

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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	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 39-30 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. • 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 29 – 20 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 19 – 10 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 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	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	03

The changing world of Athens: its friends and enemies

1 To what extent does the bias of the sources affect our view of the achievements of the Athenians under democracy? [50]

Specific

The quotation from Anton Powell's book raises a central issue in the interpretation of the Athenian Empire. He suggests that Thucydides' own experience as a general and wealthy individual in Athens led him to present a one-sided account of the reaction by other states to the democracy. Candidates may wish to argue with this interpretation of Thucydides, though they should be able to draw on the evidence of the other sources they have studied.

In answering the question, candidates will need to draw on a variety of sources to present their argument. Discussion should focus on the nature of our surviving sources and the view of the democracy presented in them. Candidates may fruitfully draw on the Old Oligarch: credit analysis of the presentation of democracy in this work. Pericles' Funeral Speech is another significant source which gives us a compelling insight into the nature of the Athenian democracy and its achievements, though it is arguable that it presents a very different account from that found in the main narrative of Thucydides.

The passages help focus on two areas. Thucydides' account of the negotiations between the Athenians and Melians in Book 5 puts a very strong version of Athenian imperialism (one of the achievements of the Athenian democracy), and the fate of Melos suggests a considerable degree of ruthlessness. This passage suggests that the Melians, as islanders, pose a particular sort of threat to the Empire, and that the Athenians are justified in acting to maintain their power. Credit an understanding of the significance of this episode, and, in particular, the unusual presentation by Thucydides. The Aristophanes passage focuses on the reaction of Megara, a state allied to Athens until 446 BC, but by the time of the play back in the Spartan fold, and suffering under the Megarian decrees. The passage uses the contemporary situation to raise laughs in the theatre, and candidates should address the reliability of evidence presented by Aristophanes for the achievements of the Athenian democracy. The Megarians, as presented here, seem more interested in trade, something which had been facilitated by the development of the Athenian Empire through its control of the seas and suppression of piracy.

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

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	03

The Roman empire: civilisation or submission?

2 To what extent were provincials forced to submit to the Romans? [50]

Specific

In the passage, Goodman outlines a sense of freedom within the Roman Empire for provincials to continue with their own culture, and yet also presents the idea of Agricola turning the people of Britain towards Roman culture. In particular, candidates might pick on the idea of retaining a non-Roman lifestyle and how this might have enabled provincials to avoid submitting on one level. The quotation from Tacitus within this could make a starting point for the consideration of whether provincials willingly submitted to Roman influences, or whether they were forced to do so, whilst Goodman's final comments could lead to further debate about the validity of Tacitus' own comments.

The passages from Tacitus and Josephus are intended to give contrasting views about the relationship between the provincials and the Romans. On the one hand, Agricola's attempts to ensure that provincials were given just, exemplary government, and the importance of the governing household setting an example - which might suggest that the provincials did not submit so much, but rather were influenced in a more positive way. On the other hand, the Josephus passage gives a clear picture of the more violent aspects of the imposition of Roman rule.

Better answers may consider the range of ways in which the Romans attempted to control subject states, including the idea of client kingdoms, as well as the growth of the imperial cult during this period, and its clashes with established religions, such as Judaism.

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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	03

Drama: the idea of tragedy

3 Explore critically the different ways in which the tragedians employed vengeance in their plays. [50]

Specific

The quotation from Morwood concerning the *Medea*, coupled with passages from the *Agamemnon* and *Oedipus the King*, ought to be a clear signal that candidates should address all three Greek tragedies in some meaningful way in their answers; those who do not are unlikely to achieve higher band marks. The 'missing' play is Seneca's *Oedipus*; some candidates may write very well on the place vengeance has in this play, and its differences from the Greek plays; those, however, who concentrate on the Greek plays ought still to be able to achieve very high marks given the inevitable Greek focus of the question (providing, of course, that their responses merit it in the first place).

Morwood's statement ought to prompt consideration of whether it is vengeance itself that is 'appalling', or simply the manner in which Medea takes it. This is a standard, if crucial, issue with the play, and candidates ought to be well-versed and well-prepared; and even if not, it should not be difficult to write an essay giving some consideration to this question. Weaker candidates are likely to discuss simply the ethics of the situation Euripides presents, without necessarily making reference to the playwright, as if commenting on a case from life; stronger ones will need to treat the play as literature, discussing the effects of the situation created on the audience. Candidates may note that, unlike in the plays quoted in the question, Medea is not avenging a murder, but care ought to be taken here: Euripides goes to some pains to make clear that the sentence of exile upon a woman with no other male to support her is tantamount to a death sentence for her and her children; and Jason's offers of support are barely credible.

The passage from the *Agamemnon* prophesies the coming of Orestes as an agent explicitly of divine justice, and thus highlights a crucial difference from the *Medea*, which higher level candidates ought to spot and explore. In the *Medea*, the divine is conspicuous by its notable absence, the gods having nothing to do with the vengeance in the play; here they are presented as ensuring vengeance occurs, and therefore exercising some level of judgement and punishment on wrongdoers. The fact that these lines are spoken by Cassandra, a prophetess, gives them divine authority; this is not merely a character's hope, but a statement of divine intent. The murder of Agamemnon, and by extension of Cassandra, will therefore be avenged, but candidates should also explore the wider compass of vengeance in this play.

