Cambridge International AS & A Level

CLASSICAL STUDIES **9274/31**

Paper 3 Classical History **October/November 2023**

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **11** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

General guidance for marking extended response and essay questions

Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The questions can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument offered by an answer.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question and be aware of any requirements set by the question to use sources or make reference to specific examples.

Indicative content in the question-specific mark schemes will neither be exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, supported responses which address the question should be rewarded.

Relevant accurate knowledge from outside the prescribed Sources for Study e.g. literary or historical sources not set in the Sources for Study should be rewarded as appropriate.

Guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The examiner should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range (where middle marks are available).
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

20 mark source-based marking criteria

Level	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	Marks	AO2 Analysis and evaluation	Marks
Level 5	• A very good range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is very detailed • Well-supported with evidence and examples where required • A very good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	8	• Thorough analysis of evidence/issues • Thoughtful evaluation that answers the question • Very thoughtful engagement with sources/task • Very well structured response with coherent and reasoned argument.	11–12
Level 4	• A good range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is detailed • Mostly supported with evidence and examples where required • A good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	6–7	• Good analysis of evidence/issues • Good evaluation that answers the question • Thoughtful engagement with sources/task • Well-structured response with reasoned argument.	8–10
Level 3	• An adequate range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is basic • Supported with some evidence and examples where required • Some understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	4–5	• Adequate analysis of evidence/issues • Adequate evaluation that answers the question • Some engagement with sources/task • A structured response with some reasoned argument.	5–7
Level 2	• A limited range of factual knowledge • Partially relevant knowledge is basic • Partially supported with evidence and examples where required • Limited understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	2–3	• Limited analysis of evidence/issues • Limited evaluation that partially answers the question • Limited engagement with sources/task • Poorly structured response with little reasoned argument.	3–4
Level 1	• A very limited range of factual knowledge • Knowledge may not be relevant • Minimal or no supporting evidence or examples • Minimal or no understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	1	• Superficial analysis of evidence/issues • Little or no evaluation that answers the question • Little or no engagement with sources/task • An unstructured response with little or no reasoned argument.	1–2
Level 0	No creditable response.	0	No creditable response.	0

