

Intermediate Certificate in Classical Greek Examiners' Report for 2024

The overall results for 2024 [2023] are as follows.

There were 465 [441] candidates in total, to whom we have awarded the following grades:

Distinction, for 90% and above: 202 [179] candidates (43% [40.6%] of the cohort)

Merit, for 70% and above: 155 [151] candidates (33% [34.2%] of the cohort)

Pass, for 50% [46%] and above: 54 [64] candidates (12% [14.5%] of the cohort)

Thus, 54 [47] candidates (12% [10.7%] of the cohort) were Ungraded.

The papers were marked by four examiners, and sample scripts deemed to be close to probable grade boundaries were moderated by two experienced classicists independent of the ICCG. Moreover, after grade boundaries had been agreed in an examiners' meeting, two of the examiners reread all of the scripts falling one or two marks beneath each of the boundaries. Of the 23 scripts thus reviewed, only one was moved up a grade (from Merit to Distinction). Again, this exercise reassured us that there was a high level of consistency in marking between the examiners, and that the mark scheme had been reliably and accurately used by all.

As in 2023 and the 2022 pilot, we were hugely impressed by the overall level of performance and the quality of the teaching that the scripts showed. We hope that many candidates will be encouraged by the ICCG to move onto greater challenges in Greek. Five candidates out of the final entry of 465 candidates particularly excelled by producing papers from which we were unable to deduct any marks.

Section 1

This section was very well answered, many scoring full marks, and with the average score of all candidates 18.5 [17.2] out of 20.

- (a) We allowed 'Persian' or 'of Persia' for τῶν Περσῶν.
- (b) Similarly, here we allowed 'Greek' or 'of Greece' for 'of the Greeks'. A substantial minority of candidates did not know νῆσοι.
- (c) This was a good discriminator. Most candidates got both parts right, but quite a few got only one mark or no mark. We allowed various forms of expression conveying the presence of peace, and the absence of freedom.
- (d) The multiple choice was done perfectly by the large majority of candidates.
- (e) This was well done. We allowed 'enslaved by' for 'slaves of'.
- (f) This was well done, often – quite properly – with the single word 'brave'.
- (g) This was a good discriminator. Candidates who didn't know πιστευετε but kept their heads scored 2/3 for recognising the question and the 'me'.

- (h) All three parts were well done. In (iii), we of course allowed various synonyms for fear and amazement.
- (i) Again, as in (f) above, the single word ‘ready’ or ‘prepared’ was usually offered and was all that was required for the mark.

Section 2

As the mark scheme makes clear, the two chunks to translate were initially marked out of 164 (97 + 67) and then the total was converted by the spreadsheet to give a mark out of 40. The average score of all candidates was 31.83 [30.7] out of 40 (still slightly below the 33/40 average in the pilot).

As in previous years, the mark scheme was intentionally designed to be generous, rewarding any knowledge on the part of the candidates, with many words carrying three or even four marks (for vocabulary knowledge on the one hand, and for different aspects of the inflection of the word and its role in the sentence including its agreement, on the other hand). This again meant that most marks were lost for leaving blank words, phrases, sentences or more: candidates should be encouraged to check carefully that they have not omitted anything by mistake, and to write down those words or word-parts that they can do, even when they can’t see their way through the whole phrase or sentence.

Words appearing more than once were given credit only once. Consequential errors were not penalised. Unlike in previous years, the average score for the second passage (82%) was slightly higher than that for the first (77.8%).

