

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9786 CLASSICAL HERITAGE

9786/03

Paper 3 (Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence),
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 2014 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 2014	9786	03

Essay: Generic Marking Descriptors for Paper 3

- 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 1:1

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 50 – 40 marks	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <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 39 – 30 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <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. • 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	03

3 29 – 20 marks	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <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 19 – 10 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis is limited/thin. • 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 9 – 0 marks	<p>ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LOST CONTROL OF HIS/HER MATERIAL.</p> <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 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	03

General

Any critical exploration as an answer to a Paper 3 question will necessarily encompass differing views, knowledge and argument. Thus the mark scheme for these questions cannot and should not be prescriptive.

Candidates are being encouraged to explore, in the exam room, a theme that they will have studied. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) may make for limitations in answers but this is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked materials of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the actual 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 interpretation and evaluation of the texts offered by an answer.

Successful answers will need to make use of all three passages, draw conclusions and arrive at summative decisions.

1 The changing world of Athens: its friends and enemies

To what extent did internal political disputes and changes of leadership stop Greek states pursuing consistent foreign policies in this period? In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below:

The quotation from Rhodes' article (in the *Cambridge Companion to Periclean Athens*) focuses on an important issue concerning the role of leaders and their ability to direct policy in Athens. The question phrases the issue more generally, so that candidates may choose to deal with other states (such as Sparta); however candidates may focus primarily on Athens, as does the majority of our evidence.

In answering the question, candidates will need to draw on a variety of sources to present their argument. Candidates should be able to present some examples of foreign policy drawn from those sources and be able to discuss the extent to which states (or just Athens) were able to maintain a consistent outlook. Candidates may choose to argue that Athens shows a consistent attitude towards other states through this period, seeking only what was best for herself; but it is also possible to argue that some of the differences apparent in treatment were down to changing leadership (e.g. the change in Athens' relationship with Sparta after 462 BC, the two decisions made about the Mytilene revolt, the dispute over the Sicilian expedition). Credit discussions of specific examples from, for example, Thucydides (such as the Mytilene debate, the Pylos debate, the Sicilian expedition); there is scope also to use Aristophanes' *Acharnians* to raise issue about the popularity of the Peloponnesian War during the 420s.

The passages help focus on two areas. Herodotus presents an example of a change of heart by the Spartans who were seeking to restore the tyrant Hippias to Athens, even though they had only recently ousted him. The description of the Athenians as an 'ungrateful rabble' may be commented on by candidates. By contrast the Thucydides passage paints a negative picture of the state of Sicilian cities; candidates may choose to relate this to other examples of states under stress of civil disagreement (e.g. Corcyra) or may relate this to Athens itself. The context of the speech is also relevant, as Alcibiades and Nicias compete with one another to win the debate over what to do at this stage in the war. This passage opens up also the possibility of discussing disagreements within Athens itself, such as happened in 411 BC or in the final stages of the Peloponnesian War.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	03

Candidates may draw any sensible conclusions provided that these are supported with critical reference to the texts.

2 The Roman Empire: civilisation or submission

To what extent did the Romans see the Empire as a resource to benefit their own interests? In your answer, you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below:

The first passage suggests that Claudius was somewhat alone in seeing the benefits that the ‘conquered’ people could bring to Rome. He clearly had respect for the talents, and saw an advantage in using these to ensure the prosperity of Rome. Notably he saw their strengths on a more intellectual level, rather than just a physical one. Candidates might consider the roles that Claudius gave to freedmen in his court, as well as the extension of citizenship both under Claudius and other emperors to those who were from further afield. They might also give specific examples of the key types of non-Romans mentioned (e.g. Greeks/Asiatic doctors etc.) and show the benefits of such people both to the court of Claudius and Romans more widely.

