

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

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

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 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 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 | <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 20-16 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, 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 | <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 10 – 5 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 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 | <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 3 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 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.

Alexander the Great

1 (a) To what extent did Alexander's achievements match his ambitions? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, what Alexander achieved by the end of his life; Alexander's ambitions; the reliability of the evidence for Alexander's intentions during his Persian campaign.]

Specific

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Candidates need to demonstrate an understanding of Alexander's achievements over the course of his lifetime, selecting a number of specific examples, and be able to set these against what they understand to have been his intentions. Candidates may choose to focus on specific points of time, such as the death of Darius or Alexander's own death.

Candidates should discuss what Alexander achieved as a Macedonian commander and leader of the Greek invasion force. They should provide a range of detail from the course of the invasion, covering (for example) the initial campaign against Darius, the subsequent assumption of the Persian throne, the expedition to India; they may also consider his attempts to unite Macedonians and Greeks with the Persians. There is also scope for discussion of the lasting value of Alexander's achievements, given the fragmentation of his empire after his death, and the limited success of the attempts to unite the different groups.

Discussion should cover what Alexander was trying to achieve at different points in the campaign, including the original motive behind the expedition and subsequent changes, if any. Candidates may also want to discuss Alexander's view of himself, the significance of his interest in deification and the reasons why he acted as he did, for example on the expedition to India or his attempt to make close links between the different peoples who came under his control. They may also discuss his plans immediately before his death.

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 what he achieved or what he was trying to do. Credit should be given for an understanding of the sources available to later writers, and their different approaches to their subject.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

- 1 (b) Was Alexander's adoption of Persian customs a betrayal of his Macedonian background? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the relationship between a Macedonian king and his people; the reasons for the adoption of Persian customs by Alexander; the reaction of his Macedonian forces.]

Specific

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding of the different elements Alexander took over from the Persian court and the reasons he had for doing so. They may wish to concentrate on the adoption of Persian dress, the attempt to encourage obeisance, the continuation of Persian government (including the use of local satraps), and the significance of the intermarriage arranged by Alexander. This should be set against the background of the Macedonian monarchy, with the traditional close relationship between the king and his nearest advisers, and also between the king and the Macedonian army. In this context the reaction of different sections of his forces and some of his significant generals to the changes he introduced should be considered.

Candidates should discuss the very close relationship between the Macedonian king and his army, particularly its leaders; there should be discussion of specific individuals amongst Alexander's close circle of friends. Credit discussion of the outspokenness which was very much a part of the relationship between king and close circle.

Discussion should cover the different possible interpretations of Alexander's choices, including his attraction to the very different concept of kingship in Persia, his use of local customs to encourage the acceptance of his new regime by conquered peoples and his attempt to draw Macedonians/Greeks closer to the Persian nobility. Candidates may also choose to look at the system of government he inherited for conquered territories, including his initial reliance on those who were already acting as local representatives of the Persian king; and also his conception of himself (as king or god) and the extent to which this played a part in the changes he sought to introduce.

Candidates should show a good understanding of particular confrontations between Alexander and his forces, including the killing of Philotas, his argument with Cleitus, the Pages' Revolt, the mutiny at the Hyphasis River and at Opis. Credit a nuanced discussion of the relationship between king and army, and Alexander's response to the challenges at the different points selected.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

Foundations of comedy: Aristophanes and Menander

- 2 (a) 'Comedy was only intended to make the audience laugh.' How far is this a fair assessment of the aims of Athenian comic playwrights? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the types of humour used by Aristophanes and Menander; how the humour was related to contemporary society; any political or social messages in the plays.]

Specific

Because of the inclusion of 'only' in the statement, candidates should question this, and consider other aims for comedy. A reasonable response would be to look at the aspects of humour reflected in a range of plays, and then consider the other messages which are present in Aristophanes and, to some extent, Menander, in particular the social and political commentary in Aristophanes.

Key areas for discussion might include:

The use of humour in Aristophanes: references to contemporary politicians (especially 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 more gentle humour of Menander in *Dyskolos* could be contrasted with that in Aristophanes.

Social commentary: answers might include consideration of the *Clouds* and the commentary on the sophistic movement contained in it, including some of the philosophical views, and the idea of a conflict of generations.

