

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series

9274 CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/41

Paper 4 (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 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9274	41

Essay: 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. 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.
- The ratio of marks AO1 to AO2 is 1:1

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 50 – 40 marks	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</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 both 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.
4 39 – 30 marks	<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 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.
3 29 – 20 marks	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/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 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 2015	9274	41

2 19 – 10 marks	<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 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.
1 9 – 0 marks	<p>ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LOST CONTROL OF HIS/HER MATERIAL.</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 AO2. • Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9274	41

- 1 Explore critically the extent to which a tragedy is more successful if characters who suffer are essentially good men or women. In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of tragedy, 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 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 opening excerpt draws the candidate's attention to Aristotle's suggestion that the most important aspect of a tragic character is their essential goodness. The two passages then present central characters reflecting on actions which seem anything but good: Oedipus's parricide and incest, and Clytemnestra's murder of her husband. This sets candidates up for an exploration of a key paradox at the heart of classical tragedy, namely a good person committing a bad action.

Oedipus the King is the classic example of this idea and candidates may outline effectively and clearly the good aspects of Oedipus' character, e.g. positive leadership and a desire to act justly and avoid wrongdoing, and explain how he came unwittingly to commit his crimes. They may comment on the irony that his very attempts to avoid wrongdoing brought it about; a more sophisticated discussion may make it explicit that it is his good qualities that led to his crimes (a sense of justice leading to his anger on the road, his duty to his 'family' leading him to leave Corinth, his willingness to serve leading him to become ruler of Thebes and thus marry Jocasta).

The *Agamemnon* provides a pointed contrast. Clytemnestra justifies her action, and candidates may discuss the virtues of her justification, but it is difficult to argue that she is a good character, as the play makes it abundantly clear that she will be punished for her crime. Some of her reasoning may be disingenuous, but candidates might explore how far Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia, merely, as she says, to get a favourable wind, could be viewed as justification. Ultimately the crime is self-serving, and it is certainly not committed in ignorance. The question concerns specifically the character who suffers, though, and candidates should be aware that they should be discussing Agamemnon (though there is certainly a case to be made for Clytemnestra being the protagonist, and her own suffering is foretold by Cassandra so her goodness may certainly be explored); there is great ambiguity over whether the actions that led to his downfall arose from good motives, and the text is clear that his death is inevitable following the sacking of Troy and associated sacrilege. The question here is more complex, and a range of levels of sophistication is to be expected, but any attempt to determine who is good, and to what extent, and connect it with our reaction to their suffering, is to be rewarded.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9274	41

The *Medea* provides further complication. Medea suffers at the beginning of the play through her abandonment and is at this point a sympathetic character (e.g. her reception by the Chorus); at the end of the play Jason suffers instead, Medea seems if anything free from suffering even guilt or pain, and while some pity may be felt for Jason it is hard to feel he is a good person, such is his obnoxious character throughout the play. On the other hand, Jason has not technically done anything wrong, acting consistently within his rights; whether this qualifies as good or not may be explored. Exploration may be made of either or both characters; more sophisticated responses will handle finely the balance of suffering and justification between them.

Seneca's treatment of Oedipus may be used as a point of comparison with Sophocles and ideally would be mentioned at some point in the argument but may not necessarily feature extensively in a response.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9274	41

- 2 Explore critically the extent to which a willingness to risk death is necessary for heroism in epic poetry. In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of epic, 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 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 opening passage sets out clearly the essential condition of being prepared to face death for being a hero. Sarpedon's speech from the *Iliad* then explores this in more detail, and a key point candidates may draw out from here is that Sarpedon acknowledges the possibility of not facing death, but also that this would mean he was not a hero and not entitled to the honours that go with that status. In addition, he admits that in an ideal world he would not risk his life in battle, if he could have this honour and status without it, but this is impossible for men, and possible only for gods. The first two passages give candidates a highly accessible starting point for approaching the question if they read them and make use of them properly. (It is reasonable to expect candidates to be familiar with Sarpedon's speech in particular, as it is cited in the syllabus as the key passage for this concept.)

Candidates may observe that Sarpedon does indeed die after giving this speech, and that the competition for his body and spoils is evidence of the glory for others that he mentions in defeating an opponent in battle, as well as the risk he takes and loses; this occurs, though, in book 16, so omission of this should not penalise a candidate. It would be reasonable to expect candidates to be able to offer other examples from the *Iliad*, for example Patroclus and especially Hector, as well as Achilles' active decision to risk death in battle in order to achieve heroism, rather than have a long and prosperous but unremarkable life at home. Perceptive candidates might also cite Paris' duel with Menelaus, and the shame he suffers after being rescued from the prospect of death by Aphrodite, though again this is outside the set books.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9274	41

Although the final passage is from the *Aeneid*, candidates should explore how well this idea fits the *Odyssey*, following the usual prompt to consider all the epic poetry they have read. Odysseus will not die in combat (though his death is indeed prefigured in the poem), but the prospect of death is ever present, and his heroism is intimately bound up with how he approaches this. His skill with words, his resourcefulness – all his heroic qualities are made manifest in the ways he triumphs over the prospect of death, whether it be by the vastly superior might of the suitors, drowning in shipwrecks, or Polyphemus. Much of Sarpedon’s speech is indeed highly relevant to Odysseus, because it is by proving his heroism that he asserts his right to his position in Ithaca that reflects the honour bestowed upon Sarpedon and Glaucus by the Lycians. Comparison with the *Odyssey* is likely to suggest to the candidates that it is facing the prospect of death, not death itself, that is necessary to heroism.

The final passage, with the death of Turnus, may broadly be taken in two ways. On one level Turnus’ death is presented as part of this heroic bargain: he profited through the death of Pallas and took his spoils and glory, and now he finds himself on the other side of it. In this sense the scene is in line with Sarpedon’s words. The *aristeiae* of books 10–12 may in general be taken to support this view, with ‘Iliadic’ conflict much in evidence. On the other hand, Aeneas’ descent into the underworld in book 6 (a different facing of death) adds something quite different to the nature of his heroism. Aeneas risks death and confronts Turnus in full heroic force, but his success as a hero depends on far more than simply playing out his part in the immediate events of the poem. Book 6 adds a historical perspective to his heroism, so that his success is measured not by how well he measures up to an old heroic code in life, but by his foundation of the Roman race to come. Candidates may find various avenues for exploring the different nature of heroism in the *Aeneid*; that it is different is evident from this passage, as Aeneas approaches the fallen Turnus in an un-Homeric way. He considers sparing Turnus; and when he does not it is for personal revenge, not the seeking of glory by vanquishing an opponent. It is nigh-impossible to arrive at a definitive explanation of the close of the *Aeneid*, but the very ambiguity of this scene may well alert candidates to the fact that a straightforward continuation of Sarpedon’s understanding of heroism may not be possible. On the other hand, weaker candidates may be rewarded for displaying detailed enough knowledge of the text to offer evidence of the heroic facing of death on the battle-field in keeping with the *Iliad*.