



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2013**

**Classical Civilisation**

**2021**

**Alexander**

**A2 Unit 4B**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the schools and colleges.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the student uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

**Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.**

## DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of students after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Students are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

## QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the student's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS**

<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question</li> <li>• clear understanding of central aspects of the question</li> <li>• ability to put forward an argument which for the most part has an analytical and/or evaluative focus appropriate to the question and uses knowledge to support opinion</li> <li>• ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li> </ul>	<b>8-10</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li> <li>• some understanding of some aspects of the question</li> <li>• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question</li> <li>• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li> </ul>	<b>5-7</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Demonstrates <b>either</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them.</li> </ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Demonstrates <b>either</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

<b>Level 5</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question</li><li>• coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question</li><li>• ability to sustain an argument which<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, responds to the precise terms of the question, effectively links comment to detail, has a clear structure</li><li>reaches a reasoned conclusion</li><li>is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and</li><li>makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul></li></ul>	<b>19-20</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question</li><li>• understanding of many of the central aspects of the question</li><li>• ability to develop an argument which<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail and</li><li>has a discernible structure</li><li>is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and</li><li>generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul></li></ul>	<b>14-18</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• some understanding of some aspects of the question</li><li>• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question</li><li>• some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar</li><li>• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul>	<b>9-13</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>either</b> a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• <b>or</b> some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them</li><li>• <b>and</b> sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>5-8</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>either</b> some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• <b>or</b> an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it</li><li>• <b>and</b> little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>1-4</b>

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 40 MARKS

These essays form the **synoptic assessment**. Therefore, the descriptors below take into account the requirement in the Subject Criteria for Classics and Specification that students should, in a **comparative** analysis, **draw together** their knowledge and skills to demonstrate understanding of the **links** between central elements of study in the context of the cultural, religious, social and political **values** of the classical world.

- Level 5** Demonstrates
- well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources which thoroughly covers the central aspects of the question
  - coherent and perceptive understanding of the links between the central aspects of the question and the values of the classical world
  - ability to sustain an argument which
    - is explicitly comparative,
    - has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,
    - responds to the precise terms of the question,
    - fluently links comment to detail,
    - has a clear and logical structure
    - reaches a reasoned conclusion
    - is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and
    - makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- 37-40**
- Level 4** Demonstrates
- generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources which covers many of the central aspects of the question
  - sound understanding of many of the central aspects of the question, including the values implicit in the material under discussion
  - ability to develop an argument which
    - makes connections and comparisons,
    - has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus,
    - is broadly appropriate to the question,
    - mainly supports comment with detail and
    - has a discernible structure
    - is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and
    - generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- 27-36**

<b>Level 3</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources</li><li>• some understanding of some aspects of the question, including some awareness of classical values</li><li>• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question</li><li>• some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar</li><li>• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul>	<b>17-26</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>either</b> a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• <b>or</b> some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them</li><li>• <b>and</b> sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>8-16</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>either</b> some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• <b>or</b> an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it</li><li>• <b>and</b> little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>1-7</b>

**Mark Scheme**  
**Unit 4B      Alexander**

**Section 1**

**Option A**

**01    *In what circumstances did Alexander inherit his kingdom? Make five points.***

**FIVE from:** Philip / previous king / father assassinated (1) by Pausanias (according to Plutarch) (1) by someone humiliated by Philip's wife / Olympias (1) Olympias incited Pausanias (1) Alexander tracked down / punished perpetrators (1) instability / Alexander's position unstable (1) need to secure backing of nobles (1) other claimants (1) e.g. Attalus / father of Philip's second wife / Cleopatra (1) backing her infant son (1) threat of Thracian / Illyrian / surrounding tribes (1) Greek cities after previous defeat by Philip (1) still a threat (1) etc.

