

# **2000 HSC Notes from the Examination Centre Classical Greek**

© Board of Studies 2001

Published by  
Board of Studies NSW  
GPO Box 5300  
Sydney NSW 2001  
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111

Fax: (02) 9262 6270

Internet: <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>

Schools, colleges or tertiary institutions may reproduce this document, either in part or full, for bona fide study purposes within the school or college.

ISBN 0 7313 4813 3

*Job Number2001113*

# 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:

The following may be noted:

παρά σφίσι (many omitted)

ων (some omitted)

γράφω (some translated as future)

Many candidates found this passage challenging. Some confused the details of the pyramid construction. The following are noteworthy:

κρόσσας, βωμίδας (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 τόσ'...κακά (proved a challenging concept)

πως...ευφραίνεται (proved challenging for both identification of vocabulary and structure)

εχόντων τωνδ' (many did not recognise the construction)

- (b) Some students had difficulty in following the context of the passage consistently because of vocabulary recognition.  
The following are noteworthy:  
Τουτον...λέγουσι, (Some candidates made “Arion” subject)  
οπίσω (many omitted)  
πελαγειῖ (some did not recognise)  
πορθμέας (many construed as object of κελεύειν)  
ως...τύχη (many found a challenging construction)  
εκπηδαν (many candidates did not recognise)  
απειληθέντα...παραιτήσασθαι (many candidates found challenging in vocabulary and construction)  
περιιδειν (many found difficult to interpret in context)  
σκευη (many candidates did not recognise)  
αισαι (many candidates did not recognise)  
υπεδεκετο...κατεργάσασθαι (few construed correctly)

## 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:

- ⌚ “Herodotus was told...”
- ⌚ “unknown was told...”
- ⌚ “public wall”
- ⌚ “for anyone who came to...”
- ⌚ “wine skins”

Elements which produced a wide variety of responses included:

- ⌚ “...treasures were decreasing”
- ⌚ “...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 αυτόν...μάχεσθαι as well as the imperative αγέσθω well.

The following proved challenging:

μετ' αμφοτέροισιν  
ευκνήμιδες  
μυθον Ἀλεξάνδροιο  
κέλεται  
οίους  
φιλότητα