Agamemnon is murdered, at least in part, as vengeance for Iphigenia; his death is also presented as a punishment from the gods for sacrilege during the fall of Troy; the killing of Iphigenia itself is presented as necessary recompense for the dead of Troy; and Aegisthus' motivation is in part a continuation of the feud between Atreus and Thyestes in the previous generation. Another point of comparison worthy of consideration is the impossibility of unaided human vengeance for the murder of Agamemnon in this play: the Chorus are noticeably helpless, and vengeance will only be achieved through the divine agency represented by Orestes. In the *Medea*, on the other hand, vengeance is entirely in the hands of mortal characters (though some candidates may instead reasonably assert that Medea herself becomes a force of divine vengeance, and in that case may build a convincing case for her transformation from typical 'Greek' woman to divine figure as the play progresses).

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	03

The passage from *Oedipus the King* also explicitly links the gods and the requirement for vengeance after murder. Rather than the gods providing the means for vengeance, though, the situation imagined here is their anger at mortals not taking charge of it for themselves, and prompting them to do so through suffering. Oedipus, presented as a good king, is appalled at the failure to do so, and so the moral world of the play includes a clear principle whereby a victim ought to be avenged. The broader point is then that Oedipus embodies this principle so thoroughly that he cannot abandon the pursuit of vengeance even when it becomes clear to him that it ought to be taken against himself. Unlike the *Agamemnon*, then, where mortals are almost wholly corrupt or helpless and gods are required to step in, here Oedipus represents a purity of moral purpose to a terrible degree, and it is the gods' prompts, firstly taking the form of suffering in the plague, and then seeming more designed to bring about Oedipus' downfall than to ensure vengeance for Laius, that seem needlessly cruel.

Good candidates may then observe a development in the playwrights' presentation of vengeance in their plays, from a divine agency correcting the wrongdoings of mortals, to a world where the divine is absent, or at least disinterested, the *Oedipus* being a middle ground. Still, the question asks for the playwrights' employment of vengeance, not their presentation of it, and, as suggested above, to reach the highest band candidates must discuss vengeance as a dramatic concept, and not simply a branch of ethical philosophy; they must approach vengeance as part of the structure of the play, and not the plays as evidence for a Greek concept of vengeance. Discussion should therefore observe how the playwrights direct the audience to consider vengeance, and how it operates within the plays to create tension, pathos, suspense, excitement etc.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	03

Gods and heroes: the importance of epic.

4 Explore critically Jenkyns' assessment of the similar natures of gods and heroes. [50]

Specific

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 Jenkyns' statement, namely that gods and heroes are very similar in many ways. It is to be hoped that the two supporting passages will help candidates to expand on the idea that gods, sometimes, behave in a way that is 'ungodlike' while heroes seem to be more 'godlike' and serious in their behaviour, which is another key part of the quotation. Although Jenkyns leads with the idea that 'an ancient critic said that Homer', the same could also be said of Juno's behaviour, in particular, in the Aeneid.

The first passage (deliberately leaving out what Achilles says his fates are) illustrates the tension between the search for honour and glory and the imminence of death. It shows Achilles giving serious consideration to what is a difficult dilemma to resolve. However, once he has made his decision, he does show himself to be almost carefree in his search for eternal glory - for example in his discussion with his horses. On the other hand he is also well aware of the hand that Zeus deals mortals from the jars by his throne. Candidates may also be aware of Homer's famous simile of the leaves from Book 6 of the Iliad which suggests, perhaps, that man achieves immortality in a generational way. Juno's outburst is one of the most famous parts of the Aeneid, coming as it does from the beginning of Book 10 and the Council of the gods. It should be seen as an indication of a god behaving in an 'ungodlike' fashion. It may be contrasted with the 'imperial' way Jupiter is portrayed in closing the same council or even Neptune being compared to the 'man of some weight' calming a riot by his presence in Book 1 of the Aeneid.

Candidates may also find plenty of examples of 'ungodlike' behaviour - the story of Ares and Aphrodite from the Odyssey, for example, which might be contrasted with the fact that in all the epics there are no examples of adultery between mortals. Venus, in Book 1 of the Aeneid, gives a pretty good impression of an 'airhead' whilst in reality she is as calculating as Juno. Zeus can appear indecisive in the Odyssey but does take action when he absolutely has to – the sun god's cattle, for example. He does begin and end the poem, first by complaining about mortals and the way they blame the gods and, finally, by unleashing a thunderbolt which halts Odysseus in his tracks. Candidates may compare Zeus and his behaviour with the behaviour of Agamemnon. He could be seen to be behaving as petulantly as a spoilt child in his dealings with Achilles. The same could be said of Achilles towards Agamemnon.

There are plenty of examples to draw on of foolish behaviour by mortals – Nisus and Euryalus, Odysseus. There are also many examples of heroes behaving with a godlike dignity, Aeneas and his mission.

There are also many examples of men being happy even with the imminence of death, though that happiness may often be tempered in some way. It may be noted that there is often a contrast between the general happiness and the sadness of an individual.

There is a wide range of material that may be called upon to discuss Jenkyns' 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.

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