

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 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 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

### 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 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"> <li>• Strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly.</li> <li>• Sustained argument with a strong sense of direction. Strong, substantiated conclusions.</li> <li>• Gives full expression to material relevant to both AOs.</li> <li>• Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued.</li> <li>• Wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer.</li> <li>• Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated.</li> <li>• Response covers both AOs, but is especially strong on one AO so reaches this Level by virtue of the argument/analysis.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided.</li> <li>• Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality.</li> <li>• Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description.</li> <li>• The requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
2  10 – 5 marks	ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are sketchy at best.</li> <li>• Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin.</li> <li>• Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance.</li> <li>• Perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether).</li> <li>• Patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered.</li> <li>• Little or no argument. Any conclusions are very weak. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance.</li> <li>• Little or no display of relevant information.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt to address AO2.</li> <li>• Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

### **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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	03

## 1 The changing world of Athens: its friends and enemies

**To what extent did the impact of war on ordinary people change during the fifth century BC?** [50]

### Specific

The quotation from Raaflaub's article (in the *Cambridge Companion to Periclean Athens*) focuses on a specific issue to do with the impact of war on Greek society, and specifically the general population, including non-combatants. During the period studied, the Greeks (particularly, but not exclusively, the Athenians) seemed increasingly ready to adopt very severe measures against enemies and, especially, allies seeking to break free from restrictive alliances.

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 warfare and imperialism presented in them. Candidates should show knowledge and understanding of Herodotus' *Histories*, in particular the very positive account given of the achievement of the Greek forces working together, and the generally positive views of the leading cities of Greece, though there is also plenty of evidence of underlying strains in these relationships, even amongst those who combined together to fight the Persians. Candidates may contrast the evidence provided by Thucydides for this period: credit analysis of specific examples (such as the Mytilene debate, the punishment of Scione and the Melian dialogue) from his work, though credit should also be given for the actions of the Spartans (e.g. the siege of Plataea) and the impact of civil war (e.g. in Corcyra). Pericles' Funeral Speech is another significant source which gives us a compelling insight into the nature of the Athenian values, 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. Herodotus' discussion of the Persian attack on the acropolis of Athens shows that the stakes were very high in a war against a foreign enemy, and that the impact of conquest for Athens was likely to be severe, because of the previous history of Athens' relations with Persia (including the Ionian revolt and the treatment of Persian heralds). By contrast the Thucydides passage reflects the strained relationship between Greek states during the early years of the Peloponnesian War and the potential for violence against those who were defeated; even though in this case, the punishment was scaled back, a significant number of those opposed to Athenian rule were put to death (presumably largely from the more affluent element predisposed towards Sparta), and this was taken further in the case of Scione and Melos within a short time. Credit discussion of the end of the Peloponnesian war, when there was a significant fear in Athens that their former allies, together with their avowed enemies such as Thebes and Corinth) would seek a similar fate for Athens as she had meted out to others (Xenophon *History of My Times* 2.2).

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

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

## 2 The Roman empire: civilisation or submission?

**To what extent did the Romans think of non-Romans, both inside and outside the Empire, as barbarians?** [50]

### **Specific**

In the passage, Wells outlines the idea of the Barbarian and the notion that there is a concept of the barbarian which the Romans projected on to others. A deeper level of philosophical meaning is also given to this by the analysis from Themistius in relation to the barbarian within each person.

Both passages are intended to give candidates a starting point for the discussion of the nature of the barbarians and how the Romans might have seen them. Candidates can then move to the description of the inhabitants of Britannia from Tacitus, and look at the elements of this description which give a clear picture of how Tacitus viewed them. In particular, their relationship with the Gauls can be analysed. On the other hand, the Josephus passage gives a clear account of some of the traditions within Jewish society, which mark them out as different from the Romans.

Candidates should discuss a range of different peoples – the examples given are taken from opposite ends of the empire intentionally – and should consider both the concept of the Barbarian and how it was applied. In particular, they should also draw on their knowledge of Caesar's *Gallic Wars* to give examples of his interaction with the Gauls, and how he saw them.