*(5 marks)*

**02    *How important to Alexander's career were his father Philip and his mother Olympias?***

Points might include the following:

- Philip as being Alexander's father and predecessor
- Philip as figure to emulate, e.g. with expansion of power into Greece
- Philip as rival figure to surpass, e.g. by conquests in Asia
- Philip as having set Alexander on course in training as warrior capable of exploits at Chaeronea when sixteen
- Philip as having hired Aristotle as Alexander's tutor
- Alexander inheriting powerful state from Philip
- Alexander inheriting well-organized and well-equipped army from Philip
- similar personality traits, e.g. ability to make quick decisions, vision, personal courage, leadership qualities, ruthlessness
- passionate nature from Olympias
- other personality traits from Olympias, e.g. imagination, will for power
- omens, miracles etc. associated with his birth (e.g. according to Plutarch) contributing to the idea fostered by Olympias of Alexander's divinity
- antagonism of parents towards each other
- Alexander's closeness to Olympias etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(10 marks)*



**03 How successfully did Alexander deal with the problems he faced in controlling the Greek states during his reign?**

Points might include the following:

- problem of traditional independence of Greek states
- problem of influence of Athens, especially Demosthenes
- separate problem of Sparta (not members of League of Corinth, therefore not bound by its decisions) in Peloponnese
- initial success with decisive invasion of Greece to force states to accept his position as hegemon of League of Corinth
- revolt of Greeks, showing Alexander's success might not be permanent, instigated by Demosthenes and Theban slaughter of Macedonian garrison
- hard-line sack of Thebes (6000 Thebans killed) successful in short term
- Plutarch's claim that later Alexander had some regrets, consequently less severe later
- unpopularity of Macedonian rule, especially Antipater's position as being in charge when Alexander left for the East
- danger of Persians - influenced revolt through Spartans
- exploitation by Alexander of lack of unity in Athens
- harsh line by Alexander against Greek mercenaries opposing him
- variety of treatment of non-mainland Greeks, e.g. democracies imposed on Greek states of Asia Minor, island-states enrolled into League
- Spartan revolt, decisive victory for Antipater, using League troops, death of Spartan king Agis, collapse of opposition to Macedon
- re-emergence of war party in Athens, Demosthenes' influence
- protection in Athens for Harpalus after his flight from Persia, having embezzled money from Alexander's treasury, leading to exile of Demosthenes and death of Harpalus
- problem of evidence, e.g. some evidence for restoration of exiles to Greek states (e.g. Arrian) none for any request for deification of Alexander – perhaps politically motivated, if it happened etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

**Option B**

**04 In what year and in which city did Alexander die?**

323 BC(E) (1) Babylon (1)

(2 marks)

**05 In whose honour had Alexander held a banquet just before his final illness?**

Nearchus

(1 mark)

**06 Where was Alexander about to conduct his next campaign?**

Arabia

(1 mark)

**07 What was the status of the 'Companions' referred to in Passage B (line 2)?**

elite Macedonians / close to Alexander / elite cavalry

(1 mark)

**08 Why do you think his men were so upset at the prospect of Alexander's death?**

Points might include the following:

- loss of charismatic leader
- end of an era
- loss of successful leader, string of victories from Granicus onwards
- loss of leader familiar from over ten years' campaigning
- disbelief at death of leader who has survived war, injury, dangers of various kinds
- humanity of Alexander apparent, Alexander ill and dying like other men
- identification with Alexander who has always led by example
- end to rewards of conquest
- fear of what might happen in terms of potential splits between Macedonian leaders
- worries about return home
- deflation on brink of fresh campaign in Arabia
- end of leader whose ideals were shared
- sources fostering image of Alexander even as he dies etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

**09 To what extent do Arrian's and Plutarch's accounts of events leading up to and following the death of Alexander differ?**

