



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
General Certificate of Education
Advanced Subsidiary Level and Advanced Level

CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/04

Paper 4 Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

For Examination from 2011

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 50

This document consists of **7** printed pages and **1** blank page.



9274/04 Generic marking descriptors (A level)

- 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.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">50–40 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY 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, substantiated conclusions. • Gives full expression to material relevant to all three AOs. • Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or 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.
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">39–30 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. • Response covers all AOs, but is especially strong on one AO so reaches this Level by virtue of the argument / analysis. • Good but limited & / or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">29–20 marks</p>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED & / OR UNBALANCED.</p> <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 all three AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking. • Good but limited &/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. <p>Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">19–10 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <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 &/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.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9–0 marks</p>	<p>ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL BE VERY POOR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered. • Little or no argument. Any 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 AO3. • Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.

1 Drama: the idea of tragedy

Explore critically the nature of the central characters in tragedy in the light of the passage from Aristotle above and your wider reading of tragedy as well as comparison of the two passages below.

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 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 that 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 passage from Aristotle encourages candidates to explore the nature of character in tragedy, specifically directed at goodness or otherwise as revealed through decisions/deliberation, but allowing scope to develop this into other areas of character in support. It is not essential that central characters be wholly good, and they may show themselves in some ways to be quite bad; there will be a balance of good and bad qualities in characters, revealed by their decisions, which are in turn revealed in their own speeches.

The passages from the plays encourage candidates to explore this idea in specific relation to Medea and Oedipus who may act in a way that may be interpreted as bad but for reasons that, to them at least, seem good. In isolation, Medea does not behave as a woman should, and Oedipus behaves in a tyrannical fashion. But Medea's contemplation of the killings ahead is framed in a heroic logic and tempered by acknowledgement that she is indeed performing a dreadful act in killing her own children, as well as anticipation of a sense of personal loss in this; her words here suggest that it is the best course of action available to her, but candidates should be aware there are grounds to question this. Oedipus, meanwhile, uses severe threats and creates a climate of fear among his citizens, but does so believing he is pursuing the god's work, for a motive that is good and seems to be his responsibility and devoid of self-interest.

Candidates should be able to relate the decisions these characters make to the broader context of the drama, and decide whether the characters seem good or not based on this, rather than a simplistic approach such as 'Oedipus should not threaten his own citizens' or 'Medea should not murder'. With the *Medea* in particular, weaker answers may offer an overly simplistic response to the character's actions. Aristotle's view of decisions – 'if it is a preference for what is good the character will be good' – may not necessarily hold true in reverse, and most candidates should be able to observe that a preference for what is bad *per se* does not make a bad character. There are also questions over the appropriateness of the character's behaviour: a woman adopting a heroic mode, a good/respected king adopting tyrannical and extreme measures. Candidates could also be aware of how a contemporary audience may have responded.

Answers should explore the characters of Medea and Oedipus in the whole plays. They may observe that Medea's words are often deceitful and designed to conceal/dissemble decisions, and she has doubts over her most awful decisions; that Oedipus uses threats freely at other times, with less apparent justification.

Some comparison of the passages quoted is required, if not broader comparison of Medea and Oedipus. Candidates may extend their answer to examine other characters. Indeed, the Aristotle leaves the possibility of exploring supporting/minor characters, e.g. the Creon in either play, the herdsmen in *Oedipus*.

Answers might explore whether decisions and actions in the passages tie into 'tragic flaws', e.g. Oedipus' quickness to extreme measures or Medea's pride.

Candidates are expected to discuss further examples drawn from the range of the prescribed texts: in this case, Seneca's *Oedipus*. Answers might assess Aristotle's words in the light of this play. They may explore whether Seneca's character seems as good or tragic as Sophocles' and, so long the focus of the question is kept, whether Aristotle's ideas on tragedy are applicable to Seneca. If not (and the same may be true of Euripides), is this play still effective as a tragedy? Where Seneca is explored, divergence of opinion and reaction is likely and much latitude should be given; it may be particularly important in this part of an answer to keep in mind the advice given in the 'General' section above.

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. Examiners are looking for some kind of conclusion to pull the strands of argument together and to offer a summative decision.

2 Gods and heroes: the importance of epic

Explore critically Bowra's view of the nature of the hero in the light of your wider reading as well as the two passages below.

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 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 that 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 Bowra encourages the candidate to explore the nature of the hero and heroism. The unsuccessful hero may be as great a hero as a successful (and often flawed) one. There may be many examples of this. It is to be expected that there will be clear reference to heroes who die in battle; those who go beyond their limits (e.g. Patroclus, Hector, Sarpedon and his thoughts, Nisus and Euryalus, Pallas Turnus, *et al.*).

Candidates may speculate on whether the heroes they have encountered are really 'superior', and if so, in what way?

Candidates may wish to examine why heroes are heroes and the inevitability of their chosen course (Sarpedon and Glaucus).

Candidates may wish to examine who is the more successful, Turnus or Aeneas, for example, or Odysseus or Achilles.

The passage from the *Iliad* encourages the candidate to investigate whether the accepted course for a hero of fighting with the inevitability of dying at some point is a worthwhile one. Sarpedon goes on to say that mortals cannot run from or escape the fates of death that are surrounding them. It is, nonetheless, of paramount importance for Sarpedon (and others) to achieve a state of being 'ageless and immortal' yet somehow in this, death is inescapable.

In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is the hero who survives and is heroic for skills different from these (fighting and dying). He never engages in battle unless the odds are stacked in his favour. It could be argued that he creates his own immortality by returning home and telling his stories. Odysseus also has another adventure to come following his return home.

The clearest refutation to the *Iliadic* ideal comes in the *Odyssey* when Odysseus meets Achilles in the underworld and is told unequivocally that heroic fame acquired at the cost of one's life is not something to be desired.

Apparently, in the second passage, Aeneas represents the 'fighting' and 'dying' hero (see also Book 2), but he does challenge this impression himself later by showing that what he has to do is unglamorous and necessary for others rather than himself, and perhaps he is not so much as deserving of honour as worthy of memory. The 'war' books of the *Aeneid* perhaps may not reflect as strongly the glamour of heroic action as the barbarous and inhumane nature of war and the ugliness of death.

Candidates may reflect on the notions of *τιμη*, *κλεος*, possibly *hubris* and other relevant terms.

Further deeper investigation by better candidates should enable exploration of other parts of the passages such as: 'Do not forget to go over in your mind the examples of your kinsmen...' What characteristics of Hector and himself does Aeneas see as important for Ascanius/Iulus? Or on what criteria a reputation is based in the *Iliad*. Sarpedon is a son of Zeus yet falls at Troy?

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 these are supported with critical reference to the texts. Examiners are looking for some kind of conclusion to pull the strands of argument together and to offer a summative decision.

