



Cambridge International AS & A Level

CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/32

Paper 3 Classical History – Sources and Evidence

October/November 2020

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 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **7** 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	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE 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 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 3 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>To what extent and for what reasons did relations between Athens and other Greek states change during the fifth century BC? In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below:</p> <p>The extract from Hornblower’s book explains the good relations between the Greek states in Ionia and Athens in 498–479 BC and then poses the question of what went wrong. Candidates should be able to identify the state of relations in the early part of the century from the Ionian revolt to the end of Xerxes’ invasion in 479 BC with the battles of Plataea and Mycale. They can interpret from Hornblower some of the possible reasons for the good relations at the creation of the Delian League. Candidates may wish to look at the support Athens gave to the Ionians in 499–498 BC, as part of these good relations, as well as Athenian actions immediately following the success against the Persians, and the actions of Athenians such as Aristides in contrast to the Spartans, such as Pausanias. They may also consider the aims of the Delian League and the benefits it provided for the Greek states.</p> <p>In answering the question, candidates will need to trace not just the development of the Delian League (as outlined in Thucydides and in epigraphic materials) but also the development of relations with Greek states, primarily Sparta, Corinth, Megara, Thebes, Aegina amongst others in order to consider ‘extent’ of change. Candidates will be able to use the prescribed material to show examples of the way relations varied – for example Thebes and Aegina were enemies of Athens before 480 (Herodotus 5.79–89) and after the Persian War, while famously Aegina and Athens put aside their quarrel in the interest of Greek unity according to Herodotus. Corinth’s relations with Athens varies from enemy to friend more than once.</p>	50

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>The extract from Herodotus offers candidates some material on Athens' actions in the interests of other states during the period of the Persian Wars, and candidates can support this with other passages in which Athens seeks to show she defends Greek freedom or puts the interests of other states before her own. The final sentence offers some points of interest regarding Athens' real intentions. The Thucydides extract develops the change in attitude towards the Athenians after 478 BC by the time of the 420s and beyond. Candidates may use both these extracts to consider the reasons for the changes in relations. They might also reflect that the extract from Thucydides is a speech apparently made in Sparta and consider its value as evidence of allied views. Candidates should be able to draw upon Thucydides' narrative for examples of interaction between Athens and other Greek states to support their argument. Candidates may use Thucydides' view that Sparta was happy to see Athens take over the leadership (1.96) and contrast it with the abortive attempts to help Thasos and Samos (1.101 and 1.141), as well as Thucydides' argument on Sparta's fear of Athens' power. They may also look before the Persian Wars and Sparta's attempts to control Athens under Cleomenes (Herodotus 5.72, 74, 90–91). Candidates may consider the relations between Megara and Athens in 460 and then in the 430s leading up to both Peloponnesian Wars (for example 1.103, 1.67 including Corinth and Aegina). Candidates may focus on Athens' treatment of her allies, as outlined in the Mytilenians' speech and support it with reference to other instances, e.g. Samos, Potidaea, but also the treatment of non-allies such as Melos (Thucydides 5.84–116). Candidates could use Cleon's speech, especially 3.37, to develop the changes in relations between states and the 'tyranny' of Athens. The Corinthian speech to the Spartans and Sthenelaidas' reply (Thucydides 1.86) emphasise Athenian aggression. Candidates might consider examples where Athens treated her allies and other states well such as the Ionians, Plataea, Methone, Corcyra, Samos (post 411 BC). Candidates have the opportunity to select and focus on a variety of examples in support of their answer to the 'extent' and 'reasons'.</p> <p>Candidates may draw any sensible conclusions provided that these are supported with critical reference to the texts.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>To what extent was Roman rule in the interests of its subjects? In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below: [50]</p> <p>Specific</p> <p>The quotation from Erskine raises the central question to be discussed – whether or not the Empire was essentially a beneficent activity on the part of the Romans or something less charitable. As he points out, there is the presentation of what was going on and what was in fact the case. Candidates should note this distinction, and then use the evidence from the sources to explore the issues raised by this question.</p> <p>The passage from Caesar shows clearly the lengths to which the Romans would go in ensuring that their will was followed, and that they were victorious. The proposal mentioned was made by Vercingetorix at a council of war in 52 BC, at a point where he was recommending a complete change in strategy in order to stop the Roman advance. The policy was designed to stop the Romans getting adequate supplies. The passage which follows shows the dangers which different peoples would have faced in pursuing such a policy, and how they would have to make considerable sacrifices (including the burning of their own towns) to ensure that the Roman forces were stopped. Candidates should note that this has been reported by Caesar and consider its reliability in this light.</p> <p>The passage from Tacitus, on the other hand, which comes immediately prior to the Boudiccan revolt, shows the effects of conquest on a conquered people, and gives a sense of the debates about how to respond to the challenges of being conquered. The poor treatment which they have received at the hands of the Romans is also clear. The fact that the Britanni viewed their situation as slavery should be noted, and the behaviour outlined finds parallels to that of slaves. This should lead to further discussion and contrast with the work which Tacitus claims that Agricola undertook in Britain, and the positive image of his approach depicted elsewhere.</p> <p>These two elements can be contrasted with the account from Josephus which shows what life was like for the population of Jerusalem, and their fate as they were besieged. This account makes it hard to see the positive aspects of empire and raises questions about the nature of that empire.</p> <p>Candidates might also wish to develop their answer in the direction of considering the benefits of empire for the Romans – they might consider the economic and cultural benefits which the Romans gained from the empire, and the wealth of both material goods and religious ideas which flooded into Rome. The issue of the selling of slaves, highlighted most clearly by Caesar’s conquest of Gaul, could also be discussed. The benefits for the Romans may also have led to benefits for subjects – for example, an increase in employment opportunities or luxuries available within the empire.</p> <p>Candidates may draw any sensible conclusions provided that these are supported with critical reference to the texts.</p>	50