

**GCE**

**Classical Greek**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H044**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2017**

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 2017

## CONTENTS

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classical Greek (H044)

#### EXAMINER'S REPORT

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
H044/01 Language	4
H044/02 Literature	7

## H044/01 Language

### General Comments:

Overall the standard of responses in the first year of this new specification was varied, with the best candidates performing excellently while weaker candidates were thrown by the language being tested in the paper. Candidates found the translation harder than either Q2 or Q3, particularly with a long and complex opening sentence. Centres are asked to advise candidates not to give (bracketed) alternative answers.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1 (i)

This was a challenging start to the passage and many candidates failed to spot the genitive absolute and render it correctly in English. Other errors included translating 'οὗτος γὰρ παῖς μὲν...' as 'for this boy...'. A number of candidates failed to translate αὐτῷ correctly here as 'same'. Many candidates slipped down to two or three marks here.

1 (ii)

This section was tackled better than 1(i). The most common error was to take 'underage' with 'mistress' rather than agreeing with the subject.

1 (iii)

Some candidates tackled this section very well, but a number of candidates failed to grasp the meaning. Some incorrectly took οὐκ with ἠγούμενος rather than δύνασθαι and others were confused by the conditional clause which generally meant that only 3/5 was scored by many. Centres might like to consider how they teach the meaning of the word δοκεῖ.

1 (iv)

Few candidates had a problem with this short section, though some did not know the meaning of the word μετεπέμφθη. The word ἠμάρτανε posed problems for a small number of candidates – many understood the general concept of what the word meant but did not translate it accurately (eg 'committed crimes'). Because it was a short section, it was important that this word was treated as an imperfect.

1 (v)

Many candidates did not recognise the question here and were confused by ποῖόν τινα χρῆ.

1 (vi)

Again, some candidates wanted to write about 'deciding' here rather than 'seeming' for which they were penalised. καὶ ἐκείνω ὅς posed some problems too.

1 (vii)

A number of candidates were flummoxed by this section. This was partly because some did not recognise ἐπιβουλεύσας as a nominative participle and wanted to render it as a genitive absolute. Others did not know the meaning of προὔδωκεν. Unfortunately the glossed word ἐπιβουλεύω did not indicate that it took a dative and therefore τῷ πατρὶ was often taken with προὔδωκεν which the examiners decided not to penalise.

1 (viii)

αλαβων was an unfortunate error in this paper and candidates were not penalised in any way – it was interesting that many had tried to make this addition of an α- into an alpha privative though clearly this word confused candidates because of its lack of breathing etc. Beyond that,

candidates tackled this section reasonably, though some did not quite understand the relationship of πρότερον μὲν... τέλος δὲ... - the placement of μὲν was relevant a couple of times in this passage – eg in 1(i) – and centres might take note of this.

1 (ix)

The first half of this sentence posed few problems for most candidates, but the second half was not tackled well by a number of candidates who failed to recognise οὐδ'...ἔφη as 'said...not...'

1 (x)

This section was done well though some candidates did not know or recognise the middle of λυω.

1 (xi)

This was a tricky end to the passage and few candidates understood it entirely, though there were many valiant attempts and many candidates pieced together enough of a translation to get 3 marks.

## Question 2

About two thirds of candidates attempted Q2.

- (a) Almost all candidates gained 1 mark.
- (b) Most candidates gained both marks.
- (c) Almost all candidates again scored 2 marks.
- (d) Few candidates were troubled by this.
- (e) Many candidates had few problems with this but some did not know the meaning of τάξις (for which they were penalised only once)
- (f) Few problems with this question in either section (i) or (ii)
- (g) A majority of candidates scored 3/3.
- (h) Most candidates had few problems with these questions, though in (ii) the plural 'villages' was missed by several candidates and some scored only 2/3 in (i) because they put 'they were near where the king had made camp'.
- (i) Many candidates only scored 1/2 because they thought ὄψε meant 'too late'.
- (j) Few candidates scored both marks here – it was confusing for many.

## Question 3

This question was answered by about one third of candidates, of whom a majority scored very well.

- (a) Many did this well, though some candidates did not use the correct form of the indirect statement (participle construction). Several verbs of perception were used and accepted.
- (b) Many did this well and it was pleasing to see many use an aorist infinitive. Some did not remember that προσβαλλω takes a dative.
- (c) Mostly good answers here. The purpose clause was rendered well by many, with lots rendering an aorist optative correctly. A few confused the gender of λιμενα.

- (d) Candidates did not find the condition hard to render in Greek.
- (e) This was done pretty well. Some candidates did not know the idiom of φερομαι (not in the DVL) but the use of νικαω was also accepted. Some thought that ἀθλον was masculine.

