention to the weakness of the opponent's case. Most then went on to consider the length of time between injury and redress, sometimes in considerable detail, and there were some good discussions of what other lovers do in similar situations.

Question No. 1f

The extended discussion of the second passage allowed candidates to draw on a wide range of issues, and there were some excellent analyses of the detail of the passage. Not all candidates included explicit analysis of style, which limited the maximum mark to 6; examiners were as generous as they could be in accepting stylistic points presented as part of the answer. The best candidates were able to select detail and then place it in context. In this case many candidates effectively related Simon's behaviour to Greek cultural norms, and explained the significance of the details they used such as εἰς τὴν γυναικωνῆτιν very effectively. The violence of Simon's drunken behavior was much commented on, as was the reaction of οἱ παραγενόμενοι καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες. Some candidates were very sparing in their direct quotation from the Greek.

Question No. 1g

Essays varied considerably. The best responses demonstrated a great command of the set text and made some use of the passages on the paper, often to make salient points about Lysias' style. Weaker answers tended to be vague and make limited use of the set text. Some responses lost sight of the question (about how 'convincing' Lysias' arguments were), though in most cases candidates were able to select and make use of specific examples. There were some good discussions of the value of specific numbers (e.g. 250 drachmas) and many

candidates also underlined the value of the specific details of names and places in making the arguments credible. The altercation between Simon and Laches was often mentioned, together with an assessment of the effectiveness of this type of attack on Simon's character. However many candidates were also able to challenge the presentation by the speaker and highlight the weaker areas of the case put forward. There were some discussions focused on rhetorical terms, though as a rule these too were focused on the question.

Question No. 2a

Although this question was generally well done, there were some rather general answers that did not keep the focus on the immediate context of the passage.

Question No. 2b

There were many excellent responses to this translation question, though there was some uncertainty over the central section (ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ μαλακώτερος), and for some reason many students omitted, in the final section, elements from line 5.

Question No. 2c

The majority of candidates recognised this as a content-based question, and effectively summarised what was said in these lines. There were a number who tried to treat this as if reference to the Greek text had been demanded, and that did weaken some answers.

Question No. 2d

Candidates responded well to this question and there were some excellent discussions of the language of the passage to bring out Achilles' strength of feeling. Most candidates were able to find 'style' points to make, such as the enjambment of Πάτροκλος in line 16 and the emphatic line ending ἄκλαυτος ἄθραπτος. There were some excellent points made about Achilles' relationship with Patroclus, and also the switch of focus to what had been achieved by the killing of Hector at the end of the passage (ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος). There were a few overly long answers to this (and to 2e).

Question No. 2e

This question was generally very well done. Candidates were able to find an excellent range of examples from the passage, and there were some very effective analyses of the details selected. There were some good discussions of the epithets used in this passage, and almost everyone made use of ἔλοιμί κεν, ἦ κεν ἀλοίην to show how Hector was now prepared to accept his fate in the contest with Achilles (many commented also on the chiasmus). Hector's change of heart was much used (lines 3-5), and there were some good analyses of his references to the gods (lines 7-10), though weaker responses could be rather confused at this point.

Question No. 2f

There were some very good responses that covered a wide range of relevant material. There were a number that appeared somewhat rushed and, in some cases, incomplete, and most candidates appeared to have dealt with this question last. The very best answers used the material they selected to show how the fight was made 'dramatic and memorable', and there were some very effective discussions of the similes and the speeches. In some cases, however, the argument became rather disjointed and more list-like, perhaps because of pressure of time, and overall the Lysias essay was perhaps more effectively done. Some responses made very effective use of the reaction of the Trojans to Hector's death, though many candidates kept the focus more closely on the fight itself. Some of the stronger answers also focused on the significance of Patroclus for Achilles and used this to help explain his savagery and determination.

F373 Classical Greek Verse

General Comments:

The vast majority of candidates should once 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 a good number 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 more often the candidate's performance on Section A, Unprepared Translation and Comprehension, which made the final determination of his/her overall grade for the paper. The depth and breadth of grammatical knowledge was often telling: candidates forgot that neuter plurals take singular verbs, and were uncomfortable with contracted futures, second person singulars, and imperatives. On the other hand, characteristic verse vocabulary was surprisingly well known. For the few much less successful candidates, it was usually the case that performances in both Sections were weak.

