

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9786 CLASSICAL HERITAGE

9786/01

Paper 1 (Foundations of History and Culture – Greek),
maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

Essay: Generic Marking Descriptors for Paper 1

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels. Good performance on one AO may compensate for shortcomings on others.
- HOWEVER, essays not deploying material over the full range of the two AOs will be most unlikely to attain a mark in Level 5.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel and possibly intuitive response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.
- The ratio of marks AO1 to AO2 is 2:1

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 25 – 21 marks	ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Sustained argument with a strong sense of direction. Strong, substantiated conclusions. • Gives full expression to material relevant to both AOs. • Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument. • Excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.
4 20-16 marks	ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. • Response covers both AOs, but is especially strong on one AO so reaches this Level by virtue of the argument/analysis. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.
3 15 – 11 marks	THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • The requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. • Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.
2 10 – 5 marks	ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are sketchy at best. • Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin. • Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance. • Perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether). • Patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.
1 4 – 0 marks	ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LOST CONTROL OF HIS/HER MATERIAL. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered. • Little or no argument. Any conclusions are very weak. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. • Little or no display of relevant information. • Little or no attempt to address AO2. • Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

Alexander the Great

- 1 (a) **'By the end of his life, Alexander believed that he should be treated as a god.'** To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates need to demonstrate an understanding of Alexander's view of his own status, selecting a number of specific examples (such as his visit to the oracle of Ammon and his adoption of customs such as the obeisance), and they should be able to relate these to his Macedonian heritage, including his father Philip's attitude to deification. There should be discussion of the final period of Alexander's life; credit analysis of his reaction to the death of Hephaestion and the demands made of Greek states about deification.

On the guide points:

Candidates should discuss the Macedonian background, including both his father's manipulation of religion and his mother's influence. Once the campaign was underway, Alexander's visit to Troy and his identification of himself with Achilles may also be relevant. His attitude to oracles of various kinds, such as that concerning Gordium, may also be included. There should be some assessment of the visit to the oracle of Ammon, and the impact this may have had on the way Alexander presented himself both to conquered peoples and his Macedonian forces. His adoption of Persian customs such as the obeisance should form part of this.

Discussion should cover the final years of Alexander's life, and consider the changes in his behaviour noted by the sources. Of particular interest is his demand for recognition of his divine status by the Greek states and his reaction to the death of Hephaestion (and his attempt to secure some recognition for him). Credit discussion of the material covered by sources such as Arrian and Plutarch in this period.

Candidates should show a good understanding of the problems presented by our sources for Alexander and the difficulty of using them to achieve an understanding of his intentions, particularly in this area. Credit should be given for an understanding of the contemporary background of sources written during the Roman Empire when the cult of the emperor was widely established.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

(b) Did Alexander’s campaigns after the death of Darius achieve anything significant?

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding the different campaigns conducted by Alexander, firstly in the immediate aftermath of the death of Darius and then in his wider expeditions towards India; candidates may also address what plans Alexander had in mind after his return to Babylon, including those discussed with his generals during the final days of his life. Credit discussion of the wider significance of Alexander’s actions for the regions he conquered.

On the guide points:

Candidates should discuss the immediate campaigns into Bactria and Sogdiana as Alexander sought to capture and punish Bessus for the killing of Darius in order to establish his own claim to the throne. There should also be some assessment of the putting down of the unrest in the frontier region (achieved by campaigning and by Alexander’s marriage to Roxane, daughter of Oxyartes), and then the further extension of the campaign to the east in 327 BC, which culminated in defeat of Porus at the Hydaspes in 326 BC, and, in particular, the refusal of the army to continue the campaign further.

Discussion should cover the different areas already mentioned. Candidates should show an understanding of the need to deal with Bessus, who had set himself up as an alternative Persian king. The resulting conflict was partially resolved by his capture, though the frontier area remained volatile. However, Alexander achieved some stability in this area, though it is less clear what the further campaigns into India achieved, and particularly the problematic choices made on the return journey, such as the march through the Gedrosian desert in 325 BC.

Candidates may show an awareness that the sources record further plans for campaigning after the return to Susa (324 BC) and Babylon (323 BC). Focus should be on the campaigns after the death of Darius: candidates may discuss Alexander’s establishing of his claim to the Persian throne and his desire to outdo his predecessors in the range of his conquests. Credit discussion of the extent to which we can be sure of the accounts of Alexander’s intentions in the surviving sources.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

Foundations of comedy: Aristophanes and Menander

- 2 (a) ‘The humour in comedy enabled the Athenians to consider problems in their society which would otherwise have been too painful to be aired in public.’ How far is this a fair assessment of Athenian comic plays?