Political commentary: the *Wasps* and the issue of the law courts (might also tie into the conflict of generations); opening of the *Acharnians*. The question of peace in the Peloponnesian War, and the appeals in *Acharnians*, *Peace* and *Lysistrata*, with some reference to the political context of their production.

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.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

2 (b) 'In comedy the Chorus adds little to the plays.' To what extent do you agree?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the identity and role of the Chorus in the plays you have studied; what it does to develop the plot; how it helps the audience to enjoy the play. You should discuss the plays of both Aristophanes and Menander.]

Specific

Candidates should argue with the proposition in the question and consider the contribution of the Chorus to each of the plays they choose. In the case of Menander, they will have to consider whether our lack of knowledge of the role played by the Chorus damages our appreciation of the play.

Candidates might consider the importance of the comic hero, and note how the attention of the audience tends to be focussed on these characters, rather than on the Chorus. Nevertheless, any comedies are named after their Chorus, who add much to the meaning of the play by their presence and their name, if not through their actions.

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

Acharnians: attack Dicaeopolis and add to the sense of drama and opposition to what he is trying to do.

Peace: Chorus has a key role in helping to extract 'Peace' from the cave, and their Panhellenic nature adds much to the meaning of the play.

Wasps: Chorus has a key symbolic role, but they do not necessarily add much to the action, which is more focussed on the key actors.

Clouds: the Chorus do very little, but they represent the new deities which Socrates is proposing to worship. When they first enter, and Socrates worships them, this must lead the audience to question his religious beliefs.

Lysistrata: key role of Chorus as representing the women of Greece, but then division with the men as well enables Aristophanes to set up a conflict on stage which adds to the drama.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

Socrates as seen through the eyes of Plato

3 (a) Assess the reasons for Socrates' unpopularity. [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, Socrates' relationship with the sophists; the charges against Socrates; the manner of Socrates' defence.]

Specific

Candidates should attempt to define 'popularity': was Socrates always unpopular? With whom was he unpopular? Is the best evidence for his unpopularity the fact of his trial, the verdict and the sentence?

It would be appropriate to put the trial in the context of the restored democracy after the end of the oligarchic coup of 404/403 BC, and to deal with the view that the charges launched against Socrates may be best explained by the hostility caused by his association with Critias (and, to a lesser extent, Alcibiades). His association with the sophists (see the various Platonic dialogues but most especially Aristophanes' *Clouds*) was likely to have been a cause of unpopularity with those many Athenian citizens who were not part of the intelligentsia. Socrates' attempts to distinguish himself from the sophists – in the ideas he examined, and in the fact that he claimed not to take fees – is unlikely to have convinced many Athenian citizens. His attempt to distinguish himself in Plato's *Apology* – however much we distrust it as a record of his actual defence speech – may also have been self-defeating.

It may be that the best explanations of his unpopularity are the fact he was a nuisance (a charge he admits in the gadfly section of *The Apology*) and his perceived arrogance, as in his argument about the sentence in Plato and as discussed in Xenophon.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

3 (b) Discuss Socrates' views of the duties of the citizen. [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, Socrates' refusal to flee Athens (*Crito*); the discussion of justice in the *Republic*; Socrates' attitude towards democratic government.]

Specific

Candidates should be prepared to put Socrates' ethical concerns at the very heart of their essay. The questions that concern the (Platonic) Socrates are mainly ethical: what is justice? What is virtue? Can virtue be taught?

In one sense at least it can be argued that Socrates was a typical Greek. He thought that one could not answer these questions outside the context of the *polis*. That is why the question about justice in *The Republic* becomes a discussion of what the ideal city would be like. Socrates may not have liked Athenian democratic politics, but he is by no means apolitical.

There are some events in Socrates' life which should be looked at: his military service; his role in the trial of the Generals after the battle of Arginusae; his behaviour during the reign of the 30; and his refusal to flee in order to avoid his death penalty.

A wide range of evidence needs to be used and evaluated. Healthy scepticism about how much we can rely on should be rewarded.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

Greek architecture

- 4 (a) 'The variety of styles used in different buildings on the Acropolis detracts from the aesthetic appeal of the complex as a whole.' How far can this view be justified? [25]

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, comparing the buildings which were constructed on the Acropolis at Athens; the variety of styles in which they were built; the possible reasons for the use of these styles.]