- use of same source: 'royal Diaries' (Arrian), 'journals' (Plutarch)
- Plutarch's claim that most of his version is copied word for word
- both critical of other writers, e.g. those who claimed Aristotle was behind a poisoning plot of Antipater (Plutarch)
- Arrian's and Plutarch's accounts broadly similar
- Plutarch's details of portents preceding Alexander's illness and his obsessive fears of what they might mean
- Plutarch's vivid description of Alexander's thirst and a prisoner sitting on his throne, Arrian's brief coverage of the incident
- both starting their accounts with the party attended by Alexander
- both continuing with report of Alexander going drinking with Medius, Arrian referring to sacrifices conducted by Alexander
- both covering Alexander's continuing fever, bathing, carrying out of normal duties, but some differences, e.g. Plutarch describing Alexander being carried around on his bed
- Plutarch's greater precision on timing day by day, e.g. worsening of fever on 25<sup>th</sup> day of illness and Alexander's death on 28<sup>th</sup> day etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

## Section 2

### Option C

10 ***‘Plutarch gives a more varied picture of Alexander’s character than Arrian does.’***

***How far do you agree? Refer to both writers in your answer.***

As this is a synoptic essay students should look broadly across the topic in creating a strong and well-illustrated central argument that shows understanding of the strengths and limitations of the two prescribed sources.

- Plutarch as a biographer looking at the whole life of his subject Alexander, including childhood
- Plutarch as writer of parallel lives, looking at moral qualities – explicitly stated at start of his *Alexander*
- Arrian as a military historian more concerned with campaigning and conquest than with personal factors but also looking at Alexander’s whole career, as explicitly stated by him at the end of Chapter 7
- the two writers acquainted with and recording cultural practices, e.g. processes of sacrifice and divination but showing critical attitudes too
- both critical of other sources and writers
- Plutarch’s more expansive storytelling in places, Arrian less expansive, e.g. in writing about Gaugamela
- some shared stories / incidents, e.g. Gordian Knot incident, but in some instances only one of the two recording them, e.g. omens at Alexander’s birth referred to by Plutarch
- Arrian’s descriptions of military matters, including preparations for war, battles e.g. Granicus, sieges, e.g. Tyre, and results of warfare fuller etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(40 marks)

### Option D

11 ***‘Outside Greece, Alexander was as good at establishing peace as he was at waging war.’***

***How far do you agree? Support your answer by reference to both Arrian and Plutarch.***

A wide view is necessary to fulfil synoptic requirements. To this end students should devise a balanced argument on how good Alexander was at both establishing peace and waging war. Of course, it is possible to argue that the two go closely together, the one even being dependent on the other. Whatever the argument, both Arrian and Plutarch should be considered in terms of what light they shed on the question.

Waging war

- won sieges, e.g. at Tyre with innovatory tactics described in detail by Arrian
- won battles and campaigns in mainland Greece and throughout Persian empire, e.g. at Granicus and Issus, acting decisively and with bold tactics, e.g. taking opposition by surprise
- used weapons, armour, machines and training to best effect
- was persistent in pursuit of conquest, going further and further east – but halted by discontent eventually
- constantly seeking further conquest, e.g. plans for Arabian campaign just before his death.

### Establishing peace

- pragmatic to some extent at leaving existing systems of administration in place, for example satrapies in Persia
- but was prepared to lay down Greek markers such as founding of cities named after himself
- and special system for Egypt
- adoption of Persian dress and customs – not always liked by his men
- fostering cross-cultural practice, particularly marriage to create new ruling elite – again not always popular with his men
- failure of some policies, e.g. some satraps corrupt etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(40 marks)*

**Assessment Objectives Grid**  
**Unit 4B Alexander**

**Section 1**

**Either**  
**Option A**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	5		5
<b>02</b>	4	6	10
<b>03</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>

**Or**  
**Option B**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>04</b>	2		2
<b>05</b>	1		1
<b>06</b>	1		1
<b>07</b>	1		1
<b>08</b>	4	6	10
<b>09</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>

**Section 2**

**Either**  
**Option C**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>10</b>	16	24	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>

**Or**  
**Option D**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>11</b>	16	24	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>

**OVERALL**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>100%</b>