In what follows, references will mainly 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 undertaken to translate and perform stylistic analysis upon an unseen verse text in a complex foreign language with no little success, as well as to study difficult set texts to a remarkable level of detail.

Comments on Individual Questions:

The reader may find it useful to read these comments in tandem with the relevant question paper and mark scheme.

Question No. 1

1(a)(i) Whereas there were almost no problems with the first part of this sub-section, a number of candidates were uncomfortable with *σώση*, leading to, for example, 'Don't save your tears for him'. The aorist imperative *ἔασον* was occasionally taken as a first person singular or third person plural indicative.

1(a)(ii) Candidates scored highly here, although a few did not know the difference between a master and a mistress, and unfamiliarity with *σέθεν* led to, for example, 'from you'.

1(a)(iii) A number of candidates translated *εὐφρανεῖς* as present indicative, or took *παῖδα* as a second object of *εὐφρανεῖς* rather than of *ἐκθρέψειας* in the next sub-section – an obvious mistake, but one which means that the next sub-section does not work – thereby compromising the mark for (iv) rather than for (iii).

1(a)(iv) See (iii) above. Another common error was to take *ἐκθρέψειας* as an aorist participle. *ὠφέλημα* was translated in a variety of ways, not all of them correct.

1(a)(v) The biggest problem here was not knowing what to do with *ποτε*, but most candidates scored highly on this sub-section.

1(a)(vi) This sub-section looked deceptively simple, but many candidates translated γένοιτο as if it were merely part of the verb ‘to be’ – ‘may exist’ rather than ‘may become’.

1(a)(vii) There was a lot for candidates to do here. A disappointing number did not know the difference between interrogative τίς and indefinite τις. δέδορκα was not always known, being often taken as if it were part of δίδωμι. Some turmoil was caused by καινῶν, as candidates confused it with κείνος, καιρός, κενός (or Ionic κεινός), καίω (as in ‘burning’) or κύων (as in καινῶν ... βουλευμάτων, ‘of those plotting dogs’).

1(a) *Fluency.* The majority of candidates made a solid attempt to improve upon ‘translationese’ and received 2 marks. Those (not many) whose translation did not read as decent English received 1 or 0 marks.

1(b) There was enough to say here for most candidates to make four reasonable points.

1(c) As always, scansion did not pose too many problems for candidates. However, a candidate would occasionally change his/her mind and overwrite a micron with a macron or vice versa, and on a computer screen (which is how scripts are marked these days) it was not always clear which was the candidate’s final intention. A similar, though not common, problem occurred when a candidate wrote his/her macron precisely on a line of the answer booklet in an ink which did not stand out from the line on screen, so that it was not always clear whether s/he had written anything at all. (Benefit of the doubt was exercised in these instances unless there was clear evidence of other omissions, e.g. of micra.)

1(d) Failure to observe the lemma led to many attempts at ὡς πύθη κακὸν μέγα, mainly botched – which is why candidates were not asked about this phrase in the first place. However, their marks were not compromised so long as they rendered κτενοῦσι σὸν παῖδα, ‘they/the Greeks will kill your child’, correctly – as most did. (‘Your child will be killed’ only received 1 mark, unless accompanied by ‘by them’ or ‘by the Greeks’.) It is always worth reminding candidates that studying the lemmata on a question paper carefully will often prevent unnecessary difficulties or mistakes.

1(e) Most candidates coped well with this, although some translated as, for example, ‘the biggest woe of her marriage’.

1(f) Some candidates confused ῥίψαι with Latin *rapio*, hence ‘seize’ or ‘snatch’ rather than ‘throw’. πύργων was sometimes translated as ‘fires’ or ‘pyres’.

Question No. 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 earlier 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 who 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.

Candidates had clearly done their homework: there were very few mistranslations or misunderstandings of the texts. (One of the commonest was taking φρονήματα in line 1 of the Sophocles as a superlative adjective.) Technical terms were, as in previous years, often applied loosely: 'caesura', 'tricolon' and 'hyperbaton' were bandied about indiscriminately again, but to their credit most candidates now know the difference between polyptoton and figura etymologica. 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.