The passage from Caesar suggests that there would have been economic benefits which could be gained from the conquest of Britain, in particular the wide variety of metals which were available. Candidates might also balance the perceived economic benefits shown in this passage, with the potential that it shows for bringing the Romans together in a mission to Romanize/Civilise the barbarian Britons, and contrast this idea with the other, more tangible benefits that may have come from the conquest. Candidates might also contrast the motives of Julius Caesar shown in this passage with those of Claudius in his invasion of Britain.

The final passage from Josephus shows the exact opposite of the proposition in the initial passage – that the Romans were looking for power, and that crushing anyone who opposed this was the way forward. Discussion here should focus on the brutal nature of the attack on Jerusalem and details of how the city was crushed, and the state to which they brought the inhabitants of the city.

Candidates might consider other elements of the expansion of the Roman Empire, in particular the failure of the Romans in Germania, and their success in Egypt. They might look at the economic and cultural motives for such expansion, as well as considering the political consequences both for individual leaders and emperors (such as Julius Caesar, Augustus and Claudius). They might also consider whether the expansion of the empire as well as its maintenance was of significance for Romans more widely.

The variety of opinions suggested in these passages is intended to set up a debate about how the Romans saw the empire and the people within it. Candidates may wish to analyse the proposition in different ways: they could look at the different geographical regions, the differing political questions or the way in which the issues changed as the empire developed during the first century AD.

Candidates are expected to discuss examples drawn from the range of the prescribed texts. It is to be hoped that some candidates may offer examples and consider ideas from their wider reading beyond the prescription.

Candidates may draw any sensible conclusions provided that these are supported with critical reference to the texts.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	03

3 Drama: the idea of tragedy

Explore critically the extent to which discoveries and reversals of fortune in tragedy contribute to the audience’s experience. In your answer, you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below:

The opening quotation from Aristotle directs candidates to consider two of the more conventionally recognised elements of a ‘typical’ tragedy: reversal or *peripeteia*, and discovery or recognition. Candidates ought to be familiar with these concepts and any candidate not addressing either with some substance ought not to access higher mark bands without particularly good reason.

The seed passage from *Oedipus the King* is from the beginning of the play, and should encourage candidates to explore how the end of the play is set up from the start. Sensible observations here might include the added impact of Oedipus’ determination to discover the truth about Laius, in order to bring about justice, being the driving force behind his discovery of his own identity and crimes; the presence of Apollo guiding him towards this discovery and therefore the horror of the gods being behind his suffering; the irony of fearing an attack on his person by the same villain, in that his discovery leads him to do exactly that in a pitiable and horrific way; the reference to family relationships setting up his horrific discovery of his true relationship to Laius. The reference to violence may well lead to an examination of the link between discovery and pity/fear in this play. In exploring the way discovery leads to reversal in this play, candidates may discuss how Oedipus moves from king to beggar (with the usual caveat over the common misconception that Oedipus goes into exile at the end of the play); stronger candidates may argue that it is not the change in status that is significant, but the reduction of Oedipus from the respected, authoritative and dynamic figure of this speech to the pitied, powerless and weak figure of the close.

The seed passage from *Medea* instead focuses attention on the end of the play, and Jason’s discovery of both the reality and nature of Medea’s revenge against him. Here it is arguable that much of the pity and fear has already been felt in the murder of the children; most candidates are likely to feel that Jason is a largely unsympathetic character, and thus may sensibly suggest that, while technically his is the discovery and reversal that brings the play to its conclusion, any pity and fear felt regarding him is limited. If then exploring catharsis further, they may question whether the end of this play really does bring it about in the way that *Oedipus the King* may. Candidates may also observe a double discovery and reversal here, as Jason discovers not only how he has fallen, but how Medea has risen; this second reversal may provoke fear of Medea, but is unlikely to provoke pity. Candidates should also be aware of Aristotle’s criticism of the ending of this play, in particular that the use of a *deus ex machina* provides an unsatisfactory conclusion; they may include this in their discussion, but may not necessarily agree with Aristotle on this point.

