

General Certificate of Education June 2011

Classical Civilisation

1021

Menander and Plautus

AS Unit 1E

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright @ 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the candidate uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- · read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of candidates after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Candidates are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the candidate's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS

Level 4	 Demonstrates accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question clear understanding of central aspects of the question ability to put forward an argument which for the most part has an analytical and/or evaluative focus appropriate to the question and uses knowledge to support opinion ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	9-10
Level 3	 Demonstrates a range of accurate and relevant knowledge some understanding of some aspects of the question some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	6-8
Level 2	Demonstrates either	3-5
Level 1	Demonstrates either • some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge or • an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it.	1-2

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

- well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question
- coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question
- · ability to sustain an argument which
- has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,
- responds to the precise terms of the question,

effectively links comment to detail,

19-20

· has a clear structure

appropriate.

- reaches a reasoned conclusion
- is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and
- makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Level 4 Demonstrates

- generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question
- understanding of many of the central aspects of the question
- · ability to develop an argument which

has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail and has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when

14-18

Level 3 Demonstrates

- · a range of accurate and relevant knowledge
- some understanding of some aspects of the question
- some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question

 some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar 9-13

• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Level 2 Demonstrates

- either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge
- or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them

5-8

1-4

• and sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 1 Demonstrates

- either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge
- or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it
- **and** little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

Level 5 Demonstrates

- well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question
- coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question
- · ability to sustain an argument which

has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, responds to the precise terms of the question, effectively links comment to detail.

27-30

has a clear structure

reaches a reasoned conclusion

is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and

makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Level 4 Demonstrates

- generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question
- understanding of many of the central aspects of the question
- · ability to develop an argument which

appropriate.

has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when

20-26

Level 3 Demonstrates

- a range of accurate and relevant knowledge
- some understanding of some aspects of the question
- some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question

question
some ability to structure a response using appropriate
language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation
and grammar

• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Level 2 Demonstrates

- either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge
- or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them

7-12

• and writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 1 Demonstrates

- either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge
- or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it

 and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 1-6



Mark Scheme Unit 1E Menander and Plautus

Section One

Option A

01 In what circumstances had Ampelisca arrived at the temple of Venus? Make two points.

TWO of **e.g.** washed up on shore [1] with Palaestra [1] after shipwreck [1] when being taken (to Sicily) by pimp / Labrax [1]

(2 marks)

02 What does the priestess need water for?

to bath girls [1]

(1 mark)

03 'Wait here' (line 33). What does Ampelisca do instead of waiting and why?

goes into temple / back to Palaestra / takes refuge at altar [1] because sees pimp / Labrax [1]

(2 marks)

04 How effective do you find the verbal and visual humour in the passage? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the passage.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- verbal: Sceparnio's exaggeration 'Who's knocking our door to pieces?' in response to Ampelisca's tentative enquiries; his immediate excitement at sight of pretty girl, invitation for her to come back in evening, line in chat-up expressions ('pretty beauty') and flattery ('the very image of Venus'); his description of her attributes (aside or to her face?) a caricature of a lusty youth eyeing up a girl, including personal comment not normally said out loud ('paps'), alliteration and malapropism; Ampelisca's increasing indignation at Sceparnio's advances; innuendo in Sceparnio's 'If you have eyes you can see what I want'; Sceparnio's taking over role of priest for himself; teasing, forcing Ampelisca to beg; Ampelisca's exaggerated appeal 'what even enemies give to enemies' echoed by Sceparnio's 'friends give to friends', since nothing will distract him from his original desire; Ampelisca's sudden volte face and total submission; repetition of endearment 'honey'
- visual: Sceparnio's repeated attempted fondling of Ampelisca ('not so free with your hands', 'take your hands off me') etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

05 In The Rope, to what extent does Plautus give the slaves individual personalities and to what extent are they simply stereotypes? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the play.

You might include discussion of

- Sceparnio: for example, his dialogue with Plesidippus and Daemones, encounter with Ampelisca and meeting with Labrax
- Trachalio: for example, his conversation with Ampelisca, defence of the girls and conversations with Plesidippus and Daemones
- Gripus: for example, his ambitions, dispute with Trachalio, deal with Labrax and attitude towards Daemones.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Sceparnio: stereotype of irrepressibly cheeky slave in conversation with Plesidippus and Daemones and in passage irrepressibly lustful – in both cases Plautus' focus on exploiting comic potential of the scene rather than developing a consistent personality; later a device to advance plot when inadvertently tells Labrax where girls are and then Plautus spins scene out with some comic banter and insults between Sceparnio and Charmides etc.
- Trachalio: much of conversation with Ampelisca is to clarify situation for benefit of audience, for example drawing attention to Palaestra's box, but also some comic banter; his chatting up of Ampelisca less physical, more respectful than Sceparnio's later, consistent with their pairing at end of play, his later protection of girls and his role of fixer for Plesidippus whose interests he serves; his exit from temple leads to standard servus currens role; later dialogue with Plesidippus centres on repetition of 'All right' in contrast to Sceparnio's cheekiness with master; a further aspect of the consistency of his portrayal is his cleverness in contrast to Gripus' gullibility and service to master by duping Gripus; however, although Trachalio is sharply and consistently distinguished from the other slaves, this does not mean he is developed as an individual etc.
- Gripus: an opportunistic fisherman whose unexpected catch leads to absurdly fantastical ambitions and the central tug-of-war scene after which the play is named; again his ill-placed belief in his own cunning and his actual stupidity are consistently sustained in his dealings with both Trachalio and Labrax, perhaps arousing some not too serious pity for his plight, but he bounces back and gains some reward at the end, consistent with the feel-good requirements of a comic ending; but more emphasis on using Gripus as a means to reunite Daemones and Plesidippus with Palaestra and on exploring the comic potential of the various scenes this entails than on developing an individual character etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B