Question No. 2/3(b):

Essay question on Sophocles/Aristophanes. Most candidates managed to turn in fairly comprehensive essays; the quantity and quality of appropriate direct textual reference was the main distinguishing factor, though many distinguished themselves still 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. Some candidates took their eyes off the question occasionally. The Sophocles question, for example, was about Antigone, not Creon: it was certainly relevant to discuss his treatment of her, and the rightness or wrongness of his position, to some extent, but essays which dwelt solely or mainly on these questions did not sufficiently address Antigone's own character and actions.

It was good to see that an increasing number of candidates are taking the Aristophanes option in Section B. The vast majority of commentaries and essays were very well done and received their due reward.

F374 Classical Greek Prose

General Comments:

As usual, the overall standard across this paper was very good. We were particularly pleased this year to see so many candidates tackling the prose composition so successfully.

Many of those candidates who answered the translation and comprehension section would be well advised to think a little about examination technique: always read through the passage, the glossed vocabulary and the questions before starting to write answers; do not give too much information if a question is worth, for example, only 1 mark; answer the question asked rather than simply writing a translation of a part of the text and hoping that the answer will appear within it; use the glossed vocabulary, and copy spellings carefully.

There was a greater range of performance evident in the literature section this year, with some candidates inclined to take a rather broad-brush approach. Those candidates who scored most highly here were those who analysed the texts in detail, giving accurate and closely focused quotations and translations and writing sophisticated commentary. Candidates should be discouraged from overuse of the term 'tricolon' and from beginning each paragraph with 'another way in which Herodotus makes this passage entertaining is...'.

To repeat last year's note on legibility: online marking means that candidates who write very clearly are likely to be at an advantage. There was less of a problem this year with candidates inking over pencilled prose compositions, which was good. However, candidates should be warned that very inky writing which soaks through the paper so that it shows on the scan of the other side makes scripts very difficult to read.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1

1(a) This proved a difficult question, which few candidates answered correctly. Often too much detail was given for the 1 mark available, although if the correct information was contained within that, the mark was awarded, even where the additional detail was not correct.

1(b) Most candidates answered this correctly, or nearly correctly. This was an example of a question where some candidates simply translated a block of text hoping to contain the answer within it: candidates should be encouraged to edit the translation to give only the answer sought.

1(c) The best candidates correctly identified the two different uses of *πρὸς*.

1(d) Most candidates answered this correctly, although some included erroneous extra information.

1(e) There was some confusion over the number, although most candidates did get 800 'somethings' from the mainland. Some knew or worked out a sensible translation for *ἐπικούροι*.

1(f) Most candidates correctly identified superiority in strength and number.

1(g) (i) A high proportion of candidates identified the partitive genitive correctly, either by name or translation. If they are unsure of the technical term, candidates should always be reassured that an accurate translation will answer the question just as well.

1(g) (ii) A small but worrying minority identified this as accusative, either accusative absolute or direct object.

1(h) Candidates should be reminded to read the questions carefully and answer all parts: some left out the ‘of which verbs’ part of this question.

(i) A pleasingly high proportion identified this perhaps rather tricky participle correctly.

(ii) Again, most identified this correctly.

1(i) Translation: there were some very pleasing and fluent translations, from candidates who had clearly thought about what was going on in the story and written accordingly. The following necessarily tends to concentrate more on where candidates went wrong. As a general comment, there was a tendency for candidates to slip into writing ‘would’ in front of every verb as soon as they began to feel unsure of the translation.

(i) Most candidates translated this sentence accurately. Any problems were with identification of the adverb.

(ii) Candidates were for the most part divided in this section into those who translated the whole of it correctly, those who transposed the meaning of *παρὰ φύσιν* so that it meant ‘according to’ rather than ‘contrary to’ nature, and a final group who had little idea at all what was going on in the second half of the sentence.

(iii) Very few candidates remembered the correct meaning of *τροπῆς*, with most confusing it with *τρόπος*. A significant number ignored the article with ‘the few’, and the sequence of events was not always expressed correctly (particularly the positioning of the participle).

(iv) Again, the lack of article with *κύκλω* was not always noticed, and the final phrase caused some difficulty, although many candidates realised that it was a negative purpose clause.