Candidates should consider the political and social issues raised by comedy, both that of Aristophanes and Menander, and might consider whether there is a difference between the two playwrights. Ideally they will identify key issues, and look at how these are played out the plays which they have chosen to write about.

Key areas for discussion might include:

Serious issues in Aristophanes: these might include the following: Sophists in *Clouds* (including the burning of the *Phrontisterion*) and the issues of conflict of the generations and corruption; the role of demagogues in Athenian society (*Knights*), the need for peace and the pressing situation with the war with Sparta (*Acharnians*, *Peace*, *Lysistrata*), the law-courts (*Wasps*).

The use of humour in Aristophanes: references to contemporary politicians (esp. Cleon), toilet and sexual humour (*Acharnians*, *Lysistrata*); farcical scenarios (such as Trygaeus and the dung beetle or the idea of a sex strike in *Lysistrata*); the mock court scene in the *Wasps*.

Menander: answers might note the apparent lack of humour after Aristophanes, and consider the somewhat serious message that seems to be included in the *Dyskolos* about society and the individual’s reliance on it. However, answers might also consider the covert political message behind the play, and the possibility that Menander is supporting the stability brought about by Demetrius of Phaleron’s rule.

Answers which give background information on the playwrights should be given due credit where it is relevant and well used.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

**(b) ‘There is no such thing as a comic hero in the plays of Aristophanes and Menander.’
To what extent do you agree?**

Candidates should argue with the proposition in the question, and consider what is meant by a comic hero. They might like to look at the literary element of the tradition of heroism, or look at the idea of a hero as being someone who undertakes the impossible or great deeds. The focus of the plays on the principal characters might be noted and discussed.

Candidates can make use of any of Aristophanes’ plays which they have studied, and the following are examples only:

Acharnians: Dicaeopolis as wanting to make peace with Sparta, and his determination in the face of opposition and corruption.

Peace: Trygaeus’ flight up to heaven on a dung beetle, and the attempts to resurrect Peace.

Wasps: The struggle between Procleon and Anticleon, and the attempts to keep the old man under control perhaps representing the younger generation struggling with the demands in Athenian society.

Clouds: is there an individual hero in this play? Candidates might look at the roles of Socrates, Philippides and Strepsiades.

Lysistrata: Lysistrata as a woman hero, and her determination to make peace.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

Socrates as seen through the eyes of Plato

- 3 (a) To what extent was it inevitable that Socrates and the Athenian democracy would come into conflict?

Socrates served obediently under the democracy, though with less involvement – we assume – than some. This means that his hostility towards the democracy will have to be demonstrated or, at least, evaluated. The charges made against him in 399 – these must be accurately related – show that after the Peloponnesian War the democracy found Socrates' nurturing of the young and the aristocratic in some way subversive. Socrates' view of justice can be seen as almost entirely un- or anti-democratic: it comes from the philosopher's understanding of absolute and unchanging forms, whereas the democratic view of justice accepts that views about it are plural and provisional. The Platonic Socrates – the adjective is clearly important – thought the sophists reprehensible, precisely because their alleged attachment to rhetoric and relativism both assisted and corrupted (in Plato's eyes) democratic citizens. The duty of the citizen was to be just: Socrates clearly thought (though only if we accept Plato and accept Plato simply) that most citizens failed in this respect. His various self-presentations in the *Apology* are important here. While Socrates claimed not to have involved himself much in the democracy, he did claim to be obedient to the laws of his city (*Crito*).

- (b) 'Socrates' view of the immortality of the soul is just a comforting story for someone facing death.' How far do you agree?

Some sense will be needed of the way that Socrates/Plato describes the soul, in particular to the immortal in relation to the forms, indeed as the only part of a human being able to apprehend forms. Some consideration should also be given to the way that Socrates puts forward his view of reincarnation in *Phaedo*, i.e. it seems to be important that, at this point, argument stops and storytelling begins. It might also be argued that Socrates wants his soul to be immortal as – in *Phaedo* – he is about to die, and that once he has asserted the immortality of the soul he needs to invent a theory of reincarnation. There seems to be a whiff of self-conscious martyrdom, on the one hand, and of no need for the acolytes to worry that all will be well and Socrates will not be annihilated.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

Greek architecture

- 4 (a) **‘Buildings in ancient Greek sanctuaries were no more than a means of displaying the fine sculpture which adorned them.’ From the evidence of the sanctuaries you have studied, how far would you agree with this view?**

