Classical Greek

2/3 Unit (Common)

Written Examination
Section I – Sophocles Philoctetes and Herodotus II

Question 1
Translations were completed competently for the most part.
(a) Virtually all candidates translated this passage well.
(b) Candidates found this more challenging to translate than (a).
(c) Candidates found some difficulty in coordinating their clauses for translation.
   The following may be noted:
   Many candidates found this passage challenging. Some confused the details of the pyramid construction. The following are noteworthy:
   κρόσσος, βωμίδα (candidates interpreted with great variety)
   επείτε (many omitted)
   όκως (proved challenging for correct identification)
   αυτήν (some omitted)

Question 2
(a) Approximately half the candidates answered each part. The majority gave thorough answers but there was still a spread of marks.
(b) Many candidates did not make sufficient points to achieve full marks.

Section II – Unseen Translation

Question 3
Candidates found some vocabulary very challenging.
Candidates generally manipulated grammatical structures competently.

(a) The following are noteworthy:
   πάρος (unfamiliar to all candidates)
   δίς τόσο...κακά (proved a challenging concept)

   πως...ενφαινεται (proved challenging for both identification of vocabulary and structure)
   εχόντων τονδ’ (many did not recognise the construction)
Section III – Prose Composition

Question 4

Candidates showed a variety of competency, but overall presented a clear ability to manipulate syntax and vocabulary well.

Challenging elements included:

1. “Herodotus was told…”
2. “unknown was told…”
3. “public wall”
4. “for anyone who came to…”
5. “wine skins”

Elements which produced a wide variety of responses included:

2. “…treasures were decreasing”
3. “…were tempted to drink…”

Section IV – Essays

Question 5

A general weakness in both the prose and verse essays was that there was too much description and insufficient analysis.

(a) (i) - This was the less popular choice
    - There was some good factual detail
    - Few developed their argument from the facts
Few knew much background information about the chorus
(ii) Most candidates chose this question
- Candidates provided a good variety of detail
- Candidates generally utilised much material from the set text portion
- Some candidates did too much story telling
- Many tied the question to the effect on Philoctetes
- Many tied the question to Neoptolemus’ “phusis” and the nobility of both characters
(b) (i) No candidates chose this question
(ii) Many candidates did much story telling without linking details back to the question
- Only some candidates discussed facts versus “mere” entertainment
- Some brought out the didactic elements
- A few discussed historiographical elements.

3 Unit (Additional)

Written Examination
Section I – Homer, Iliad VI

Question 1
All candidates translated both passages competently. Most rendered vocabulary and syntax well, translating idiom accurately.
(a) Most candidates clearly identified the specific relationship and explained its consequence clearly. Candidates generally brought out excellent, relevant background detail.
(b) This proved a challenging question. The “Why” question presented a variety of interpretations. Better responses brought out connexions with Andromache’s last speech of attempted dissuasion and also what is in Hector’s mind to make him give such sad details (which he clarifies in the next line after the passage).

Section II – Essays

Question 2
Candidates’ choices were essentially evenly spread among the three questions.
(a) Candidates brought out Neoptolemus’ experience of suffering quite effectively to disagree with the question. They discussed the variety of psychological and physical suffering and some brought out the establishment and interaction of character through the element of suffering.

(b) Candidates addressed all three adjectives adequately. There was some story-telling without linking this back to the question. “Clear” proved the most challenging for discussion.

(c) • Candidates did not address “To what effect…” well.

• Candidates discussed the factual details of battle, home, peace clearly and accurately

• Candidates made intelligent choices of examples/illustrations

• Some brought out specifically blended elements well (e.g. Hector leaving for battle)

• Candidates did not develop the scope details well (e.g. that warriors have other sides)

Section III – Unseen Translation

Question 3

Candidates translated the passage generally well. Candidates translated the construction ending συνόν...μίσχος as well as the imperative αγέσθω well.

The following proved challenging:
μετ’ αμφοτέρωσιν
ευκνήμιδεσ
μυθόν Άλεξάνδροι
κέλεται
οίους
φιλότητα