
CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/42

Paper 4 Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

October/November 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

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 October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9274	42

Essays: Generic Marking Descriptors for Papers 3 and 4

- 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.
- 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.

Level/marks	Descriptors
Level 5 50–40	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED AT THIS LEVEL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly; • sustained argument with a strong sense of direction, strong and substantiated conclusions; • give full expression to material relevant to both AOs; • towards the bottom may be a little 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.
Level 4 39–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a determined response to the question with clear analysis across most of the answer; • argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour, strong conclusions adequately substantiated; • covers both AOs; • good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument, description is avoided; • good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.
Level 3 29–20	<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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9274	42

Level 2 19–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues, analysis is limited/thin; • limited argument within an essentially descriptive response, conclusions are limited/thin; • factually limited and/or uneven, some irrelevance; • perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether); • patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.
Level 1 9–0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little or no engagement with the question, little or no analysis offered; • little or no argument, 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 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9274	42

General

Any critical exploration as an answer to a Paper 4 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 examination room, a theme that they will have studied. Engagement with the question as set (in the examination 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.

1 Explore critically the extent to which the chorus plays a significant role in the tragedies you have read. In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of tragedy, as well as the two passages below.

The role of the chorus is a broad topic with a multiplicity of possible routes towards an answer, and the open nature of the question should allow candidates to develop a competent answer no matter in what way they have studied this aspect of the syllabus. The prompt passage encourages candidates to consider the effect the chorus has on the audience, providing in its own turn a prompt for emotional response, as well as a developed character in its own right – indeed, in the *Agamemnon* in particular, there are many aspects to the chorus' character. The first extract, from the *Agamemnon*, provides an example of the chorus as helpless onlooker confronted with the horrors of the tragedy; the second, from the *Oedipus*, an example of its moderating influence, whereby in wishing for or recommending the 'middle course' it amplifies in comparison the extremities of suffering that inevitably, at least in tragedy, come as a check to extremities of prosperity.

It is to be expected that candidates might identify the groups that make up the choruses in the plays – elder statesmen in the *Agamemnon*, *Oedipus the King*, and *Oedipus*, and Corinthian women in the *Medea*. Some may observe that these groups have a natural affinity with the protagonists – rulers in the former three plays, the female Medea in the latter one – and that this makes them initially sympathetic: important in the *Medea* where that sympathy will be sorely tested and the chorus itself abandons its initial sympathetic attitude, and ambiguous in the *Agamemnon* where their primary loyalty is to Agamemnon, and at the start of the play their loyalty to Clytemnestra is borne out of duty to Argos and its 'regent' rather than personal attachment to her (and in fact outright hostility to Aegisthus, as it transpires).

The nature of the passages on the question paper means that discussion is likely, nonetheless, to focus on the two particular modes of operating represented therein, and many examples may be found across the four plays. A standard response, within which there is scope for a wide range of sophistication, might explore the chorus as an intermediate position between actors and audience, looking inward and out, sharing in the horror of the action as a character, as in the first extract, and responding to it as an outsider, as in the second. Their inability to affect the action,

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9274	42

only observing, makes them like the audience; their ability to converse with the characters and hold the attention of the audience, like the spectators.

Some candidates may explore the efficacy of choral odes *per se*, and should certainly be rewarded for doing so. The innate difficulty of this particular aspect of the chorus should be borne in mind, however, and as this is not explicit in the question it should be possible to access the highest band with a rigorous exploration of the chorus' role as character (of course including their words within specific odes), and without necessarily commenting on the choral ode itself as an element of tragic performance.

2 Explore critically the extent to which the motivation of heroes in epic is selfish or driven by other responsibilities. In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of epic, as well as the two passages below.

The prompt passage invites the candidates to consider Aeneas as a different manner of hero from those in the Homeric world (which should not be an unfamiliar position), in particular in the nature of his mission, something quite lacking in Homeric heroes. There follow two extracts: one a supreme example of Aeneas' realisation of the scope of his mission and that 'his' glory is really the glory of others to come; the other demonstrating explicitly that heroic honour in the *Iliad* is personal and selfish, with Achilles rejecting out of hand Odysseus' argument of responsibilities to a broader group of comrades.

Some candidates may see in the second passage a suggestion that Achilles is wrong to take the personal and selfish view. Odysseus even uses the words of Achilles' own father, perhaps giving a powerful feeling that there is some obligation to others involved in being a hero. On the other hand, it is certainly no motivation of Achilles', and in general the *Iliad* represents a distinctly solo heroic code. Achilles feels an obligation to Patroclus, but out of personal affection, and towards one who is not his equal and thus under his protection. Hector feels an obligation to his fellow Trojans, and anger towards Paris for not feeling it, yet these fellow Trojans are again his inferiors and it is his duty to protect them – his glory for so doing is his, not shared with them. Candidates may see a difference between Achilles' initial selfish desire for glory and later desire for revenge, but these are both selfish. Odysseus has an obligation to his men, but again as a senior to those inferior to him, and it is part of his personal glory to fulfil this senior position.

Aeneas' glory, on the other hand, is barely personal at all. He will barely live to enjoy his success in Italy, and certainly will not know the Roman destiny which it is his duty to enable. He will have struggles, and future generations will have prosperity. He must leave his home, his wife, his lover – and marry a woman who is so characterless as to have not a single spoken word in the poem, so that descendants he will never see will fulfil their own destinies. The whole of the *Aeneid* seems to be a struggle for him to adapt to this – one he finds difficult, even impossible, right at the close of the poem. And yet candidates may argue that his awareness and acceptance of his mission, after periods of reluctance, makes him more than a 'puppet', which would only apply if he was unaware. They may also argue that Aeneas' acceptance of his mission, with awareness of the glory of Rome to come, gives him a personal involvement with it which was not present before, but arguing that this makes it a selfish motivation is stretching the definition of 'selfish' more than one would like.

On the whole, it is to be expected that candidates broadly support the idea that Aeneas' motivation is 'social', with the specifically Roman and un-Homeric virtue of *pietas*, in contrast to the essentially individual heroism of Homer. Of course, alternative views may be expressed, and credit should be given for the quality of any argument made.