66 'We beat them hollow' (line 5). According to Sosia earlier in the play, what act of valour did Amphitryo perform during the battle and what was his prize?

killed king / Pterelas [1] (Pterelas' gold drinking) bowl / cup [1]

(2 marks)

O7 According to Bromia at the end of the play, what happens after Alcmena goes into labour and gives birth? Give three details.

THREE of **e.g**. thunder / lightning [1] Jupiter's voice [1] house lit up [1] painless birth [1] of twins [1] slaves wash / swaddle babies [1] one very strong [1] which Jupiter later says is his [1] babies attacked by (two) snakes [1] which bigger baby killed [1] after jumping out of cradle [1]

(3 marks)

In the passage, how successfully do you think Plautus entertains the audience? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the passage.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Alcmena's admiration of, and comfort in, valour, expressed in lyrics which end with tongue-twister
- Amphitryo's belief that Alcmena's eulogy of valour is evidence of her love for him, his
 repeated anticipation of her joy, which the audience knows is ill-founded; his boasting and
 description of battle as if game of sport
- Alcmena's grumbling, overheard by audience but not by Amphitryo
- Sosia's quick realisation that Alcmena not pleased to see them and Amphitryo's failure to read the signs and understand
- Sosia's remark 'the mistress looks as if she's had it', joke about bathing baby and ironic sudden switch of mood
- Amphitryo's pompous greeting, Sosia's disrespectful but accurate 'She'd be as glad to see a lost dog' while Amphitryo oblivious to effect he's having and Amphitryo's ill-chosen references to her 'shape' and 'condition' while her anger / outrage mounts etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

09 In Amphitryo, to what extent does Plautus poke fun at traditional concepts of men's and women's honour? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the play.

You might include discussion of

- Sosia's account of the war and his meeting with Mercury
- the portrayal of Alcmena and her attitude towards Amphitryo's achievements
- Amphitryo's situation as a result of Jupiter's trickery
- other sources of humour.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

 Sosia's rehearsal of lengthy account of battle self-consciously embroidered in heroic literary style so target as much literary / dramatic as male values themselves; Sosia a poor witness because humorously admits to own cowardice and mundane concern about dinner; but knows he has to impress Alcmena with what she wants to hear, tales of her husband's martial glory; thoroughly bamboozled by Mercury's knowledge of every detail of his anti-heroic behaviour, including his in-tent drinking during battle etc.

- Alcmena a caricature of a loving, dutiful matrona who prides herself on her chastity but is easily deceived by appearances; according to Mercury, it was pillow-talk of his heroic exploits on battlefield that seduced Alcmena (military conquest as a means to sexual conquest); she is then most impressed by his gift of Pterelas' drinking bowl, a sign of his extraordinary valour; what gives her comfort in her enforced separation from him, when he leaves to avoid accusation of putting wife before patriotic duty, is his public glory and triumph; irritation and then outrage at Amphitryo's rapid return etc.
- joke that proud Amphitryo who glories in his martial triumph is being cuckolded and disgraced in marital affairs; absurdity of conquering hero being at wits' end because of domestic confusion etc.
- male and female honour undoubtedly provide the context of the play but perhaps Plautus'
 main concern is to spin out the trickery as long as possible and with as much
 inventiveness as possible, all the while parodying the structure, language and subject
 matter of the genre of tragedy; but the suspense of near-tragedy, averted only at the
 eleventh hour, is possible only because the issues on which relationships turn are viewed
 as deadly serious etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section Two

Option C

10 'Menander mocks human stupidity more harshly than Plautus does.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the plays by Menander and Plautus you have read.

You might include discussion of

- Old Cantankerous: Knemon's behaviour and its consequences; the actions of others such as Chaereas and Sostratos
- The Ghost: the reasons why Tranio tricks Theopropides and what happens as a result
- Amphitryo: the way Jupiter and Mercury play around with the humans
- The Rope: the actions of Labrax, Plesidippus and Gripus.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Old Cantankerous: Knemon presented as extreme antithesis of urbane manners of respectable well-to-do townsfolk, the stereotypical urban caricature of a gruff peasant, lacking all social decency, graces, sophistication and politesse and irrationally suspicious of all outsiders, claiming the world would be a better a place if everyone just minded their own business like him, but ultimately needing outside assistance; Knemon's misanthropy described in exaggerated terms by Pan in prologue; his verbal and physical aggression vividly described by Pyrrhias; his grumpy abuse of Sostratos, irritation at sacrifice and absurd over-reaction in idea to knock house down; his excessive abuse of Getas when comes to borrow pot and of Simiche when has lost bucket and mattock down well; his 'punishment' in well, after which a partial conversion; Getas' mockery of him and eventual getting him into shrine for communal celebration etc.
- The Ghost: Tranio's trickery the response to Philolaches' stupidity during Theopropides'
 absence and played out to emphasise Tranio's cunning and inventiveness in contrast to
 Theopropides' slow-wittedness and gullibility in accordance with the role reversals
 typical of the topsy-turvy conventions of Roman comedy; all potential threats to the

