

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 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 2010	9786	03

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

### 1 To what extent did the Athenians try to dominate and exploit the rest of the Greek world? [50]

#### 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.*

#### Specific

The quotation from Meiggs suggests that there were benefits, for the allies at least, from membership of the empire, even if Athens benefited more than anyone else. Candidates may wish to look at the extent to which the financial burden of the tribute was significant, both in itself and as a sign of Athenian control. They may refer to evidence such as the ATL or the decree marking the establishment of the Second Athenian Confederacy (where tribute (amongst other things) is explicitly ruled out of consideration).

The question, however, refers to the 'Greek world' which needs to be considered: Athens' relationship with her allied states is one part of this, but candidates should consider other areas, such as the Peloponnese, Central Greece, perhaps Macedonia and the Greek cities of Italy and Sicily; credit discussion of what constitutes the 'Greek world' at this time. Candidates should be aware that the Empire was not static and that the relationship between Athens and other states changed significantly over the period studied, from the earliest period of the Delian League, through the growing tensions with mainland states and revolts during the Pentekontaetia, to the Peloponnesian War itself. There should be discussion of the terms 'dominate' and 'exploit', with reference to specific examples during this period: in addition to the members of the Delian league, other examples could include: Megara, Melos & Sicily. Candidates may discuss the range of different tactics that Athens used on different occasions to win over support or to quell opposition. Athens' relationship with Sparta over the period is also likely to feature, especially given Athenian unwillingness to commit to full-scale land battles against the Spartan hoplite army.

The passages should also feature in this discussion. The Thucydides passage presents a version of an allied view of Athenian behaviour during the Peloponnesian War, which raises issues about the extent to which we can judge the impact of Athens on other states when we rely heavily on evidence from Athenian sources. The passage reflects on some of the inherent imbalances in the Delian League which eased the transition to empire, even for those states such as the Mytileneans who were 'independent and nominally free'. The Aristophanes passage points to the behaviour of different groups within Athens and hostility to states such as Megara that were outside the Athenian Empire and yet also trading partners. The passage also suggests intense

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

disagreements within Athens about responsibility for events and candidates may wish to discuss the reliability of evidence derived from comic drama.

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 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	03

## The Roman empire: civilisation or submission?

### 2 To what extent do you agree that the Romans never understood the leaders of their opponents? [50]

#### 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.*

#### Specific

In the passage, Martin highlights the Roman peculiarity of including speeches made by the leaders of any opposition. Candidates should be aware of this convention. Martin goes on to consider whether Tacitus actually believed what he had written in his speech about Calgacus, pointing out that the language 'comes straight from the language of Roman declamations.'

The extracts are also drawn from speeches. Vercingetorix's rousing speech shows him to be a good leader – very Roman in many respects, with 'intelligence', and 'consummate'. However, would he ever have been shown in a bad light, as Caesar's victory would then have been devalued?

Josephus' speech by Judas is equally rousing. In this case, though, we can argue that, as Josephus 'changed sides', our picture of these rebel leaders could well be more accurate.

The speeches are designed as a *starting point* to the argument and candidates should go on to consider other aspects of 'enemy' leaders from the textual evidence.

Better answers may consider the idea that the Romans could not really understand the leaders, given the heavy Roman bias in the presentation of the evidence. Such answers will also consider a range of examples, together with in-depth analysis.

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 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	03

## Drama: the idea of tragedy

### 3 Explore critically how the fate and nature of the characters in tragedy succeed in producing pity and fear in the audience. [50]

#### 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.*

#### Specific

The quotation from Aristotle encourages the candidate to explore two questions. The first is what sort of character prompts us to engage with them as a tragic figure; the second is the part played by reversal in encouraging the audience to engage with the characters in a sympathetic manner. Both ideas must be addressed, not necessarily equally, but substantially; the wording of the question makes this clear.

The passages from the plays encourage the candidate to explore these ideas in relation first to the character of Oedipus, who might generally be most recognised as fitting Aristotle's description, but the Seneca passage should warn them that they should discuss both playwrights' portrayals, providing an opportunity for various arguments. For example, they may argue that Sophocles' play provides the true tragic ideal, while Seneca fails to elicit the same emotional response. Alternatively, they may argue that the nature of the story provides both playwrights with the required ingredients for a 'tragic' reaction in the audience, albeit one brought about by different means. They should also show awareness that Oedipus does not always display admirable behaviour, for example his treatment of Creon and Tiresias. They will need to demonstrate that Oedipus does have flaws, but might also argue that these do not cause him to deserve his punishment. An assessment will need to be made of how much Oedipus mixes good and bad traits, to prevent him from being a 'good man' (weaker candidates may take a simple view of Oedipus as a 'good man'; if so, they may well challenge Aristotle on this, and be careful to allow limited credit for the quality of any argument that follows this path). Better answers may differentiate more sharply between the two plays; weaker candidates may fail to mark any clear distinction in presentation or effect.