Specific

The question asks the candidate to consider the variety of buildings found on the Acropolis, to discuss the variety of styles and architectural features which they exemplify, and to reach a conclusion about the aesthetic cohesion of the complex as a whole. Clearly this is an open question in that, provided appropriate support is provided, a case might be argued either way – but a specific conclusion *is* necessary!

Aside from the Parthenon, Doric in essence and 'traditional' from this standpoint, candidates ought to consider the Propylaea (which provided the visual context and scene-setting for ancient visitors more than it does today when visitors are familiar with the site from guide-books), the Erechtheum (which itself might be argued to be either a complex fusion of styles or an attempt to combine multiple functions and styles on a difficult site without total success from an aesthetic standpoint), and the purely Ionic temple of Athena Nike (would a *Doric* Athena Nike have looked as fine?). Suitable context material such as the functions of each building and the sequence of construction should be rewarded appropriately where accurate detail is supplied, whether from the surviving material or from literary sources (e.g. Plutarch *Perikles*).

Good answers will address both 'ways' and 'extent' as they proceed, and reach a firm conclusion; weaker ones may describe well, but fail to analyse and/or respond to these 'extent' clearly.

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

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

- 4 (b) 'The grandeur and purity of the Doric order meant that developments in the architecture of religious sites were not strictly necessary.' To what extent do the buildings you have studied from Greek religious sites bear out this view? [25]

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, the details of both Doric and Ionic orders; the specific designs of individual buildings; changes to the Doric order incorporated in them.]

Specific

The question requires some detailed discussion of specific examples of temples 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. This should be developed as a platform for evaluative discussion about the relative merits of each order from an aesthetic perspective. 'Grandeur and purity' may be evaluated and explored using examples such as the Hephaestum and temple of Poseidon, Apollo at Delphi, Zeus and Hera at Olympia. These should be contrasted with developments – particularly in the temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassae, and perhaps better known in the Acropolis at Athens – with some attempts at explanation as to why elements of the Ionic order, and then complete Ionic temples, were introduced. Were these aesthetic statements or political ones (Athenians preferring their own 'Ionic') or merely developments in fashion?

Candidates may also discuss whether some technical issues had a part to play (understanding that stone had greater weight-bearing potential than the Doric order indicated). There may be discussion of symmetry, elegance of line, the finer and more 'feminine' Ionic style contrasted with the more 'solid' or 'rugged' Doric (depending on your point of view!).

Any temple may be used as an example in the discussion; it is the accurate detail and evaluation of each example which should be credited. Stronger responses will address 'unnecessary' and evaluate reasons why the Ionic order was used, with accurate dating of temples and detailed descriptions; weaker responses may simply outline the essential elements of the two orders and juxtapose them while not reaching any supported conclusion, or offer unsupported assertions.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

The rise of democracy in fifth-century Athens

5 (a) To what extent can we trust the portrayal of Pericles in the surviving sources? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the details of what Pericles actually achieved; the way Pericles is presented by Thucydides and Plutarch; alternative perspectives on Pericles.]

Specific

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding of Pericles' career and the way he is portrayed in the sources. Candidates should be aware of the potential bias in the evidence derived from Thucydides, and the likely impact of this on subsequent writers. Credit should be given for assessment of those sources which survive only in fragments, especially those which challenge the dominant tradition derived from Thucydides. Reward clear contextualisation of the material found in our main sources.

Candidates should discuss the details of Pericles' career and show a good understanding of the range of source material we can use to fill out this picture. There should be a good understanding of the limits of the surviving evidence and that biography, as a genre, did not begin to develop until some time after Pericles' death. Pericles' actions should be placed in the context of his time; credit should be given for a range of details of Pericles' military and political achievements, especially if these can be interpreted to show what sort of a person he was and how he achieved his success in the Athenian democracy.

Discussion should cover the strengths and weaknesses of these two important sources. Thucydides presents a contemporary view; credit assessment of his personal bias for Pericles and his generally anti-democratic stance. The issue of Thucydides' approach to speeches raises important questions about what we know about Pericles' policies. In discussing Plutarch, there should be some understanding of the project of the Parallel Lives, and awareness of the particular interest Plutarch had in matters of character. There should be a judgement on the value of these two sources for our understanding of Pericles.

