



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

CLASSICAL GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES

Standard Level

Paper 1

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

These generic markbands are specific to Paper 1 and should be used in conjunction with the question-specific part of this markscheme. The range of possible answers and approaches listed in this markscheme is not exhaustive. Although the questions test a common set of skills, the application of these may demonstrate variation, and the range of appropriate specific knowledge may not be exactly alike across candidates and schools.

Application of the markbands

Examiners judge the answers using a “best-fit” model, as described in the following paragraph. When assessing a candidate’s work, the descriptors for each markband should be read until a descriptor is reached that most appropriately describes the level of the work being assessed. If a piece of work seems to fall between two descriptors, both descriptors should be read again and the one that more appropriately describes the candidate’s work chosen. Where there are several marks available within a markband, the upper marks should be awarded if the candidate’s work demonstrates most or all of the qualities described. The lower marks should be awarded if the candidate’s work demonstrates few of the qualities described. A response that meets most of the requirements of a particular markband, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in that markband.

In the assessment of extended responses in Paper 1, the following terms included in the Markband descriptors should be considered, as appropriate to the focus of study for each topic (outlined in focus of assessment above):

Specific features	refer to factual knowledge derived from the details of primary sources.
Features of genre	refer to genre or the conventions of genre. Candidates are expected to have developed a basic critical vocabulary in these areas, though not all areas may be relevant to the question.
Context	includes the historical, social, political, religious, or cultural knowledge to the extent that each may be used meaningfully to relate specific features (or features of genre) to the context of the society in which they were produced.

Markbands for the extended responses for Paper 1.

- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in markband 1–3, 0 should be recorded.
- 1–3** There is very little understanding of the question or relevant knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world. Appropriate skills and organizational structure are lacking. The answer is no more than a series of generalizations or a few facts that bear little relation to the question.
- 4–5** Little understanding is shown of the question, which is not addressed effectively. Although some factual details and comments are present, they are limited, often inaccurate and of marginal relevance. There is no clear and coherent argument and little evidence of specific features being analysed or related to their context. There is no reference to features of genre. Comparison and contrast are not used or not used effectively. There is also very little evidence of appropriate skills, such as selection and effective use of knowledge, and the structure is basic.
- 6–7** There is some indication that the question is understood. The question is partially addressed, and there is a limited degree of accurate and relevant knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world. Reference to features of genre is at best implicit. There is a limited demonstration of skills, focus (including relating specific features to their context) and structure. Skills of comparison and contrast are rudimentary.
- 8–10** The demands of the question are generally understood. The question may be answered with a relevant, coherent argument that is supported by limited material and/or contains limited reference to specific features and features of genre. Alternatively, the answer contains accurate knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world but is mainly descriptive or narrative in form, with implicit analysis or explanatory comments, or is made relevant by its conclusion. There has been some attempt to relate specific features to their context and to structure an answer. Comparison and contrast are used to some basic effect.
- 11–13** The demands of the question are effectively and relevantly understood and addressed, but not all the implications are considered. Specific features are related to their context with some explicit analysis and explanatory comments, which are supported by accurate, relevant and adequate knowledge based on evidence from the ancient Greek and Roman world.
The approach is either thematic or analytical or a soundly focused combination of narrative and analysis. Use of comparison and contrast is generally effective. Where appropriate there is a grasp of features of genre, at least in general terms. Where appropriate there is evidence of evaluation and interpretation.

- 14–16** The demands of the question are effectively and relevantly addressed, usually in a structured framework. Arguments are generally well developed, and clear and coherent. The answer is clearly supported by the effective use of appropriate factual knowledge based on evidence from the ancient Greek and Roman world. It also demonstrates a consistent level of analytical ability and/or a critical approach to specific features under study. Where relevant, features of genre are explained and specific features are related to their context. It makes effective use of comparison and contrast. An awareness of issues of substantiating claims may be demonstrated where appropriate. Where appropriate there is evidence of informed evaluation and considered interpretation drawn from a personal engagement with the subject.
- 17–20** The question is addressed in a clearly structured and focused essay that indicates a high level of awareness of the demands of the question. Arguments are clear, coherent, relevant and well substantiated. The answer demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the ancient Greek and Roman world through the effective selection and use of evidence. It also demonstrates a high level of analytic ability and/or a sharply critical approach to specific features under study, or which are strongly related to their context with a good grasp of features of genre. It makes highly effective use of comparison and contrast. Where appropriate the answer may draw on or generate wider historical or cultural views from an international perspective.

