

---

AS

# Classical Civilisation

CIV2A Homer 'Iliad'  
Mark scheme

---

2020  
June 2016

---

Version: 1.0 Final

---

---

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

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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## 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>9-10</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>6-8</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>3-5</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>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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,</li> <li>responds to the precise terms of the question,</li> <li>effectively links comment to detail,</li> <li>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>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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,</li> <li>is broadly appropriate to the question,</li> <li>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>	<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 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>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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 30 MARKS**

<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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,</li> <li>responds to the precise terms of the question,</li> <li>effectively links comment to detail,</li> <li>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>27-30</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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,</li> <li>is broadly appropriate to the question,</li> <li>mainly supports comment with detail</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>20-26</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 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>13-19</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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> writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>7-12</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <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>1-6</b>

**This page has been left intentionally blank**

**Unit CIV2A Homer Iliad**

**Section 1**

**Option A**

**0 1**

**After the passage Homer describes the death of the Trojan warrior Adrestus (Adrestos). Describe how this comes about. Make three points.**

**[3 marks]**

**Three from:** Thanks to (hitting) a bush (1) / he was thrown out of his chariot (1) / was caught by Menelaus (1) / then supplicated Menelaus (1) / offering him a ransom (of bronze / gold / iron / precious metal (1)) to spare him (1) / Menelaus was going to agree (1) / but Agamemnon shouted at him (1) / saying all Trojans must die (1) / Menelaus pushed Adrestus away (1) / Agamemnon killed him (1) with a spear (1)

**0 2**

**Later in Book 6 Hector (Hektor) returns to Troy. Name two of the women he speaks to there.**

**[2 marks]**

**Two from:** Hecabe (1) / Helen (1) / Andromache (1) (allow 'a serving woman' (1))

**0 3**

**How effectively does Homer create sympathy in the passage for the warriors whose deaths he describes?**

**[10 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

Starts by praising Ajax ('tower of strength') but suggests that Acamas was a worthy opponent ('tall and splendid'; 'best fighter'); fairly straightforward picture of the act of killing ('hit him on the ridge ..'; 'pierced right through the bone') but suggests pain; then brief mention of Acamas' death ('darkness engulfed his eyes'); increase in sympathy when it comes to Axylus; personal details give positive picture: (home town 'well-built'; personal wealth stressed); also 'wide circle of friends' – presumably a popular man, stressed by 'entertained everyone'; nice contrast with him being all on his own here ('none of his friends ..'); little detail of the killing, but pathos of his attendant dying alongside him; further ratcheting-up of personal touches in final paragraph: Dresus and Opheltius passed over, but the twins are given lots of detail: romance of Abarbarea & Bucolion ('made love'); pastoral picture (B 'was shepherding his flocks'); focus on the boys' status as twins, but abrupt change following 'But' in the last sentence; 'bright young limbs' ironic here; emphasis returns to Euryalus: grim but prosaic picture of his 'stripping the armour from their shoulders'.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.



0 4

**'Plenty of suffering; not much glory.'****How true is this of the fighting and its consequences in the 'Iliad'?****Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of the 'Iliad' you have read.****You might include discussion of:**

- the passage
- the general fighting, particularly in Books 4, 6, 16 and 22
- duels between leading characters
- the heroic code
- the effects of the fighting on civilians
- the involvement of the gods.