In the first passage, in the first sentence, Λακεδαιμονιούς was often translated ‘mainland’ in spite of the plural ending. As we have made clear, this proper name and seven others are in the ICCG Vocabulary List and so are not glossed in the paper. In the first two sentences, and not only here, quite a few candidates confused ἡλθε and ἡθελε -- this seems to be something of a recurrent problem. In the second sentence αὐτούς ‘them’ tripped many up. As last year and in the pilot, the various uses of this pronoun – ‘him’/‘her’/‘it’/‘them’, ‘self’, and ‘same’ – clearly pose a challenge to many, and always repay close attention. In the third sentence, we allowed the adjective ‘Spartan’ for the genitive plural (των Λακεδαιμονιών). In the fourth sentence, ἔχουσι was often translated as a participle. Credit was given in this sentence for recognising singular and plural objects (χωρας, χρηματα, οινον), even if the vocabulary was incorrect. In the sixth sentence, ὑμεις was often translated ‘we’, and οιοι τ’ ἔστε was not recognised. In the last two sentences, the marks for future (κωλυσει) and imperative (πεμπετε) were often missed.

In the second passage, in the first sentence we were happy with any way of conveying the apposition (ο … ἀρχων). In the second sentence, we allowed some credit for translating ἐπει with an English participle, and we allowed ‘replied’ for ειπεν. The third and fourth sentences were quite strong discriminators. Not all candidates made use of the help given them. On the other hand, good marks were scored by those who rendered what they recognised (e.g. that ἀρα …; marks a question, and that Δαρειον is genitive), even if some of the vocabulary eluded them. In the fifth sentence, we were happy with various different ways of rendering the participle ἐκπεμπων, but if it was taken as a second main verb, then we required it to be linked with ‘and’ to the actual main verb. More candidates were foxed by the

participle κελευον in the sixth sentence, which cannot so easily be a second main verb, but really requires consideration of the important question ‘what is the force of the participle?’. In the final sentence, pleasingly few candidates lacked the key pieces of knowledge of the ending of βατνειν and the meaning of εις.

Section 3

This section was well answered, the average score of all candidates being 23 [23.4] out of 30. As in previous years, the grammatical questions in this section tended to be the keenest discriminators, and key identifiers of those candidates who scored distinctions. As ever, it deserves to be stressed that technical terms are not required for full marks in these questions.

- (a) (i) was nearly always answered correctly, and we allowed ‘Athenians’ for ‘Athens’. For (ii) we allowed the mark for the translation ‘to(wards)’, but not for saying that Athens was the object.
- (b) In (i) very few candidates, even among those getting a Distinction, correctly identified the vocative. We allowed ‘nominative-vocative’. In (ii) we allowed any four of five possible marks. Many candidates did not know ὁ αὐτος as ‘the same’, but still scored four marks.
- (c) Nearly all chose the right answer (C).
- (d) All three parts were well done by nearly all. In (ii), again we did not penalise ‘weak/first aorist’, but we gave no credit for ‘imperfect’ or ‘participle’. In (iii) we required both ‘Athenians’ and ‘allies’ for the mark, and a large majority of candidates got both.
- (e) This was well done. We required the superlative for full marks, but not the indefinite article with ιερον.
- (f) As we had failed to gloss ὄργη, we gave the mark even for a blank answer. However, the large majority correctly guessed ‘anger’ or something close to it.
- (g) This question was quite a discriminator. In (i) we required the imperative for the mark for ἐχε. In (ii) we did not insist on precise translation of δειπνον ἐσθιοντι, but allowed time expressions such as ‘at dinnertime’.

Section 4

This section was – as in 2023 and in the 2022 pilot – the greatest discriminator. The average score on it was 6.5 [5.7] out of 10. As in previous years, we awarded 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) The first was usually correct, but very few candidates got the second one right (singular verb with neuter plural subject).
- (b) In both (i) and (ii) we awarded half a mark for the stem and half for the correct ending. In (i) we allowed the imperfect. We did not penalise a missing breathing.

(c) Once again, the last question was deliberately challenging, but it was done better than in previous years. On the main words we credited endings and stem separately, so it is important to stress to candidates not to leave a blank, and the articles again offered some easy marks.

David Langslow
Claire Le Hur
Soo-Lin Lui
John Taylor
August 2024