

Examiners' report on 2022 ICCG pilot

Section 1

This section was well answered with the average score of all candidates 17.4 out of 20. A few pieces of general advice might be useful for candidates in future years:

- Pay careful attention to proper names, both those that are given (eg Ἑλενη), and those that should be known from the proscribed vocabulary (eg Ἑλλάς).
 - It was intentional that the story was well-known, which was meant to be helpful to candidates, but they need to be wary of going into autopilot mode and answering the questions on the basis of their knowledge of the myth rather than the content of the passage.
 - As ever, reading the questions carefully is crucial, such as in writing out a phrase of the specified number of words, and in ensuring that it is also translated (if that is required by the question).
- (a) For some candidates this was the only question they got wrong in this section, usually by putting 'the Greeks' instead of 'Greece' for της Ἑλλάδος. Apart from the difference in form, the singular article should help to identify the correct answer here. Others used their prior knowledge of the myth to put 'Sparta', which did not receive a mark.
- (b) Although the question was carefully worded to encourage candidates to identify ἐν πλοίῳ as the required two-word phrase, some put ἐν πλοίῳ ἐφυγον, and others πλοίῳ ἐφυγον, both of which were fully credited (if correctly translated) since the examiners felt that though both were strictly incorrect, they answered the question in their different ways.
- (c) (i) Here the examiners allowed 'boats' as an equivalence (by sense) to 'fleet', but did insist upon the idea of 'sending' in ἐπέμψαν: simply putting that they sailed to Troy was a common mistake among weaker candidates.
- (ii) There were some errors from taking λυεῖν as λαμβανεῖν, but perhaps these were caused by assumptions made from prior knowledge of the story.
- (d) Almost all candidates got this question correct. The idea of the multiple choice questions is to encourage candidates to differentiate between potentially confusable words (here παρασκευάζω and παρεχω; Ἑλληνες and Ἑλενη), and to show an understanding of the story.
- (e) (i) As in (b) several candidates struggled to identify a **three**-word phrase (and some identified it incorrectly as πολλὰς μάχαις οὖν). There was some inaccuracy here in translation as well: 'much fighting' was not seen as a sufficiently accurate rendering, especially in a question which asked for a phrase that suggested 'there was a lot of fighting'.
- (ii) Most candidates got this correct, but there were still some candidates confusing Τροία and Τρῶες: again the singular article should help candidates distinguish between these similar forms.

- (f) Here the examiners insisted upon plan (or a synonym) for βουλη rather than council, because although both are correct renderings out of context, in this particular point in the story, ‘plan’ is the required meaning.
- (g) A very few candidates did not seem to understand what was being asked for in this type of question, and simply wrote ‘horse’. Recognisable misspellings were credited.
- (h) As in (d) this question was intended to test easily confused words (στρατηγος/στρατιωτης, κλεπτο/κρυπτο, αυτος) but was usually done correctly.

Section 2

As is clear from the mark scheme, the two chunks to translate were marked out of 120 (52 and 68) initially and then the total was divided by 3, to give a total out of 40. The average score of candidates was 99.3/120, giving an average score of 33 out of 40.

The mark scheme was intentionally designed to be generous, rewarding any knowledge on the part of the candidates, with some words carrying up to three marks (for vocabulary knowledge, and for different aspects of the inflection of the word). This means that the heaviest penalties were for omission (whether intentional or inadvertent), and candidates should be encouraged to check carefully that they have not omitted a sentence by mistake, and to attempt sentences even when they cannot see a way through to making complete sense of it.

Candidates found the first section easier. In the first sentence, there were again some failures to recognise της Τροιας as the place rather than the people. A common mistake in the second sentence was to omit the ‘they’ needed to translate ἐλιπον: ‘And left...’ cannot begin a sentence. In the third sentence, any translation of the aorist participle was accepted which made sense. However, some candidates lost a mark if they translated it as a main verb, but failed to link it with ‘and’ to the actual main verb. So ‘Then they burned their own camp, all ran...’ was not acceptable. The fifth sentence didn’t cause many problems, perhaps helped by having ἐγγυς της Τροιας first, which meant that it could be translated in the same order, and did not require candidates to come up with ‘there was’ for ἦν. The final sentence of the first part caused no problems (and we were not asking candidates to distinguish the imperfect tense of ἔμενον.)

The second paragraph brought, as intended, more of a challenge to candidates. In the first sentence, candidates needed to come up with an appropriate translation for θαυμαζω, not just any from the list of possibles (‘admire’ was not acceptable), ἐπει caused some confusion (with ειπε) and παρησαν likewise.

The second and third sentences contained the word – αυτος – which caused more problems than any other on the paper, even to some strong candidates. Spending a bit more time on how this word can be used, and the need to pay close attention to its case, gender and number would be time well spent.