**[20 marks]****Discussion might include:**

- **passage:** credit for examples from the passage which illustrate suffering or glory; also for examining the degree to which the description here is typical of the other set pieces of general fighting (seen mainly in Books 4, 6 and 16 - credit for relevant discussion of how few of the set books actually include general fighting)
- **general fighting:** other examples for discussion could include: **Book 4:** heavy involvement of gods stressed here (below); wounding of Menelaus described in graphic detail (not only the minor characters suffer); lots of talking before the fighting; simile of two mountain rivers clashing as the two armies meet; then very graphic illustrations of stark reality of deaths ('spear .. pierced right through the bone'; 'hit him .. by the right nipple'; 'all his innards gushed out' etc); **Simoisius** is a good example ('unmarried young man' – innocence, vulnerability, loss of potential etc; 'mother bore him'; 'loving care' of family – effect of war on innocent family members; simile of him falling 'like a poplar' which a chariot-maker uses to make wheel-rims for a beautiful chariot – does mention of nature & beauty offset suffering to any degree?); **Book 6:** credit for use of details from passage as long as focus is directed to suffering / glory; **Book 16:** more of the same but even more graphic: 'completely dislocated the arm-bone'; 'Lycon's head dangled down'; 'smashed the white jaw-bones'; 'his eyes filled with blood' etc; less personal details here to mollify the sheer brutality; are the minor characters killed offered any share in the 'glory' that is attached to the leading characters?
- **leading characters:** series of set-pieces here given much greater space and description than in the general scenes: credit for discussing some key meetings; **Menelaus v Paris:** glory would have gone to Menelaus but thwarted by Aphrodite (see gods below); **Patroclus v Hector:** whole build-up seems to be glorifying Patroclus until he kills Sarpedon and incurs Zeus' wrath; picture of his death may be seen as pathetic – started by Apollo, continued by Euphorbus (spear in back) and finished off while helpless by Hector: no glory for Patroclus (taunted by Hector – 'You innocent'; his life slipping away 'bemoaning .. the manhood it had left behind'); but little glory for Hector (hardly had to show his abilities; reminded of his own imminent death by Patroclus' dying words ('inexorable destiny' etc); **Achilles v Hector:** in a sense this is the climax of the poem so glory for Achilles in beating his number one enemy **but** is the stress on this 'glory? Again glory could be seen as being lessened by divine assistance to Achilles (below); ironic repetition of 'You innocent' by Achilles, this time to Hector; threat to let 'the dogs .. mangle you foully' seems to deny Hector his request to die 'not without glory'; the grim mistreatment of Hector's body after death confirms this but do the events of Book 24 redeem this and in some way bring glory to Hector (or indeed Achilles)?

- **heroic code:** much of the above may be seen to support the quotation but here students may find a counter-argument by looking at the events in the context of the desire and need for warriors to win honour; this involves facing life-threatening situations in a way that puts honour above life; so **Menelaus'** search for honour is frustrated in Book 3 when Paris disappears; **Glaucus v Diomedes** in Book 6 is a good example of honour (and life) being redeemable at a price (denied by **Hector to Patroclus** and in turn by **Achilles to Hector**); complex issues in Book 22 where Hector's cowardice is initially stressed while the gods treat him unfairly, as Zeus admits; yet by facing Achilles knowing he is to leave (despite entreaties of family and friends) does he achieve honour which even Achilles' action cannot remove – hence Book 24?
- **civilians:** suffering is by no means restricted to the fighters: on the Trojan side stress is put on the women, children, fathers and mothers; credit for discussing pathetic picture of Priam (but the redemption of his honour in Book 24?); pleas of Hecabe and Andromache; the use of Astyanax to reflect the suffering (and denied glory) of children affected etc; the conflict between the two peoples in their search for glory via victory, and the suffering of the individuals caught up in the fighting
- **gods:** potential for good discussion both ways here (as referred to above): the gods involving themselves in human affairs may be seen to reflect their glory on those humans; yet their callous attitude (eg Apollo to Patroclus, Athene to Hector) emphasises (and even causes) the suffering; credit for looking at the resolution in Book 24 – does the fact that Zeus arranges this restore glory to all concerned; or does the suffering still hold sway? Despite the resolution of Book 24 Achilles will fight on, doomed to die.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

**Option B**

**0 5** Which son of Zeus has Patroclus (Patroklos) killed earlier in Book 16? [1 mark]

Sarpedon (1)

**0 6** With what weapon does Hector (Hektor) kill Patroclus? [1 mark]

Spear (1)

**0 7** As Patroclus dies, what does he say to Hector? Make three points. [3 marks]

**Three from:** boast while you can (1) / you only won because of the gods' help (1) / especially Apollo and/or Zeus (1) / and Euphorbus (1) / and fate (1) / otherwise I could fight 20 men like you (1) / you will die soon (1) / at the hands of Achilles (1)