The question asks the candidate to consider both buildings *and* sculptures found with them – so a first aim will be the deployment of a range of good secure knowledge of each category. No sanctuaries are mentioned, but the obvious choices are going to be the Athenian Acropolis complex, Delphi, and Olympia. Allow any other relevant material used to support the answer. Answers should also address the issue raised in the question – were the buildings merely a means to an end, like the frame for a picture, or were they developed in their own right as a means of honouring the deities worshipped (or showing the economic and political power)? The question is worded to allow an open discussion of the variety of styles found at the different centres, the architectural features which they exemplify, and to reach a conclusion about the relative aesthetic values of both buildings and sculptures. The question should allow candidates to deploy and develop their examination of ‘relationships between architecture and its sculptural decoration (including problems and solutions in its use)’ and ‘the uses of architecture and its sculptural decoration for religious, cultural, political statement.’ ‘Sculpture’ may include metopes, pedimental works and cult statues.

Good answers will examine ‘no more than’ as they proceed, and reach a firm conclusion about ‘how far’; weaker ones may describe well, but fail to analyse and/or to respond to ‘how far’ clearly.

Whatever examples are chosen as support, the answer must contain a developed argument and justified conclusions based upon them.

- (b) **‘Ancient Greek architecture developed as a result of the Greeks’ desire for symmetry, order and perfection.’ How far do you agree with this statement?**

The question requires some detailed discussion of ‘the origin and development of Greek architectural principles, building methods and materials; the development and uses of the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian orders and other stylistic changes/innovations’ in order to support an evaluation of the aesthetic qualities of each of the orders. There should be a good use of technical vocabulary in this discussion, and a clear understanding not only of the steps in the development of architecture, but *why* it developed as it did. There may well be a concentration on temples rather than a wider range of materials, though this should not be regarded as a weakness, if they are used to illustrate both development (using examples of Doric, Ionic and Corinthian, for example) and are used as the basis for a discussion about the aesthetics of the buildings. Reward discussion of other types of Greek public buildings, particularly theatres, whose development may be regarded more from practical perspectives (sight-lines, acoustics) than from beliefs about purity and excellence of form (perhaps from a Platonic or Pythagorean standpoint – the latter being found most probably in discussion of the Athenian Acropolis complex and the Parthenon.) Reward answers which explore the idea that successive temples built by different city-states expressed rivalry, always striving to be ‘bigger and better.’

Credit all detailed, relevant examples, crediting accurate detail and evaluation. Likewise, the conclusion should be credited according to the support for and development of the argument, not the ‘rightness’ or ‘error’ of the conclusion – the question is an open one! Stronger responses will address ‘symmetry, order and perfection’ in context, evaluate material both for and against, and produce a plausible conclusion based on the discussion which precedes it.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

The rise of democracy in fifth-century Athens

- 5 (a) 'After the reforms of Ephialtes and Pericles, Athenian democracy was radically changed.' How far do you agree with this view?

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding of the reforms carried out by Ephialtes and Pericles in the 460s and subsequently, and be able to explain their significance in the development of radical democracy during the remainder of the century. Reward clear contextualisation of the material found in our main sources.

On the guide points:

Candidates should discuss the details of the reforms of the 460s, such as the attack by Ephialtes on the Areopagus, and the importance of the powers taken away from that body and given to the assembly, the *boule* and the law courts. In addition, they should cover later changes such as the introduction of state pay (for jury service in the 450s, and probably for other areas such as the *boule*) and changes to citizen status associated with Pericles. Credit discussion of the increased emphasis on the role of the assembly, and of political leaders in the assembly, from this period onwards.

Discussion should cover the significance of the attack on the Areopagus, and the increased emphasis on the role of the political leader in the assembly, as demonstrated by the career of Pericles; credit discussion of the importance of the office of general (*strategos*) for political influence, and the changes that result particularly in the period of the Peloponnesian War, as reported in our sources, such as Thucydides and Aristophanes.

Candidates should show an understanding of what our surviving evidence tells us (and what it does not), and the potential bias of many of the surviving sources such as Thucydides and Aristophanes. Credit discussion of the value of Aristotle's *Ath Pol* for our understanding of the development of the democracy, together with an understanding of the problems inherent in using it for an understanding of fifth century democracy in practice.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

(b) How important was the art of rhetoric for political leaders in Athens during the fifth century?

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding of the way the Athenian democracy worked, including the demands placed on individuals to argue their case in public at various venues, such as the assembly, the *boule*, the law courts and on military service. There should also be discussion of the other factors important for political success, such as wealth and family background, though there is scope for argument about how this changed over the period studied.