Candidates ought to include the other plays they have read in their discussion of this question in whatever way seems appropriate to them. For example, they may compare the effectiveness of the discovery and its consequent catharsis in the two Oedipus plays, or they may compare the revelation of Medea’s revenge with that of Clytemnestra’s. The strength with which Aristotle identifies his ideal play with *Oedipus the King* may mean that weaker candidates analyse other plays less effectively, and in this case reasonable attempts to do so should be credited so long as some recognisable focus on the question is evident; candidates answering in the highest bands ought nonetheless to be able to discuss all plays in light of Aristotle’s observations, including where plays do not fit his observations but may nonetheless be successful.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	03

4 Gods and Heroes: the importance of epic

Explore critically Gransden’s assessment of the motivation of heroes. In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of Epic as well as the two passages below:

A successful exploration of this type of question in paper 3 will require the candidate to define their argument to answer this question by picking up on the key point of Gransden’s statement: the prime motivation being individual glory. It is to be hoped that candidates will find this to be an accessible area for investigation and that they may pick up on the idea that, while a thirst for individual glory is a prime motivator, it may not be the only one and that it may not be unqualified.

The passage from the *Iliad* should be well known and is specifically mentioned in the syllabus notes. Even though this extract may seem to reinforce the Gransden statement, when Sarpedon’s speech is looked at in its entirety it does qualify the notion with some regrets. Sarpedon would change the way his society operates if he could, but he can’t. It is also noteworthy that Sarpedon and the Lycian nobles have little to gain from the war apart from individual glory as their land is not under threat. Tangentially, of course, Sarpedon is a son of Zeus and as such has a destiny placed on him that even Zeus, regretfully, will not change. Thereby, perhaps, making the individual glory trait of the hero with its consequential death more immutable. There are many other examples of heroes seeking individual glory from both the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* – Achilles, Hector, Patroclus, Turnus, Nisus and Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus and even Iulus to a certain degree. Candidates may also recognise that, even after death, the glory of an individual will be remembered either through a burial mound (see *Iliad* 7) or the stark nature of the choice Achilles has to make before going to Troy. Candidates may wish to note that when Odysseus meets Achilles in the underworld in the *Odyssey* that the view that individual glory is a goal worth seeking is largely rebuffed and that Achilles is more interested in finding out about his son.

It is to be hoped that the passage from the *Aeneid* will lead candidates to challenge the view that individual glory is all-important and that, for various reasons, this quest needs to be qualified. It may be appropriate to discuss whether this may be due to the demands of a culturally more sophisticated society and the requirements of what is often called ‘secondary’ epic. In the *Aeneid*, generally, those characters that seek individual glory in an Iliadic manner fail (and die) and are shown to have many faults or shortcomings, as here with Mezentius. In this way they may not be seen as the paragon to aim for, while the rather less exciting Aeneas is very much the epitome of the Roman hero - one who establishes his status not primarily by seeking individual glory on the battlefield, for example, but through hard work and achieving a difficult task that he has been set. It is true that Aeneas establishes the Trojans in Italy through battle and single combat but the duel between Turnus and Aeneas is not one in which Virgil allows for any exultation but points up vividly its brutality and pointlessness.

While candidates may bring the *Odyssey* in to their answers and it would be pleasing if they were to comment on the nature of Odysseus’ search for individual glory, the quotation directs candidates specifically towards the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* and so answers focussing on those two texts alone will be able to access the whole range of marks. There can be no doubt that Odysseus’ adventures and his reclaiming of his kingdom serve to fulfil that desire for glory but in a different way from the battlefield. In that area Odysseus’ reputation is already secure.

There is a wide range of material that may be called upon to discuss Gransden’s assessment. Candidates are also expected to discuss further examples drawn from the range of the prescribed texts. It is to be hoped that some candidates may offer examples and consider ideas from their wider reading beyond the prescription.