Candidates may wish to extend their answer to examine other characters, for example Jocasta, whose fate may arouse pity and fear in proportion to her lesser status as a character, or indeed her more flawed character. They should also, given the reference to wider reading in tragedy, extend their answers to examine the other two prescribed plays. This may be done less fully by weaker candidates, or extensively by stronger ones; discussion of *Agamemnon* and *Medea* might make up between a quarter and a half of a high-level answer. These plays provide much scope

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

for alternative views: Medea's reversal from suffering to triumph, and Jason's more conventional one from high position to suffering, may be set against the reversal in our sympathy towards the characters, Medea's good woman becoming a monster, Jason's vainglorious hero a wretched figure. (Other views are, of course, potentially quite valid.) In any case, these characters should be weighed against Aristotle's formula. Equally, candidates may have differing views on whether we sympathise with Agamemnon's fall or are appalled at Clytemnestra's triumph. In both of these plays, the presence of one character triumphing while another falls may give rise to challenges to Aristotle's statement, particularly the idea of an evil man progressing from misery to prosperity, or a worthless man from prosperity to misery. To what extent are Medea and Clytemnestra evil, or Jason (and even Agamemnon) worthless? Do Medea's and Clytemnestra's triumphs not arouse pity and fear?

Candidates may discuss other methods of arousing pity and fear, e.g. messenger speeches and spectacle, but the focus of this question is quite specific, and little, if any, credit should be given for this.

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 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	03

## Gods and heroes: the importance of epic

### 4 Explore critically Jenkyns' view of the tragic paradox of the hero.

[50]

#### 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.*

#### Specific

Any successful exploration of this type of question in paper 3 will require the candidate to define their argument from the critical comment and make good use of the key words and phrases in the light of the passages and their wider reading. In this passage key words and phrases are: 'tragic paradox', 'worthwhile', 'useless', 'splendour' and 'death'.

The syllabus detail for this topic highlights the importance of the development of the role of the hero through the epic poems to be studied.

The extract from the *Iliad* comes from book 24 following the killing and maltreatment of Hektor by Achilles. Priam is coming to ransom his son's body. This passage does highlight the splendour of Hektor in battle as well as the misery of death. Priam is most concerned about the treatment of his son's body after death. The extract also shows that Achilles' triumph and Hektor's death have changed nothing and that battle will be resumed.

The extract from *Aeneid* book 2 comes at the point where Aeneas has picked up a band of Trojans to follow him to certain death. Candidates may suggest that this will perhaps be the most useless of gestures and that Aeneas' band are neither heroic nor splendid nor pursuing a worthwhile aim. However, the simile of the wolves is particularly apposite, suggesting that there may be other reasons for this desperate action. Candidates may note that, while Aeneas' comrades are killed or kill themselves, he escapes from Troy to carry out a mission, as a different kind of hero, which will ultimately be worthwhile in Roman terms.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>03</b>

Candidates should recognise that:

- for an Iliadic hero, the glory of the moment (whether successful or unsuccessful) leading to immortal fame is of itself worthwhile
- in the context of their society, it is also worthwhile (Sarpedon and Glaucus Bk 12) to maintain the established order of that society
- that it is also a role to emulate – Aeneas urges Ascanius to remember Hector as a role model in *Aeneid* book 12
- that this sort of hero's role is likely to be transient, there are many moments of passing glory in the *Iliad*, such as Hektor at the ships, Hektor facing Achilles – better to die in facing Achilles than have a 'worse man' criticise his actions.

While an initial investigation might suggest that this paradox is very much the case, which can be backed up with other examples, better candidates may question whether Jenkyns is imposing modern value judgements of the codes of ancient societies. They might then go on to show that the role of the hero of epic develops into something more worthwhile than useless. For example, candidates might cite the contrast between the live Achilles uncaring that it is his fate to die at Troy (end of book 19) with the ghost of Achilles speaking to Odysseus about the importance of 'life'.

The development of the hero through Odysseus and Aeneas shows that immortal fame and glory are still important, but that the misery of death is not an essential requirement. Odysseus' heroism will come from outwitting his opponents and returning home to tell the tale, so gaining immortal fame. Odysseus makes sure the odds are stacked in his favour before resorting to violence. Odysseus' heroic role is worthwhile. It may still be useless in Jenkyns' terms but he does get home, regain his wife, son and kingdom and live to tell the tale (which is more than can be said of Agamemnon). He may get into plenty of close scrapes but he is not going to die himself. It is his 'strong willed crew' who suffer the consequences. Candidates might argue that this shows splendour on the part of Odysseus and close proximity to the misery of death of others not his own.

Like Odysseus, Aeneas is not to die but has a mission which may take him close to death and despair but which he will achieve through duty. He is kept on track by the gods and there is nothing provisional about their support. However, the gods' protection of Achilles is provisional. Although Aeneas speaks and acts like an Achilles in the extract, he moves on from this.

Candidates may regard the statement as simplistic in that Odysseus and Aeneas as heroes display other qualities which develop the idea that the hero's role is far from useless and that splendour does not necessarily go hand in hand with death. They may suggest that there is far more to the role of the hero that is of worth than useless and that through the development of epic the nature of the hero changes to become one of much greater worth.

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.