**0 8** How effectively does Homer build up tension in the passage? [10 marks]

**Discussion might include:**

Appearance of Apollo ('wrapped himself ... mist') is ominous; rather matter-of-fact description of Apollo's actions ('now and then striking ..') contrasted with their dramatic effect on Patroclus ('made Patroclus' eyes spin'; 'knocked the helmet ...'); focus on the helmet ('defiled with blood' – not made clear whose) - and stress on the fact that this 'had not been allowed ...' previously (stressing Patroclus' inferiority to 'godlike' Achilles); entrance of Zeus dramatic ('Zeus granted it ...') looking beyond this moment to the death of Hector; emphasis on qualities of spear ('huge, thick and heavy') followed by its shattering to stress Apollo's divine power; Apollo then 'undid the body-armour' presumably to make it easy for the humans to finish Patroclus off; stress then on helplessness of Patroclus ('fatal blindness'; 'paralysed'; 'in a daze') allowing Euphorbus to come up behind and stab him; digression then to establish worthiness of Euphorbus for the task ('best spearman ...' etc) but final sentence prepares us for Hector's entrance ('But he did not kill you').

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

0 9

**‘Neither Patroclus nor Hector deserves the death he suffers in the ‘Iliad’.’**

**To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of the ‘Iliad’ you have read.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the character, motivation and actions of each**
- **the manner in which each is killed**
- **the qualities and motivation of their killers**
- **the part the gods and fate play in their deaths.**

**[20 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **character, motivation, actions: Patroclus:** initial appearances suggest hardly hero material (subservient to Achilles, popping up with food etc); transformation starts in Book 11 with visit to Nestor, but is complete in Book 16 with his (doomed) ‘aristeia’; credit for seeing relevance of his early appearances (coupled with warnings from Achilles): is he always over-reaching himself in Book 16? Does his motivation change? Clearly in Book 11 he is upset by the fate of his comrades and is persuaded to fight if he can’t persuade Achilles to return to battle; as Book 16 proceeds, his early successes seem to provoke a blood-lust under the influence of which he forgets good advice (and his own second-class status?) and pushes on to far, even offending Zeus by killing Sarpedon; yet even ‘in his fury’ it is not his decision to fight Hector, but Zeus’. **Hector:** a more complex situation; seen initially as most respected Trojan (Agamemnon in Book 3, ‘Stop shooting ... Hector ... has something to say’); regular contrast between his heroic status and cowardice of Paris; view of his human qualities in Book 6 (meetings with the three women, especially Andromache; pride in his son etc) yet his sense of honour and patriotism take prime place; on the other hand, his killing of Patroclus requires no effort on his behalf and his cowardice in the face of Achilles’ approach (Book 22) casts doubt on his character (redeemed by his eventual god-assisted decision to face him?)
- **manner of deaths: Patroclus:** stress put on his helplessness (credit for relevant use of passage) in contrast to his frenzy of his recent assault on Sarpedon; it needs Apollo to act on behalf of Zeus; even a god had to strike his back (unfair?) yet much is made of his inferiority to Achilles (references to helmet being untouchable when worn by Achilles); Euphorbus takes advantage of Apollo’s actions, but again hits him ‘in the middle of the back’; all suggests unfair play; Hector has only to stab the wounded Patroclus; Hector’s dismissal of Patroclus as ‘You innocent’ and ‘like an idiot’ may be accurate but is his ‘fight’ really a genuine triumph of one hero over another? Do the events of Book 23 to some degree negate any unfairness in Patroclus’ death? **Hector:** initially he acts manfully as he rejects entreaties from his family warning him that he will surely die; his resolve does not last – as Achilles approaches, ‘Hector fled in terror’; it takes the trickery of Athene to restore his resolve – credit for assessing to what extent Hector’s eventual decision to stand his ground impacts on the essay title; does his suggestion to abide by the rules of divine morality do him credit (compared to the savage refusal by Achilles) or is it a sign of weakness, acknowledging his inadequacy for the task? Do Athene’s interventions weaken the victory of Achilles, or is divine assistance a sign of one hero’s superiority over the other (see below)? At least the final interaction between the two is left to human skill – unlike Hector with Patroclus, Achilles does have to use his fighting skill to dispatch Hector – but is his treatment of the dead hero justified? If not, do the events of Book 24 rebalance the degree of unfairness Hector has suffered?