## H044/02 Literature

### General Comments:

The standard of responses in this first year of the new specification was very high and centres should be congratulated for preparing candidates so well for the new exam. Candidates responded well to the format of the paper and prove themselves well able to deal with the range of questions across the four set texts. The majority of candidates organised their time very effectively in the examination and were able to do with the more focused questions as well as the two essays in the time available.

Most candidates dealt very effectively with the translation question and secured very high marks. A very few candidates failed to translate all the material set for Question 4(d), the question did set out the exact lines required. The longer analysis questions on all the set texts were generally answered to a very high standard, but this style of question certainly presents a challenge to those candidates with a weaker grasp of the meaning of the Greek. As is often the case, many candidates were more comfortable writing about verse set texts, and found it more challenging presenting an analysis of prose authors. There were, however, many excellent answers to these demanding questions. The very best candidates usually set out their work very clearly in paragraphs, so that examiners were left in no doubt what the points were that the candidate wished to use to answer the question. Some weaker answers required examiners to decide for the candidate what the separate points were. In a small number of cases, it was quite difficult to read the Greek text that candidates included in their answers; it is worth reminding candidates that examiners might reasonably expect to be able to recognise the material taken from the passage on the paper.

A more problematic area was the context question. These proved more straightforward in some sections and more challenging in others, and some time was taken during the standardisation process to ensure that all candidates had access to the full range of marks for these.

There was some considerable variety in the essays produced. There were some very strong answers which demonstrated a thorough understanding of the texts studied. Nearly all candidates were able to draw on the set text in some detail, but there was less certainty in their grasp of wider reading. Some text perhaps made this rather easier than others: many of those who studied the *Odyssey* were able to develop Odysseus's back story to good effect to support their discussion of his leadership, but this was perhaps more difficult to do for other texts such as the *Antigone*. Some candidates highlighted where they were drawing on material outside the set text to ensure that this was not missed by the examiners; the examiners were grateful for this. This is certainly an area where teachers will want to consider carefully how best to prepare their candidates. At this level, it would certainly seem a good idea to look at those areas of the set text prescribed for the full A-level, though examiners were certainly prepared to reward a candidate who drew on, for example, the choruses from the *Antigone*.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question No. 1(a)

This question proved quite challenging, and some answers were rather vague and unclear. This is certainly an area that candidates need to practice.

#### Question No. 1(b)

This translation was generally done very well. The phrase *αὐτὸν ἐπιτιμῶντα* caused some problems, though a range of versions were accepted. The rather more challenging phrase *τὸ ἐπὶ σφᾶς εἶναι* was generally handled well, though those who did not know what it meant either mangled it or omitted it.

#### Question No. 1(c)

This question was generally well done.

Question No. 1(d)

There was plenty for candidates to work with here. Quite a few candidates tried to use ὅσῳ ... τόσῳ but not always successfully. There were some good discussions of αὐθις ... ἐποιεῖτο, though more could be made of the imperfect tenses, and ὄχλος was a popular word to focus on. A number of candidates tried to make effective use of ἐκ μὲν τῆς πόλεως οὐδένα, but were not always clear about the significance of the phrase in context.

Question No. 1(e)

Generally well done.

Question No. 1(f)

Many candidates made effective use of πολὺς ἐνέκειτο, of ensuring excellent recall of the textbook. After that, there was less agreement about what made an effective point. There were some good discussions of balance (μὲν ... δ', πρότερον ... νῦν), and some candidates use the contrast between τῷ μὲν πλήθει and ὀλίγοις δὲ ἀνδράσι to good effect. ὑγιὲς was often mistranslated.

Question No. 1(g)

Although there was some misunderstanding here, candidates were usually able to secure two marks.

Question No. 1(h)

There were some very competent essays on Thucydides, the relatively few took the opportunity to really develop the detail in a convincing way. Many candidates focused on Brasidas, but could perhaps have made more of the dramatic events on the beach which almost proved fatal for him. There were relatively few mentions of Demosthenes, surprising perhaps when that provided an opportunity to go outside the set text. More perhaps could also have been made of the debate in Athens, and here again there were opportunities to go beyond the set text which some candidates took. A very few candidates considered the issues posed by speeches in Thucydides, often to good effect. A very few candidates made reference to events in Sicily, not very effectively as a rule.

Question No. 2(a)

Generally well answered.

Question No. 2(b)

Generally well answered.

Question No. 2(c)

This translation question was generally done very effectively.