(v) Hardly any candidates realised that *οικείας* and *ἀλλοτρίας* were agreeing with *οικίας* in the previous section, taking them instead as nouns by themselves. It was important to translate *χρήματα* as ‘goods’ rather than ‘money’ for the sentence to make sense.

(vi) Most candidates translated the first half of this section perfectly. The second half caused more difficulties, but again most worked out a pretty good idea of what it meant, even if they hadn’t known *ἐπίφορος* to begin with.

(vii) Any problems here were with the order of events, but most candidates had worked out what was going on.

Question No.2

The prose composition this year was treated with good sense and flair by a large number of candidates.

(i) Candidates should be reminded that the usual way of expressing ‘Persia’ is to say ‘the Persians’. A genitive absolute was a good way of expressing the first phrase, and most candidates remembered to put *τις* in to express ‘a’. Any sort of purpose clause was accepted and we particularly liked those candidates who added an intensifying prefix to ‘came’ to match the preposition they used for ‘to’.

- (ii) A number of candidates had a hanging nominative here – genitive absolute was a good way of expressing the first phrase. A huge number of candidates did not know the correct positioning for τε and καί.
- (iii) Some candidates had difficulty with the accusative of Intaphrenes. A style mark was awarded to candidates who linked this sentence to the previous one with οὖν.
- (iv) The imperfect tense for ‘wept’ was preferable here. It is important to remember that ‘promise’ is followed by a future infinitive.
- (v) The best candidates remembered the correct placement of ἔφη (i.e. embedded within the speech). This was a long and complicated section and candidates handled it impressively. The best remembered to use the perfect tense for ‘are dead’.
- (vi) Most candidates rendered this perfectly.
- (vii) ‘her eldest son’ caused a surprising amount of difficulty, with some of the sons being ‘most ancient’ or even ‘nearest to death’.
- (viii) The article was required in the phrase ‘all the others’.

Question No. 3

- (a) The best candidates answered this question with a clear and accurate account of what Socrates is arguing coupled with a close linguistic analysis and discussion of the methods by which Socrates leads Simmias through the argument. Most candidates dissected lines 3-6 well, bringing out the multiple repetitions and contrasts by which Socrates explains what he thinks death is. The rest of the passage was dealt with in varying amounts of detail, with the highest marks going to those who were able to bring out interesting or arresting vocabulary choices, and identify nuance, as well as commenting on the progression through the argument.
- (b) The highest achieving candidates found an enormous amount to say here, giving impressively close and exhaustive analysis of the language of the whole passage. Most candidates who answered on Plato did so well, but there were some who were clearly less sure of the meaning of the passage so restricted themselves to one-word quotations or paraphrase, or who concentrated only on parts of the extract.

Question No. 4

The Herodotus text was popular, but too often treated in a rather superficial manner. The very best candidates, as with the Plato questions, were able to give the passages a close linguistic analysis, bringing out the stylistic details as well as noting interesting vocabulary choices. Less good candidates tended to rely on summarising the translation without actually analysing the Greek.

- (a) All the candidates concentrated on the individual responsibility being laid on the shoulders of Callimachus and most brought out the contrast between the two outcomes envisaged by Miltiades. Too many candidates, however, wrote as though ἐλευθέρας at the end of line 1 was a verb, took ἅπαντα in line 2 with the wrong noun, or made vague references to Harmodius and Aristogeiton without really explaining who they were. Again, whilst most mentioned the possibility of Athens either becoming subject to the Medes, or becoming the first city in Greece, some mistranslated μέγιστον κίνδυνον or ignored the phrase ἐξ οὗ ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναῖοι going with it, merely saying that ‘Athens was in great danger’. The best candidates brought out the strength of

vocabulary such as ὑποκύψωσι, διασείσειν, ἐμπεσοῦσαν, or σαθρὸν or the significance of the tenses of verbs such as δέδεκται, πείσονται, ἐστὶ, and ὑπάρξει.

(b) Again, all the candidates knew what was going on here and found things to say about the entertainment value of the story. The best analysed the build-up of tension carefully, particularly the parallel descriptions of Hippocleides' increasingly outrageous behaviour and Cleisthenes' correspondingly increasing rage.

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 2016