30 mark essay marking criteria

Level	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	Marks	AO2 Analysis and evaluation	Marks
Level 5	• A very good range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is very detailed • Well-supported with evidence and examples where required • A very good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	11–12	• Thorough analysis of evidence/issues • Thoughtful evaluation that answers the question • Very thoughtful engagement with sources/task • Very well structured response with coherent and reasoned argument.	15–18
Level 4	• A good range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is detailed • Mostly supported with evidence and examples where required • A good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	8–10	• Good analysis of evidence/issues • Good evaluation that answers the question • Thoughtful engagement with sources/task • Well-structured response with reasoned argument.	11–14
Level 3	• An adequate range of factual knowledge • Relevant knowledge is basic • Supported with some evidence and examples where required • Some understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	5–7	• Adequate analysis of evidence/issues • Adequate evaluation that answers the question • Some engagement with sources/task • A structured response with some reasoned argument.	7–10
Level 2	• A limited range of factual knowledge • Partially relevant knowledge is basic • Partially supported with evidence and examples where required • Limited understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	3–4	• Limited analysis of evidence/issues • Limited evaluation that partially answers the question • Limited engagement with sources/task • Poorly structured response with little reasoned argument.	4–6
Level 1	• A very limited range of factual knowledge • Knowledge may not be relevant • Minimal or no supporting evidence or examples • Minimal or no understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.	1–2	• Superficial analysis of evidence/issues • Little or no evaluation that answers the question • Little or no engagement with sources/task • An unstructured response with little or no reasoned argument.	1–3
Level 0	No creditable response.	0	No creditable response.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**Using this passage as a starting point, discuss the changes in the relationship between Athens and Sparta after the Persian Wars.** Use the 20 mark source-based marking criteria. Candidates must make use of the passage but should also provide other information about the relationship between Athens and Sparta. AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 8 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1. Answers might include some of the following points. Suggested sources are in brackets, but accurate information without a source should be credited. In the passage: • Sparta called for Athenian help, based on their relationship during the Persian Wars • Ephialtes emphasises the rivalry between Athens and Sparta and the opportunity for Athens to gain from the disaster • Cimon adopts a different approach based on his emphasis on what Sparta and Athens had achieved together. Other sources: • Diodorus *Library of History* 11.46–47, 11.50, 11.63 • Plutarch *Cimon* 11–13 • Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 1241–1321 • Thucydides 1.102 (1.89–117 *passim*) AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Candidates should come to some conclusion about the way the relationship between Sparta and Athens was affected by this incident. This should consider the aftermath of the Persian War, including the foundation of the Delian league and the continuing war against Persia. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the sources chosen. Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing. Credit understanding of our lack of sources from the Spartan side.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**How important was ostracism in the Athenian democracy?**	**30**
	Use the 30 mark essay marking criteria.	
	AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1.	
	In their answers candidates should: • Outline what is known about ostracism in Athens in the fifth century BCE. • Explore how ostracism affected the working of the Athenian democracy.	
	Candidates might make some or all of the following points. Suggested sources are in brackets, but accurate information without a source should be credited.	
	The early use of ostracism to sort out leadership issues in the period of the Persian Wars: • Attacks on those related to the tyrants (Aristotle *Constitution* 22) • Ostracism of Hyperbolus (Plutarch *Nicias* 11)	
	Later examples of ostracism: • The ostracism of Cimon after the Ithome expedition • Ostracism of Thucydides, son of Melesias (Plutarch *Pericles* 12–14) • Ostracism of Hyperbolus (Plutarch *Nicias* 11)	
	AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 18 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the examples chosen.	
	Candidates may choose to focus more on the earlier examples than the later ones. Credit should be given for critical discussion of the origins of ostracism.	
	Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing. Credit understanding of the limited access we have to a full account of the period.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Assess the impact of the disastrous Sicilian expedition on Athens.** Use the 30 mark essay marking criteria. AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1. In their answers candidates should: • Show a knowledge of what happened in the immediate aftermath of the Sicilian expedition • Demonstrate an understanding of Athenian recovery in warfare but continuing uncertainty at home. Candidates might make some or all of the following points. Suggested sources are in brackets, but accurate information without a source should be credited. The aftermath of the Sicilian expedition: • The attitude of Athenian allies (Thucydides 8.2–3, 5.6, 9) • The role of Alcibiades (Thucydides 8.17–18, 45, 52) • Engagement between Athens and Sparta (Arginusae, Notium, Aegospotami) • Political upheaval in Athens and the return of Alcibiades (400, 5000) (Plutarch *Alcibiades* 34) AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 18 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the examples chosen. Candidates are free to balance their answer more to the immediate impact of the disaster, but credit should be given for an understanding of the scale of the impact and an assessment of its contribution to the final defeat. Expect candidates to consider the impact on Athenian self-confidence (e.g. the appointment of the *probouloi*) and the loss of confidence in the democracy demonstrated by events in 411 BCE. However candidates may also comment on the successes of the Athenians, especially after the return of Alcibiades, and also the challenges faced by Spartans. Stronger responses will show an understanding of the potential bias of the sources. Credit discussion of Thucydides 8.1 for the immediate response to the disaster. Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing.	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Using this passage as a starting point, discuss how important it was for Roman emperors to put on a show for their people.** Use the 20 mark source-based marking criteria. Candidates must make use of the passage but should also provide other information from their study of Roman Emperors. AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 8 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1. Answers might include some of the following points. Suggested sources are in brackets, but accurate information without a source should be credited. In the passage: • orders given by Nero and the reasons for them • nature of the burial and the materials used • Nero wishing to be seen as an artist and his final words. Other sources: • Suetonius on Nero as an artist • Tacitus' comments on Nero in the same role • Claudius' character, and lack of interest in public performance • Juvenal, bread and circuses • Archaeological evidence (e.g. Colosseum) AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Candidates should come to some conclusion about the importance of putting on shows for the people. These could be focused on the actions of the individual emperor (in this case Nero) or more widely on the use of entertainment (as Juvenal) to keep the plebs happy. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the sources chosen. Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing. Credit comments on the attitudes of the authors, especially Tacitus' cynicism and Suetonius' interest in character.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5	**How far were the women of the Imperial Court able to influence politics?**	**30**
	Use the 30 mark essay marking criteria.	
	AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1.	
	In their answers candidates should: • Outline what is known about the actions of key women such as Messalina and Agrippina. • Candidates might also show knowledge of other women by way of contrast, such as Eppia, Calpurnia et al. as included in the sources which they have studied. Due credit should be given to any such evidence. • Discuss how these women might have influenced political decision making (e.g. the role of Agrippina in the appointment of Seneca), and what the demise of these might show about their importance.	
	Candidates might make some or all of the following points. Suggested sources are in brackets, but accurate information without a source should be credited.	
	Influence of women in the Imperial Court in sources: • Suetonius, *Claudius*, 17, 27, 44 • Suetonius, *Nero*, 34–35 • Tacitus, *Annals*, 13.5, 13.15ff.	
	AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 18 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the examples chosen.	
	Candidates may choose to focus the discussion on one of the women or one court, should they wish to.	
	Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing. Credit understanding of the limited access we have to a female perspective. They should note Roman attitudes towards women being involved in politics, as well as the particular approaches of both Tacitus and Suetonius.	

Question	Answer	Marks
6	**'Emperors had no need for the support of senators.' Assess this view.** Use the 30 mark essay marking criteria. AO1 – Knowledge and understanding – 12 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO1. In their answers candidates should: • Show knowledge of the position and power of the emperor in relation to the Senate. • Demonstrate understanding of how the emperor worked with the Senate, and the nature of the political and military power structures in place. • Show an understanding of how emperors were appointed, and the importance of the army in this regard, rather than the Senate (e.g. the succession to Claudius). Candidates might make some or all of the following points. Sources from the syllabus are expected, but accurate information without a source should be credited. The sources to be used will depend on the individual candidate's choice of emperors. AO2 – Analysis and evaluation – 18 marks. Marks should be awarded using the marking criteria for AO2. Discussion and conclusions will depend on the examples chosen. Candidates are free to argue the case as they see fit, but their answers should be well supported with relevant source material. The strongest answers will probably focus on the notion of 'no' need and question whether this is too extreme. Candidates should note the sources, especially Tacitus, have a particular view of the autocratic nature of the imperial regime at this time, and consider whether the evidence which they provide supports that view. Where relevant, candidates should discuss the reliability of the sources used in terms of their potential bias or prejudice and their time of writing.	30