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 2013	9786	03

### 3 Drama: the idea of tragedy

**Explore critically the extent to which changes in fortune in tragedy are due to error rather than deliberate wrongdoing.** [50]

#### Specific

The question allows for a superficially straightforward discussion of whether characters who suffer reversal do so because of a deliberate or unconscious act. The first extract directs candidates to the obvious case, that of Oedipus, who was not aware he was killing his father or having children by his mother, and is concerned throughout the plays to do the right thing. But in all the plays the question is in fact more complex. Even with Oedipus, good candidates may observe that, while he did not know the full impact of his actions, he did know that he was killing a man, and he did know that he was taking a wife, and so there is some deliberate quality in these actions. Essentially this is the operation of double determination, and a sophisticated discussion of this may in part indicate a Distinction candidate.

The second extract directs candidates to a less clear case, that of Medea, and so there is evidence in the material provided with the question that they ought not to be taking too simple an either/or line on this. Jason tells Medea that she has a choice about how she acts. Her character, though, makes it impossible that she act in any way other than she does. Still, she does deliberate and choose to act, to kill Creon and Glauce, and then to kill her children. Indeed, the killing of the children is a deliberate change of plan part-way through the play, and even the original plan was presented in a reasoned and deliberate way to the Chorus. The level of deception required is highly deliberate. Above all, Medea's internal dialogue when she resolves to go ahead with the murder of the children identifies clearly that this is a deliberate wrongdoing. Yet there is further sophistication to be found here; the character who truly suffers the reversal is perhaps Jason, rather than Medea (the best candidates may weigh up to what extent each character suffers reversal while discussing this). His acts are selfish and reckless, but candidates may want to examine whether his lack of foresight equates with genuine error.

The *Agamemnon* presents perhaps the most famous example of double determination in tragedy, with the Chorus' discussion of whether Agamemnon had a choice or not in the killing of Iphigenia. Agamemnon cannot be said to have been in error in killing Iphigenia, but nor can he be said to have had complete freedom, as it is not an action he would have chosen without the constraints of the expedition. Candidates may also question to what extent this is the cause of his reversal. Firstly, Clytemnestra is plausibly disingenuous in claiming this as her reason, as her adulterous affair with Aegisthus is also to be taken into account. Secondly, the play indicates clearly that Agamemnon is paying the price for outrages during the sack of Troy, deliberate actions which were reckless but not without predictable consequences, perhaps inviting comparison with Jason.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	03

#### 4 Gods and heroes: the importance of epic

**Explore critically Pomeroy’s assessment of how the portrayal of women in ancient epic contributes to the concept of the hero. [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 points of Pomeroy’s statement: the value of women as prizes and the idea of fierce competition among men.

Although the question asks candidates to look at the role of women in epic and women are certainly ‘among the less prominent characters whose actions illuminate the concept of the hero’, the focus of the first passage is not so much about Chryseis or Briseis and the Greek leaders’ somewhat ambivalent attitude toward them but about the male ego, honour and prestige. Achilles is upset because Agamemnon has asserted his authority as leader of the Greeks to take back a gift given to Achilles by the Greeks themselves. Agamemnon has also, previously, made a mistake by taking Chryseis as his slave and the whole Greek camp has been punished by Apollo with a plague. However, there is more to it than that, as Achilles goes on to ask Thetis to get Zeus to punish the Greeks and Agamemnon for this slight to his honour and let ‘all have enjoyment of their king’. It is about honour and reputation rather than a broken heart.

The extract with Penelope shows why women should be prized for a different reason. Testing, whether the suitors with the bow or a possible Odysseus with the question of the bed or her clever deception with the weaving of the funeral shroud, shows skills other than beauty. She also mentions Helen which may lead candidates to discuss her attributes both beauty and other skills.

Women may be prized for other reasons – Dido as an exceptional queen, though fatally flawed in Vergil’s presentation, who was loved by 2 men, Sychaeus and Aeneas, who both were taken away from her and whose life ended in tragedy. Nausicaa displays the qualities expected of a royal bride to be. Helen has exceptional skills with potions and is the key to the throne of Sparta. There are many other examples – Andromache, in both Iliad and Aeneid, although the fall of Troy in book 2 of the Aeneid would seem to presage a pretty grim future for noble women. Lavinia is little more than a cipher though her mother is a strong character gaining respect for her views, even though they pervert the course of fate, and her death.

That Agamemnon might prefer Cassandra to Clytaemnestra and that Clytaemnestra might murder her husband because of the death of Iphigenia (and a reluctance to give up power) might be an area candidates wish to explore as the death of Agamemnon features so prominently in the Odyssey. His spirit also warns of the dangers of not being cautious towards women. There are many facets that a candidate may draw on in answering this question.

There is a wide range of material that may be called upon to discuss Pomeroy’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.

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