- **their killers: Patroclus:** clearly killed by a better warrior (yet ironically Hector's superiority is not demonstrated at all by the killing of a helpless man as shown in the passage and what follows); Hector is the Trojan number one hero so would be expected to deal with Patroclus (as Achilles seems to acknowledge when giving Patroclus his instructions); Homer calls Patroclus 'completely deluded, the blind fool' for not restricting his mission to what Achilles had ordered, suggesting Patroclus' actions are a more important factor in his death than the fact that Hector (with help) killed him; but is Hector's arrogant treatment of the dying Patroclus (and Patroclus' warning to Hector about the latter's destiny) relevant when considering how far Hector deserves his (in many ways similar) death later? **Hector:** despite Hector being number one Trojan warrior, Homer suggests throughout that Achilles is the greater warrior (comes to a head with hawk v dove simile of Book 22): in theory their duel should be to decide the war, but it is intensely personal at least to Achilles ('You dog .. the dogs and birds of prey will divide you up' etc); given the heroism shown by Hector generally in the Iliad, can he be said to 'deserve' this – especially as Achilles needs divine help to dispatch him, recalling Patroclus' death earlier? Are the gruesome details of Achilles' lack of respect for the body ('fouly maltreated godlike Hector' etc) sufficiently rebalanced by Book 24?
- **gods / fate:** clearly both deaths are seen as part of a cycle of death which will culminate in the killing of Achilles (Zeus' balancing of the scales suggesting a force more powerful than the gods is at work etc); do the interventions of the gods in these deaths reflect the inevitability of destiny as much as cruel intent on their parts? How far do Books 23 (for Patroclus) and 24 (for Hector), where each is awarded appropriate post-death honours, make up for any previous unfairnesses in the manner of their deaths? **Patroclus:** Zeus confirmed that he was to die even before the Sarpedon episode (wouldn't grant Achilles' prayer for his safety earlier in Book 16); even at Sarpedon's death Zeus shows sorrow for his son more than anger at Patroclus for rising above his station; his sending of Apollo seems to be as much to keep fate rolling along as to punish Patroclus who never has a fair chance (above); is his death simply a necessary plot requirement to lead us to the inevitable Hector v Achilles climax? **Hector:** Zeus' desire to save Hector may be seen as key here (and the response it provokes from Athene reminding him Hector is 'a mortal man whose destiny has long been settled'); yet Athene clearly delights in her mission to make a fool of Hector; given that Achilles is the better warrior, why not let the fight take its course? Credit for looking at these and other relevant issues in line with the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

## Section 2

## Option C

1 0

**'The mortal women in the 'Iliad' show feelings and values that are completely different from those of the men.'**

**To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of the 'Iliad' you have read.**

**You might include discussion of**

- **Andromache**
- **Hecabe**
- **Helen**
- **Briseis**
- **the men connected to these women.**

