

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series**

### **9274 CLASSICAL STUDIES**

**9274/04**

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 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

### 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

<b>Level/marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
<b>5</b>  <b>50 – 40 marks</b>	<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"> <li>• Strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly.</li> <li>• Sustained argument with a strong sense of direction. Strong, substantiated conclusions.</li> <li>• Gives full expression to material relevant to both AOs.</li> <li>• Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued.</li> <li>• Wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>  <b>39-30 marks</b>	<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"> <li>• A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer.</li> <li>• Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated.</li> <li>• Response covers both AOs.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided.</li> <li>• Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>  <b>29 – 20 marks</b>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality.</li> <li>• Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description.</li> <li>• The requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

<b>2</b>  <b>19 – 10</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION &amp; ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis is limited/thin.</li> <li>• Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin.</li> <li>• Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance.</li> <li>• Perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether).</li> <li>• Patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>  <b>9 – 0</b> <b>marks</b>	<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"> <li>• Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered.</li> <li>• Little or no argument. Any conclusions are very weak. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance.</li> <li>• Little or no display of relevant information.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt to address AO2.</li> <li>• Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

- 1 Explore critically how ancient tragedians used different forms of language to persuade, to influence and to deceive. 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 passages on the paper give examples of two different forms of language from tragedy with different purposes. The first is a typical example of a messenger speech, with the playwright communicating directly to the audience in a grand and oratorical manner; the second an example of a character addressing an audience within the play, in a more straightforward and conversational manner. The first presents action vividly with arresting effect; the second reveals Medea's character, in that she is manipulative and cunning, and perhaps even Jason's, in that he is persuaded, but some candidates may observe that Medea's use of language here is essential to move the action of the play forwards, as Medea cannot gain her revenge in the way that she does if she does not persuade Jason here.

The messenger speech gives ample scope for discussing the effectiveness of these speeches in all the plays studied; given the large amount of material for the candidates to draw from, it is to be expected that they make clear and consistent reference to the plays, rather than giving a string of generic statements. Points made might be expected to include: the narrative nature of such speeches (which perhaps become more like epic); the appeal to senses beyond sight, with references to sound and touch - even on occasion to smell and taste; the focus on specific, often small, visual details to create a detailed depiction, typically focusing on the horrific and grotesque; the emotional impact on the audience, through the arousal of fear, pity, horror, revulsion etc - nb too the arousal of suspense in the typical pattern whereby a messenger arrives, announces news of an event, and then spends considerable time setting up a scene before reporting the actual occurrence.

Candidates may well refer to the opportunities messenger speeches provided for presenting events too complex or gruesome to occur physically on stage, and that they are frequently closely followed by the appearance of the ekkyklema and the presentation of the aftermath of the events described, but any more than a brief mention of this is drifting too far from the question. One point worth considering, though, might be why Seneca retained such a narrative feature if the view is

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

taken that gruesome spectacles were presented on stage, and what it afforded him that a straightforward visual presentation might not have done.

The second passage, Medea's rhetorical trickery against Jason, is phrased in a conversational, almost casual manner. It should encourage candidates to consider the different tones and modes of speech achieved in the plays they have read, offering plenty of scope for comparisons with other plays, e.g. the comic nature of the exchange between the two old shepherds in the *OT*. But just as there a sinister current is not far below the surface, here too candidates should be well aware of what is in fact a highly rhetorical speech, concealing its craft beneath a veneer of amiable conversation. In response to this passage, they should explore how language is used internally, between characters (among whom the Chorus is to be included). This particular example increases the tension in the play through the extensive dramatic irony and the audience's awareness of Jason falling into the trap prepared for him; it enhances Medea's position of dominance, and therefore the inevitability of her victory, by illustrating her intellectual superiority. This is not the first occasion in the play, and candidates ought to comment on her previous use of language to gain what she needs from Creon - where she encountered some difficulty, needing to try different approaches - and, more easily, Aegeus; she also initially won over the Chorus with a remarkably argued case; and on each occasion she has tailored her arguments to her audience with great care. (Candidates may observe that this is a very 'male' area for her to reveal skill, let alone superiority, but it is not the focus of the question.) Other examples of rhetoric being used in plays between characters (and examples from other plays are to be expected) might include Clytemnestra's entrapment of a cautious Agamemnon, and any agon-scenes encountered. Yet there are examples, too, of language being used ineffectively by characters, and this poor use of rhetoric is also important dramatically. Jason singularly fails to convince of his rightness on his initial appearance, and this arrogant yet inept display is crucial for his characterisation; the (over-)enthusiasm of Sophocles' Oedipus in pronouncing punishments and curses upon Laius' murderer are to catch up with him later; Jocasta's self-serving arguing away of oracles and priests similarly ensnares her later on; Clytemnestra's speeches before the Chorus are full of rhetoric, yet fail to persuade them of her rightness in her actions. This second passage should, then, encourage candidates, especially the good ones, to think of what the language used by characters reveals to us about them and how it might further plot and action, as well as simply how the playwright employs it to enhance communication with the audience.