At the upper end of this markband the answer will further show an independent approach by displaying at least **one** of the following features: a highly developed awareness of contextual issues; the effective use of a wider historical or cultural perspective; a high level of conceptual ability; a successful challenge to the assumptions implied in the question.

SECTION A

Greek and Roman Tragedy

1. “Justice, even if slow, is certain to come.” (Solon.) Discuss the portrayal of justice in *each* of the three plays you have read in light of this statement. [20 marks]

Candidates should examine in all three plays the ways justice is portrayed. Candidates achieving the upper range of marks should discuss the portrayal of justice in all three plays in the light of the statement with sensitivity to similarities and differences between plays. The ideas which follow should be treated merely as guidance rather than as setting a limit on the scope or perspective of a candidate’s answer.

Electra

In a major way the necessity of retributive justice is integral to the plot and the play’s themes. The first part dramatizes the problem that long-awaited justice may be slow to arrive, putting added pressure on human agents of revenge. The chorus enhances the feeling of determinism through which Aegisthus and Clytemnestra are to meet their doom, significantly through its meditation on the curse of the house of Atreus. It is not clear how unequivocally just the retribution is (Electra’s near fanatical frame of mind, the portrayal of Aegisthus in the messenger speech, the broadening of the scope of argument in the agon scene) but the problem of how to deal with the siblings’ act of injustice in killing their mother, as well as the intervention of the gods, question the scope and efficacy of justice.

Trojan Women

Retributive justice in the form of Athena’s slight and her planned revenge on the Greeks establish clear cause and supernatural punishment. The punishment is certain and will be fairly quick to come (and understood to have come by the audience), though the Trojans’ and Greeks’ ignorance of it lends the play dramatic irony which complements the absence of Zeus’s intervention to save Troy. Injustices are claimed (the death of Astyanax, Talthybius’s involvement, Helen as cause of the war and Troy’s destruction) but perhaps only Cassandra’s prophecy concerning Agamemnon’s death (justice as slow burner) has the stronger claim in relation to the question.

Phaedra

Within the personal sphere of the psychological relation of the characters, there is no strong and impersonal definition of justice. There are strong reactions to perceptions of unjust actions with the gods being called upon to witness these. When retributive justice is invoked by Theseus it comes quickly and in a devastating form in what might be felt as arbitrary access to punitive power. There is a miscarriage of justice in the killing of Hippolytus. The chorus focuses on the blind, amoral force of nature and the fickleness of fortune.

Award [0–7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.

Award [8–10 marks] for descriptions of the plot with little contextualization and analysis.

Award [11–13 marks] for addressing the question effectively for the most part with some explicit analysis of the dramatised collapse of the family and explanatory comment.

Award **[14–16 marks]** for a balanced, well-substantiated answer with informed analysis drawn from a personal engagement with the plays.

Award **[17–20 marks]** for sharply analytic or strongly reflective exploration, showing depth and/or breadth of understanding of tragedy, and well substantiated, engaged and individual treatment.

2. Analyse one scene from each of the three plays you have read, showing how effectively the playwright has used the conventions of tragedy. [20 marks]

Candidates should choose three scenes – one scene from each play – and through their effect analyse the playwrights’ use of the conventions of tragedy. Look for a subjective response with relevant and accurate details of the chosen scenes described, discussed and analysed with a view to explaining how effectively conventions of the genre are used. Candidates may use a number of perspectives – *e.g.* plot conventions, performance, theatrical context, *etc.* – to enhance their analysis, though good knowledge of the text and of specific features is likely to offer the strongest evidence enabling candidates to achieve the upper range of marks.

Award **[0–7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations.

Award **[8–10 marks]** for descriptions of scenes with little contextualization.

Award **[11–13 marks]** for addressing the question effectively for the most part with some analysis of the scenes within the framework of tragedy.

Award **[14–16 marks]** for a balanced, well-substantiated answer with informed analysis drawn from an effective understanding of tragedy and a personal engagement with the plays.

Award **[17–20 marks]** for sharply analytic or reflective exploration, showing depth and/or breadth of understanding of tragedy, and well substantiated, engaged and individual treatment of the chosen scenes.