The third sentence was the trickiest in the whole passage. Apart from αὐτῶν, there was the difficulty of Ἕλληνα as a singular (which didn't cause as many problems as we might have expected), the need to express the contrast somehow expressed by the μὲν ... δε, and the difficulty posed by having to supply (or also omit in English) ἐγὼ εἰμι in the second half of the sentence from the first. If candidates struggled with this final point, they tended to ignore the cases of ἐχθροῦ and τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, leading to sentences such as 'the enemies' generals...'

The next two sentences were well handled, though confusions of οὖν with οὐ caused some problems, as did taking τοῖς θεοῖς as a genitive, since 'gift of the gods' has rather a different meaning in English.

In the penultimate sentence, we allowed ἀγετε to be translated as an indicative, though it would have been nice for more candidates to see that an imperative would have worked much better here. εἰς here needed to be rendered 'into' rather than just 'to' for the story to make sense. The future (φυλαξουσιν) was well handled generally, ὑμᾶς less well with 'us' a common mistake, even though it was Sinon speaking.

In the final sentence, many candidates did not spot the adverb μωρῶς and tended to translate as 'the foolish Trojans', but the concessive καίπερ was generally well handled, though we were generous even if the English was not quite right ('The Trojans trusted Sinon, despite being a liar').

Section 3

This section was well answered with the average score of all candidates 24 out of 30. The grammatical questions in this section tended to be the biggest discriminators between candidates. It is worth noting that technical terms are not required for correct answers in these questions.

- (a) (i) This question was well answered by most candidates. Any sensible translation of ἡγαγον was accepted.
- (ii) οὐδεὶς caused difficulties, with many candidates taking it as a nominative, and mistranslating the phrase as 'no one was afraid'.
- (b) Of the grammatical questions (v) was the one which was answered correctly most often, though it should be noted that 'aorist' on its own was enough to identify the tense – 'strong' (or 'second') was not required. In (i) 'participle' on its own received full credit, but it was nice to see stronger candidates identify it as a present participle. For (ii), a generic 'time phrase' was not acceptable, but a translation 'for many hours' did score the mark as well as '(accusative of) time how long'. (iii) caused more problems than might have been expected for some of the weaker candidates. Perhaps they were put off by the other grammatical parts to the question. A derivation from ὑπνοῦς proved trickier than

ἵππος in the first section, because of the need to adapt the stem to one beginning ‘hy-’ in English.

- (c) (i) was answered well by most candidates, but quite a few struggled to identify φρυκτον as accusative though φρυκτος was given. In (iii) it is worth noting again that there was no need to identify the dative as an ‘indirect object’: translating the phrase, such as explaining that the fire-signal was sent ‘to the fleet’, scored the mark.
- (d) This was well answered by almost all candidates; marks only tended to be dropped by some omission.
- (e) (i) This question posed considerable difficulties to many because of the sandwich construction, and the confusion of στρατιωται with στρατηγος.
- (ii) ἐξελθοντες was tricky, but credit was given for any sense conveying the men leaving the horse, before they opened the gates of the city.
- (iii) This was well done, but some candidates put ‘fled into Troy’. This was not acceptable for εισεδραμον (though it might be in other contexts), because these men were not fleeing into Troy, but running into it to attack it.
- (f) (i) Quite a few candidates did not get the plurals – again the articles might have helped.
- (ii) This was well answered, but ‘citizens’ was required, rather than just ‘people’.
- (iii) Again, generally well answered, but some lost a mark by putting ‘conquered’ for ἐλαβον rather than ‘captured’.

Section 4

This section was – as expected – the greatest discriminator across the whole paper. The average score on it was 5.9 out of 10; few candidates who achieved a distinction scored over 7, and only four candidates achieved full marks. We did award half marks in this section in order to allow candidates to score for partially correct Greek. We make clear below where this was the case.

- (a) These were the best done questions in this section, but there was some confusion when candidates filled the gap and ringed an answer, but they did not agree. In future, we may just ask candidates on such a multiple-choice question just to ring the correct answer. Candidates should be careful to write epsilon and nu in distinctive ways: they were often hard to distinguish.
- (b) For (i) and the first part of (ii), we awarded a half mark for the correct stem ἐγραψ- and a half mark for the correct ending -ε (we also allowed the imperfect, with no penalty). Similarly there was a half-mark for γεροντ- and a half-mark for -ες. Therefore both γερες

and γερωντοι scored half a mark each. For the second part of (ii), the correct answer was required for any mark.

- (c) This was the hardest question on the paper, but again we sought to reward any correct Greek. It was marked out of 10 initially, then divided by 2, and half-marks were allowed to stand. The verbs and nouns carried two marks each (one for stem and one for the ending), whereas the articles and preposition carried one mark each. The mark for the question could be scored either by the correct use of the Greek question mark (;) or the inclusion of ἀρα. Although a maximum of 2 marks was removed for missing breathings (so that candidates without any added could still score 4 out of 5 for the sentence), it was notable how many strong candidates did not include breathings. Quite a few candidates mistakenly included ἐστι in rendering ‘Is... speaking...?’