On the guide points:

Candidates should discuss the importance of public speaking in the various institutions of the Athenian state, such as the assembly, *boule* and law courts and its role in the promotion of the individual in democratic Athens, particularly where elections were involved (e.g. the generals). This should ideally be illustrated with some specific examples drawn from the contemporary sources, such as the meetings of the assembly included by Thucydides in his *History* and the plays of Aristophanes (e.g. *Knights*, *Acharnians* etc.) and some assessment of the contribution of rhetoric to the success of specific individuals (such as Pericles, Cleon etc.)

Discussion should cover how political figures maintained their profile in Athens, such as their holding elected office (e.g. general), their performance of public duties such as military service and liturgies and their activity in the political arena by attending meetings and speaking to the people in the assembly and the *boule*). Credit use of the evidence of Plutarch, *Life of Pericles*, for attempts to organise support in the assembly (Thucydides son of Melesias), and also details of inscriptions where relevant.

Candidates should show a good understanding of the importance of family background and wealth in a political career through most of the fifth century, and the significant changes brought about by the increasing importance of the assembly in particular during this period, as shown in sources such as Thucydides, Aristophanes and Xenophon. Credit understanding of the importance of personal involvement in public life, through, amongst other things, military service and the liturgy system.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

The archaeology of Minoan Crete

6 (a) How far can archaeological methods determine the existence and extent of a Minoan maritime empire in the Aegean?

The question asks the candidate to examine the archaeological evidence from the Aegean region which points to the existence of a Minoan maritime empire. Better responses will question the ability of archaeological techniques to engage such a question. Candidates might discuss material culture and the existence and form of settlement sites. The archaeological definition of the word 'culture' might become an area for discussion with candidates evaluating whether archaeological cultures point to political domination by a given central state. Fall-off analysis and the use of distribution maps might be useful areas for discussion in this regard. Candidates might advance alternatives to political domination in the form of a greater Minoan cultural region or economic contacts. Place name analysis – for example the use of the place name Minoa – might be a useful area for discussion.

A weaker answer will not have sufficient range and will tend to list functions with little attempt to interlink them. Such responses may place undue emphasis on description at the expense of analysis and evaluation, and may at best have a limited grasp of methods of archaeological interpretation.

Suggested specific evidence might be: the sites at Thera, Melos, Kythera, Rhodes and Keos. A discussion of the nature of material culture might follow with a view to establishing Minoan dominance in the region. Of course, candidates might point to the problems encountered when attempting to establish political unity when using archaeological methods. The mass of pottery evidence from these sites certainly supports commonality of 'culture' in an archaeological sense, moving on to argue for political unity is more difficult. The design and layout of buildings from these sites might also perform a similar function in a response. The bronze ingots at Hagia Triada might be used as evidence for Minoan economic dominance of the Aegean region; once again whether or not this proves political control from some central place on Crete is open to discussion. Responses might discuss the existence, or not, of Minoan naval power as an agent of maritime imperialism, supporting evidence can be found in the mass of seals relating to naval power and the Thera frescoes. Evidence from outside the Minoan world for political unity can be found in Egypt in the form of the Rekhmire tomb paintings. There are references in later Greek literature – for example Herodotus and Diodorus – to a Minoan thalassocracy in the Aegean, the shortcomings of such evidence vis-a-vis the archaeology must, however, be discussed.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	01

(b) To what extent does the form of the palaces on Minoan Crete shed light on their function? Explain your answer.

The question asks the candidates to analyse and evaluate the function of the Minoan palaces in relation to their form. Better answers will identify different functions of the palaces, link each to the supporting archaeological evidence and address the question's requirement for relative evaluation ('To what extent...?'). Such responses will have a firm grasp of the archaeological techniques that underpin the debate. High quality responses, however, will show an ability to link disparate functions and understand the concept of status. Better candidates might discuss developments over time, such as whether the palaces start with one function and acquire or develop others.

A weaker satisfactory answer will not have sufficient range and will tend to list functions with little attempt to interlink them. Such responses may place undue emphasis on description at the expense of analysis and evaluation, and may at best have a limited grasp of methods of archaeological interpretation.

Candidates could discuss the internal layout of the palaces, potential status areas such as throne rooms which may point to an administrative function. This analytical route could then link the form of the palace to other supporting archaeological evidence, for example the regalia found at Mallia. The palaces also contain certain features that point to a ritual function, facilities for bathing (i.e. ritual cleansing) and a lot of the fresco art. The storage facilities at Knossos and other palaces might point to an economic function or, alternatively, a high status centre. Governmental functions might be discussed with reference to written Linear A and B, evidence for status and links with the surrounding territory.

Useful archaeological techniques to consider might include symbols of acquired and attributed power, distribution maps, spatial analysis, site catchment analysis, central place theory and Thiessen polygons.