- smooth running and financial well-being of the household are ironed out with Philolaches quickly and Tranio eventually pardoned etc.
- Amphitryo: Mercury's prologue oscillates between putting the play in a theatrical make-believe context and giving it a religiously endorsed moral slant; then antics of Jupiter, an amoral impersonation of male lust, with his sidekick Mercury hoodwink the honourable Amphitryo and Alcmena; since the audience is in on the prank, they can laugh at the stupidity of Alcmena, easily charmed by Jupiter's pillow-talk of martial valour and gift of the bowl seized as booty from Pterelas etc., of Amphitryo, commander of a victorious army who cannot control his household and is terrified of being cuckolded etc., and of Sosia etc.; but what almost turns to tragedy is rescued in the nick of time by Jupiter's spectacular intervention and humans are seen to be just the playthings of gods, who are on this occasion playful rather than malicious etc.
- The Rope: Arcturus in prologue gives moral slant to drama, which is not then carried through; deception and sacrilegious brutality of Labrax, stereotype of wicked pimp, leads to temporary discomfort of him and friend Charmides in shipwreck and detention, but ultimately to happy resolution in which Daemones finds his daughter, Plesidippus gets his girl (despite his stupidity in trusting pimp and ineffectiveness in taking action himself); Gripus, whose stupidity is emphasised in contrast to Trachalio's cleverness, does not see his absurd ambitions fulfilled but after being kept on tenterhooks receives his freedom in a universally happy resolution that ignores Labrax's crimes etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Option D

11 'The comedies of Menander and Plautus are just harmless fun in which no one gets seriously hurt physically, emotionally or financially.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? Give the reasons for your views and support them with details from the plays by Menander and Plautus you have read.

You might include discussion of

- Old Cantankerous: how Knemon treats others and what happens to him
- Amphitryo: the effect of Jupiter's and Mercury's behaviour on Alcmena, Amphitryo and Sosia
- The Rope: Labrax's trickery and the consequences for him and the other main characters
- The Ghost: Tranio's trickery of Theopropides and its consequences.

Judgements may be supported by discussion of a range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Old Cantankerous: extreme misanthrope Knemon reported to have attacked Pyrrhias verbally and physically, excessively abuses Sostratos, Getas and Simiche all part of Menander's exaggerated caricature of a dour, blunt peasant, but treated comically with no serious effects; his behaviour seems to have had no adverse effect even on his daughter (after all, Pan is keeping a benevolent eye on things); Knemon gets his deserts down the well, a serious accident but, despite Knemon's self-pitying expression of his pain, this too is treated light-heartedly and leads to the happy outcome of a double betrothal linking classes and redistributing wealth and a celebration etc.
- Amphitryo: the gods' antics have disastrous effects on the honour, sanity and
 relationships of the humans, but lightning strikes instead of tragedy and, apart from
 some damage to Amphitryo's house, no harm is done; Mercury has made it clear to the
 audience throughout that this would be a comedy with no serious consequences etc.
- The Rope: Labrax's wickedness leads to temporary discomfort of Palaestra and Ampelisca in shipwreck, treated humorously with stereotypes of helpless females and

tragic parody, and is quickly resolved with refuge in temple; Labrax and Charmides also figures to be laughed at in their drenched state; their violence in the shrine and their physical restraint is also treated comically; ending of play, though reminding of potential harm owner could do to slave such as Gripus, brings all to a happy resolution with father finding daughter on whom life under Labrax appears to have had no ill-effect, a double betrothal as in *Old Cantankerous* and an appropriate distribution of finances which satisfies all except Gripus, who nevertheless is freed etc.

 The Ghost: play centres on absurd inventiveness of Tranio's trickery of slow-witted, easily confused Theopropides, which potentially poses serious threat to economic wellbeing of household, but all is within the conventions of Roman comedy and brought to a happy resolution in which all possible harm is air-brushed out, Philolaches being quickly forgiven, and Tranio eventually, though not without some reminder of the harm a deceived owner could potentially do to a disloyal slave etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid Unit 1E Menander and Plautus

Section 1

Either Option A

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	2	-	2
02	1	-	1
03	2	-	2
04	5	5	10
05	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Or

Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
06	2	-	2
07	3	-	3
08	5	5	10
09	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section Two

Either

Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
10	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Or

Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
11	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

OVERALL

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
TOTAL	30	35	65
%	46%	54%	100%

UMS conversion calculator www.aga.org.uk/umsconversion