Candidates should show awareness of other approaches, preserved in our sources. Discussion of the representation of Pericles in Old Comedy is one fruitful area, and discussion of the range of sources behind Plutarch's fifth-century lives another. Credit understanding of the possible bias of sources, and the limited range to which we have access.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 12 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

- 5 (b) Do you agree that, under Pericles, Athens became a city dominated by the interests of the poor? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the opportunities for the poor to engage in political activity; Pericles' role in developing this; the importance of other groups in Attica.]

Specific

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Candidates need to show a thorough understanding of the way the Athenian democracy worked, including the various institutions to which the poor had access in the later part of the fifth century. Candidates should focus on the significance of 'dominated', and consider both how the poor affected decision-making in Athens and to what extent other groups (such as the aristocrats, the rich) were able to play a decisive part. Credit discussion of particular examples which illustrate the argument and show change during the period.

Candidates should discuss the various institutions of fifth-century Athens in which the poor played a part (such as the *ekklesia*, *boule* and law courts: credit also discussion of *demes*). Credit discussion of the importance of state pay in allowing the broadening of the influence of the poor, particularly the city poor; sources include the *Ath.Pol.*, the Old Oligarch and Aristophanes. Particular examples of assembly meetings recorded by Thucydides and Xenophon may be discussed to advantage (the Mytilene debate, the Pylos debate, the Sicilian debate, the trial of the generals).

Discussion should cover Pericles' role in the development of the democracy in association with Ephialtes, including the transfer of power from the Areopagus to the law courts, *ekklesia* and *boule*. In particular, the introduction of state pay for jury service (and probably other payments as well) broadened the opportunities for particularly the city poor to participate more actively in the democracy (though payment for attending the *ekklesia* was not introduced until the 390s).

There should also be discussion of Pericles' role in the *ekklesia*, and his influence there, as reported by Thucydides and Plutarch. This can be broadened to show the close connection between the developing imperialism in the Aegean and the growing importance of the poor as both voters and rowers in the fleet. Credit discussion of the general restriction of leadership to those of higher status, at least until after Pericles' death.

Candidates should show a good understanding of the importance of family and wealth in a political career through most of the fifth century, and the significant changes brought about by the increasing revenues of empire and the pressures of the Peloponnesian War, as shown in sources such as Thucydides and Xenophon. Credit understanding of the liturgy system in Athens and the involvement of richer Athenians in the army, cavalry and navy.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 13 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

The archaeology of Minoan Crete

- 6 (a) To what extent can archaeological methods be used to determine the extent of the political unity of Minoan Crete? [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the role of the palaces; central place theory; Thiessen polygons; material culture; theories of state organisation.]

Specific

The question asks candidates to analyse and evaluate the unity – or not – of Minoan Crete. Better candidates will be aware that the extent of unity might vary from period to period. The question also questions the ability of archaeology to determine political structures. Thus, shared material culture might not be enough to justify unity. 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.

The role of the palaces as centres of power is an obvious area to debate, so too the existence of a ruling elite. A common approach would be to argue that Knossos is the centre of power on the island, the capital for want of a better word, with the other palaces acting as regional centres.

Better responses might address what might indicate unity other than shared material culture. The economic, administrative and cultural unity of the island are areas for debate.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 14 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2012 | 9786 | 01 |

- 6 (b) How far is it possible to determine the social organisation of Minoan Crete? Explain your answer. [25]

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, art in the form of wall paintings; pottery and small artefacts; buildings and their design.]

Specific

The question asks the candidates to analyse and evaluate the evidence for social organisation in Minoan Crete. Better answers will identify the limitations of the evidence and address the question's requirement for relative evaluation. Such responses will have a firm grasp of the archaeological techniques that underpin the debate.

A partially satisfactory answer will not have sufficient range and will tend to take evidence at face value and/or be unable to interlink different types of evidence to produce a coherent and well structured response. The functions of different social groups may tend to be listed. 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.

Better responses should work on several levels with social organisation being discussed in relation to the economic, ritual and military role of individuals. Status – both ascribed and acquired – is a rich area for discussion. Gender might form part of the response especially with reference to the high status held by some females within Minoan society, and this might be used to discuss the potential existence of a matriarchal society on the island. Specialisation could also be an issue for debate and the possibility of the existence of a society with castes. Candidates might rightly point out that social organisation might change over time. Further, the nature of the evidence might favour a discussion of the question with reference to the elite of Minoan society, with better responses showing that the evidence might be more complete for this social group.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.