
CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/43

Paper 4 Classical Literature – Sources and Evidence

October/November 2018

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **8** 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.

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	ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED AT THIS LEVEL. <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.
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/marks	Descriptors
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.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Explore critically to what extent one particular individual is to blame for the events of a tragedy in the tragedies you have read.</p> <p>In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of tragedy, as well as the two passages below.</p> <p><u>Specific:</u></p> <p>The prompt passage invites candidates to consider the issue of where fault lies in a tragedy, essentially the aspect of a tragedy that Aristotle identifies as hamartia. The two excerpts from tragedies the candidates have studied are both speeches by characters who commit outrageous acts that bring suffering on the titular heroes of the plays, justifying these actions with reference to the wrongdoings of the heroes. Candidates may then consider to what extent these justifications are reasonable, exploring the validity of the claims made against the heroes. Agamemnon and Jason have both undeniably acted as Clytaemnestra and Medea state they have: in the case of Agamemnon, candidates may explore other agencies driving his actions as explained in the play, such as divine anger, prospective and reactive, at the harms done in Troy; in that of Jason, they may explore to what extent, if any, Jason's subsequent defence of his actions has validity, either to a modern or contemporary audience.</p> <p>There is then ample scope in both excerpted plays to discuss whether one or more than one character is responsible for the events. While, as stated above, Clytaemnestra and Medea have a certain validity to their arguments, they are the ones in the play that carry out the killings. But each playwright treats the responsibility of the character differently. In the <i>Agamemnon</i> there is no suggestion that Clytaemnestra was ever going to act in a way other than she did; her actions have tragic inevitability, and are a result of her character being what it is. In the <i>Medea</i>, Euripides takes pains to show us Medea evolving and adapting her plan: at first aiming at killing Jason himself, and only later turning her attention to the children; and then debating vividly with herself whether she should go ahead. While in the end she must act as she does, the possibility of her acting otherwise is very present, and opens up the question of her guilt much more.</p> <p>In the two Oedipus plays, there is scope to explore further the ways both human and divine action drives events, looking at the extent to which Oedipus is portrayed as responsible for his own actions, while at the same time being in the grip of fate or the god Apollo, or both. There is ample scope for exploring double determination in responses to this question, with the caveat that it should be rooted in the texts studied and not become too abstract.</p> <p>Candidates may also wish to focus in on the idea of 'blame' contained in the prompt passage, and explore more personal responses to the plays, arguing for the different extents to which heroes are felt to be to blame for the suffering that is experienced, or if blame can be attributed elsewhere, whether the gods or other mortals (such as, for example, Clytaemnestra and Medea).</p>	50

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Explore critically to what extent Virgil makes Aeneas similar to or different from Homeric heroes.</p> <p>In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading of epic, as well as the two passages below.</p> <p><u>Specific:</u></p> <p>The question invites candidates to compare and evaluate the nature of Aeneas as a hero with reference to heroes from Greek epic (note – not ‘Greek’ heroes, so Trojans from Homer may also be considered). The prompt passage places this in the broader context of the way Virgil models his work on Homer and places the <i>Aeneid</i> in the epic tradition, but with a specifically Roman flavour; the passages show Achilles and Aeneas in analogous situations, each mourning the loss of a young warrior companion, and thus invite direct comparison of the way heroism is displayed in each man, and by extension in Aeneas in comparison with other heroes in other analogous situations.</p> <p>Candidates therefore have a strong steer towards comparing the heroism of Aeneas and Homeric figures as displayed through comparable scenes, and this approach may provide a strong and effective structure to an argument. In the two scenes chosen for the extracts on the paper, for example, candidates may discuss: both characters displaying strong outpourings of grief; both comparing the lost companion with a son; both thinking of a mourning father figure; both reflecting on the disfigurement of the victim’s wound; both voicing scepticism about the wars they are fighting. They may also observe Aeneas’ broader focus, on Pallas’ lost future, on his own responsibilities, on a father figure who is not his own, and each of these may be linked with the unique idea of <i>pietas</i> mentioned in the prompt passage, and explained there usefully as an emotional quality for Romans, which makes Aeneas unique. They may then argue either way for the effectiveness of Aeneas as a hero – perhaps that this greater context elevates him as a hero, or perhaps along the lines that that it clouds the issue and makes him a good vehicle for the concept of <i>pietas</i> but poor as a convincing and human character.</p> <p>Other comparable scenes that may be of use include, but may not be limited to: Aeneas’ killing of Turnus compared with Achilles’ of Hector; the receipt of arms from a divine mother by both Aeneas and Achilles (Note: the description of the shield of Achilles is outside the set books of the <i>Iliad</i>, but the receipt of the shield is not); councils of gods discussing the ‘divine missions’ of Odysseus and Achilles, and the rightness of assistance or resistance by gods.</p> <p>But candidates may of course take scenes in isolation as well, exploring what makes different figures heroic. Essentially this is a question about heroism; but responses which do not progress beyond listing examples of heroism are unlikely to be rewarded highly, and candidates should pay heed to the instruction in the question to compare Aeneas with Homeric figures: there should be a strong element of comparison and evaluation in candidates’ arguments.</p>	50

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Candidates may also consider the broader context of the <i>Aeneid</i> as outlined in Griffin's prompt passage, and what implications this has for Aeneas as a hero; again there should be an element of comparison in responses, for example whether the legacy of Aeneas' mission, which will result in Rome's dominion over the Mediterranean, makes him equal to or greater than Odysseus, whose mission is limited to restoring stability to his family and dependants on Ithaca.	