Candidates may refer in their answers to the fairly limited treatment Aristotle gives to language, and argue that the low ranking he gives it as one of the constituent elements of tragedy fails to recognise its role in the effectiveness of plays and their impact and effect upon the audience. This will sensibly address the final point on the syllabus and be a sensible basis for assessing whether the plays function well as tragedies independently of Aristotle's ideas. Given the limited nature of his discussion of this aspect, though, too detailed a discussion of this ought not to be expected; it is more important that candidates have addressed language in the plays than Aristotle's evaluation of its importance. Some may be aware, too, of Aristotle's view in later lines, essentially that writing should not be too commonplace, in order to achieve a 'dignity' or register greater than the ordinary, nor too out of the ordinary, in order not to appear ridiculous.

There are a great deal of possible responses to the question and these passages, some quite possibly addressing the use of 'ordinary language' more than is detailed above, and the best candidates need not necessarily address anything like all of the points mentioned here. It will be helpful to consider, in deciding whether to award the higher mark bands, whether the candidate can be seen to have addressed both types of language, and has responded in a positive and useful way to the two passages.

Candidates may draw any sensible conclusions provided that these are supported with critical reference to the texts.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

## Gods and heroes: the importance of epic

- 2 Explore critically Jenkyns' assessment of the ideal nature of a hero. In your answer you should make use 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 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:

Any successful exploration of this type of question in paper 4 will require the candidate to define their argument from the critical comment and make good use of the key words and phrases in the light of the passages and their wider reading. The quotation from Jenkyns states that there are two sides to a hero not just a 'killing machine' and glory hunter - as we expect to find - but also an intellectual - in the case of the first passage, Achilles seen as a speaker and deep thinker on the nature of heroism. Candidates may recognise that the quote from within the introductory passage is what Peleus encourages his son to become. Candidates may also note that heroes often ponder on their fate or the lot of heroes as well as the fate of man, in general. In the first passage, Achilles can be seen to be doing pretty much all that is required of him in terms of xenia and behaviour, except of course that he has withdrawn from the fighting. The picture of Turnus is very different whilst being a 'doer of deeds', he recognises the hopeless nature of his actions but does not really ponder on his fate (the killing machine).

Both extracts may encourage candidates to look into what is being highlighted: Achilles and his comments on the value (or lack of it) of doing what a warrior should. So using his skill as a 'speaker of words' to question the validity of what he is as a 'doer of deeds'. Turnus may be articulate in some ways and he is certainly an action hero but he could be said to be rather one dimensional with only an action response to problems, see also his encounter with Drances. As such we may wish to see him as an incomplete hero, in Jenkyns' terms, being prepared to face up to the inevitable outcome of fighting Aeneas and seeing it in terms of Fate. He is described as a boy compared to the man of Aeneas early in book 12.

Although the Odyssey is not used, candidates may wish to use Odysseus as an example of a clever and articulate hero - there are many examples of him being a 'speaker of words' as well as a 'doer of deeds'.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9274</b>	<b>04</b>

From the *Aeneid*, Aeneas, perhaps, may be seen as being the 'odd one out' of the primary heroes as he does seem to be a more reticent and taciturn character who appears to spend much of his time lacking comprehension of what is going on - the underworld or the shield. We might see Aeneas as a vehicle for the completion of the mission rather than as an individual making his own way, a tension that is brought to light in book 4. On the other hand, he always appears keen to find out what he does not understand, and learn. With Dido, at best, his efforts at speaking are stumbling and their roles are interestingly reversed in their underworld meeting. If he has great 'speaking' moments, they come at the beginning of the *Aeneid* after the shipwreck "*Hoc meminisse iuvabit*"; his address to the doomed Trojans in book 2 and the words of advice for Iulus in book 12.

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 they are supported with critical reference to the texts.