Question No. 2(d)

Most candidates seem well-prepared for this question. Many made use of the superlatives (ἀλογώτατον, ἀπορώτατοί), but fewer dealt effectively with οὐδὲ τὰ ὀνόματα ... εἰπεῖν. Relatively few even mentioned Aristophanes by name or the particular play in question. More were drawn to comment on φθόνῳ καὶ διαβολῇ χρώμενοι, often to good effect. There were also some effective discussions of ἀνέπειθον ... πεπεισμένοι ... πείθοντες. Some candidates also make good use of technical language from the court. Many candidates picked out ὥσπερ σκιαμαχεῖν for effective discussion.

Question No. 2(e)

Generally well done.

Question No. 2(f)  
Generally well done.

Question No. 2(g)  
This proved more challenging passage for most candidates to work with, though the majority scored well. Many referred to the use of direct speech, but were not always clear about what the god actually said. Examiners felt there could have been better use of Socrates' mission and his attempts to do the god's bidding.

Question No. 2(h)  
Generally well done.

Question No. 2(i)  
This was quite a challenging question because of the limited nature of the set text, and there was certainly an opportunity to bring in wider reading, though this was not always taken. It would have been interesting to see more discussions of Aristophanes. Many candidates tried to deal with 'corrupting the young' and the sophists, and there were also some who could connect Socrates with his rather dubious oligarchic friends. Most candidates were well able to draw good material from the set text and make effective use of it in an essay, but there is perhaps scope to develop further the discussion of wider issues.

Question No. 3(a)  
This translation was generally done very effectively.

Question No. 3(b)  
Candidates in general seem to deal effectively with this question. The four ὄπη gave most candidates a good first point, and some even attempted to get two out of it. There was some good discussions of μήτις and Odysseus' cunning words ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶομαι εἶναι. Many also try to use the material about the island, though not always very clearly. καπνὸν was a popular area to discuss, and many candidates linked it to the last time the travellers saw smoke.

Question No. 3(c)  
Generally done well.

Question No. 3(d)  
Generally done well.

Question No. 3(e)  
This was generally answered very effectively. Not many used the luxurious setting at the beginning of the passage as effectively as they could have, and more could have been made of the details of the feast prepared for the men. However, many picked on the dramatic change to φάρμακα λύγρ' (and used the enjambment to good effect); and many made poignant use of the reference to the fatherland. The details of the magic and the transformation were generally used very effectively. The retention of human feeling was well brought out and the contrast between earlier feast and pig food was well discussed by some.

Question No. 3(f)  
Generally well done.

Question No. 3(g)  
There were some very successful essays. This was, perhaps, a more predictable essay, and many candidates seem well-prepared to make effective use of the set text, and even go beyond it. There were some very well organised answers that ranged over the set material, and candidates were able to select relevant detail with a sure touch. There was some difference of opinion over the qualities of leadership shown by Odysseus, and examiners were happy to credit any effectively argued response. The killing of the stag and the comforting of Eurylochus were

used by many; there were some interesting discussions of Odysseus' encounter with Hermes, and his behaviour in the house of Circe.

Question No. 4(a)

This proved quite a challenging question.

Question No. 4(b)

Candidates found plenty of issues to raise in this passage and there were some very effective discussions of detail. Many candidates were able to use the repeated *αὐτο-* to good effect. Relatively few made effective use of *διπλοῦν ἔπος*, and not all recognised or used the dual forms.

Question No. 4(c)

Generally well done.

Question No. 4(d)

This was quite a challenging translation question, but it was generally well done. *τὸ ... περισσὰ πρᾶσσειν* was translated in various ways, and *τῶνδ'* in line 16 was sometimes omitted.

Question No. 4(e)

This was a challenging passage for analysis. Many candidates made effective use of the opening lines. Most got something out of *πρῖν μοι μοῖραν ἐξήκειν βίου*, but perhaps more could have been made of *λοισθία ἴγῳ καὶ κάκιστα*. There was plenty to use the final section, particularly the repetition of *φίλ-*, which some candidates used to very good effect.

Question No. 4(f)

This question proved quite challenging, even though candidates were just expected to select details from the Greek text.

Question No. 4(g)

This question was perhaps rather open-ended, and it drew some candidates into a personal response which was not always successful. In trying to give a balanced view in response to the question, most candidates picked out Antigone's treatment of Ismene to illustrate her lack of humanity, though some also considered her lack of consideration for Haemon. There was arguably room to develop a fuller discussion of Creon's behaviour here as well. Overall, candidates rose to the challenge and there were some very stimulating essays. Antigone's relationship with Haemon was one area that enabled students to bring in material from outside the set text, but there were relatively few references to other parts of the play. Given the double burial in the play, it would be worth candidates highlighting where they are drawing on such material.

**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 2017



001