SECTION B

War to peace in Augustan Rome and Empire

3. Evaluate the actions of Octavian (later Augustus) between the time of the assassination of Julius Caesar and the battle of Actium. [20 marks]

Candidates may evaluate Octavian's actions from a strategic viewpoint in the power struggle following Caesar's death in terms of challenges to overcome, though there is ample room for discussing effect beyond strategies for power, *e.g.* the moral aspects of certain decisions as well as repercussions on individuals and peoples of events in which Octavian was complicit.

Some areas for discussion may include Octavian's initial actions on deciding to take over Caesar's name, his conflict with Antony, his relationship with the senate and with Cicero, his marching on Rome, the second triumvirate, the proscriptions and their purpose, the Battle of Philippi, the division of empire and Octavian's unpopular settlement of veterans, the Perusine war with Antony, dealing with Sextus Pompeius, the deposing of Lepidus, keeping his troops limber on campaign in Illyricum, building aqueducts, *etc.* for Romans, the war of propaganda against Antony and Cleopatra, the preparation for and lead-up to war with Antony (*e.g.* spread of propaganda, building projects for Romans, organising an oath of loyalty).

Award [0–7 marks] for general comments that are limited in focus or relevance.

Award [8–10 marks] for limited evidence and evaluation of Octavian's actions.

Award [11–13 marks] for evidence of Octavian's actions satisfactorily understood and their implications addressed with generally consistent analysis.

Award [14–16 marks] for evidence of informed engagement with the question, with relevant examples, showing understanding of historical context and effective interpretation supported by clear argument.

Award [17–20 marks] for an answer showing a range of cogent examples, an in-depth understanding of Octavian's actions, and a strong grasp of historical context, supported by clear and developed argument.

4. Discuss the effectiveness of Augustus’s attempts at religious, political and social reform in Rome. [20 marks]

A response of a high standard should take into account all three types of reform and evaluate to some extent their “effectiveness”.

Religious

- the renovation and rebuilding of temples;
- the revival of priestly colleges;
- the building of new temples;
- the worship of Lares encouraged in new divisions of the city;
- the suppression of foreign cults, with the revival of ancient customs encouraged the idea of a golden age of religious piety after the neglect of religion and decline in morality which was seen to have led to civil wars.

Evaluation may turn on the extent to which he co-opted religion to boost his and his family’s image by explicit and implicit connections. Augustus’s Forum, the temple of Apollo, the Secular Games and the *Ara Pacis* provide rich pickings for connecting religion to propaganda.

Political

- an amnesty for those proscribed in 43;
- a revision of the senatorial role and functions/power of the senate and magistracies;
- consolidation of his own position of power through carefully controlled titular awards for himself (settlements, *etc.*);
- the reorganization of equestrian order;
- relations with plebs;
- the use of freedmen;
- administrative reform in Rome, perhaps for political ends;
- the downplaying of political power;
- the use of influence (*auctoritas*), *etc.*

As to the effectiveness of these, central are the constitutional changes over time which allowed him supreme power in ostensibly republican guise, but which allowed for the progress of a more complex and thorough practice of government.

Social – a broad category. Answers may include

- creating jobs for the unemployed;
- improving the quality of life (providing systems for supplying grain, water, proper sewage, policing, preventing fires, against flooding);
- fostering civic spirit in creating local “councils”.

There is no evidence of any attempt at spreading the wealth downwards, but more on trying to stop any erosion of class distinctions. Attempts at social engineering, or at least nudging the elite classes to “responsible family outcomes” through moral reforms (against adultery or confirmed bachelorhood), were greeted with mixed success. If anything, they increased the elite’s vulnerability to public scandal and manipulation by the unscrupulous (Ovid’s fate?).

Award **[0–7 marks]** for general comments that are limited in focus or relevance.

Award **[8–10 marks]** for evidence of knowledge of a limited range of aspects of reforms and an understanding of their effect.

Award **[11–13 marks]** for evidence of Augustus’s reforms effectively understood and their implications addressed with generally consistent analysis.

Award **[14–16 marks]** for evidence of informed engagement with the question, with relevant examples, showing understanding and considered interpretation, supported by clear argument.

Award **[17–20 marks]** for an answer showing a range of relevant examples, an in-depth understanding of Augustus’s reforms and their effects, and an identifiable historical/cultural grasp supported by clear and developed argument.