**[30 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **general:** this is an opportunity for students to compare the qualities of the women in the 'Iliad' with those of the more dominant male characters; they may point out that we mainly have this opportunity on the Trojan side as the Greeks are far from their women (and more often seem to show higher regard for their fathers than their wives - typified by Agamemnon's 'I like her better than my wife' of Chryseis in Book 1?); Briseis and Chryseis do give some sense of things from the Greek side; better answers will not suggest 100% difference between the women and men over regard for family etc, but will address the conflicts often seen in the male attitude to personal honour and glory on one hand, and their role as protectors of their women, families and city on the other;
- **Andromache:** may be seen to represent the ideal wife and mother, accepting if not welcoming Hector's decision to face Achilles as his right as her husband; as mother she understands her fundamental role to look after their son ('took him to her fragrant bosom'); she uses Astyanax to remind Hector that they share this role ('you have no pity on your little boy'); Hector sees Astyanax more as an extension of himself ('let him bring home the blood-stained armour of the enemy'; does he misread Andromache in believing this would 'delight his mother's heart?'); yet they share their delight in their son (both 'burst out laughing' at Astyanax drawing back from his fearsome father); again despite Hector not reacting positively to Andromache's pleas not to fight ("I have no father ... or lady mother ...' as well as her reference to seven brothers killed by Achilles), he has 'all this constantly on my mind', while 'pity overcame him' as he left them to return to battle; in Book 22 Andromache shows her all-consuming love for her husband (her hopeful preparations for his return having a bath prepared etc) her reaction to his death ('crashed back fainting' etc) while he is not mentioned as giving her or Astyanax another thought (perhaps understandably as Achilles approaches?); yet is her loyalty to him matched or even outdone by his loyalty to his city in fighting a battle he knows he will lose?
- **Hecabe:** shows us much of the suffering a wife and mother feel, but not a total victim: as a mother, in Book 6 she has a natural desire to fuss over Hector ('wait ... while I fetch you sweet wine') which he ignores while remaining polite ('My lady mother') but firm, sending her off to pray: she obeys without further comment; does her baring of the breast in Book 22 demean her (a public humiliation?) or reinforce the dignity of the status of mother, and push home to Hector the ultimate quality of her love?

Does the fact that ‘this did not shake Hector’s resolve’ show a lack of filial affection from him (or a greater quality in putting ‘greater causes’ first? In Book 24 she entreats Priam not to go to Achilles (‘Are you mad?’) (rather provocative for a female?); she accuses him of having a ‘heart of iron’ for thinking of going; his response is typically Homeric male: ‘you will not dissuade me’ – initially firm (but not necessarily showing lack of love / emotion?); then ‘My dear, I will surely do as you request’; yielding (to a degree) and showing ability to compromise?

- **Helen:** something of a mix of emotions; seems to blame herself (not unreasonably) for the whole war (‘what a cold, even-minded slut’ in Book 6 etc); she feels ‘sweet longing for her former husband’ – although Aphrodite causes this feeling – while apparently loathing Paris (‘I refuse .. to share that man’s bed’ in Book 3) even under divine instruction to go to him; Menelaus wants her back “Now give up Helen ...’ (Book 3) but never comments on his personal feelings for her; is she (like Chryseis, and Briseis below) only important as a ‘prize’? Helen brings out a tender side of Priam in Book 3 (‘Dear child ... I don’t hold you responsible’); Hector seems immune to her charms (Book 6 – ‘you will not persuade me’) but acts pleasantly towards her (‘You are very kind’); for all the war-causing ‘romance’ Paris only speaks once to Helen (Book 3 ‘don’t say such hurtful things ..’) and admits feeling desire for her, but her feelings for him seem complex; her final appearance in Book 24 sees her lamenting Hector (but also very sorry for herself – not a trait seen in the male characters apart from Paris) a not very convincing ‘next time I shall win’ in Book 3 and ‘Hector, your taunts are justified’ in Book 6’
- **Briseis:** her men are effectively her captors: Briseis is seen to lament Patroclus (one of her captors) in Book 19 suggesting an ability to see beyond her own pride and situation; she is upset at being taken from Achilles in Book 1 (‘the girl went unwillingly’) so has presumably formed an attachment to Achilles (and Patroclus?); yet Achilles does not speak to her during the hand over (seeing her simply as an object of which Agamemnon has deprived him?); Chryseis’ feelings are not revealed (despite Agamemnon’s praise of her looks); he states her future is ‘working at my loom, sharing my bed’; she has no part in influencing her release (caused by Agamemnon’s impiety to her father) and is never seen as a character in her own right.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

## Option D

1	1
---	---

**‘Agamemnon is much more responsible than Achilles for their quarrel and the events that happen before the quarrel ends in Book 19.’**

**To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of the ‘Iliad’ you have read.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the causes of the quarrel**
- **the way each behaves during their argument in the assembly and immediately after it**
- **the Embassy in Book 9**
- **the events of Books 11 and 16**
- **the ending of the quarrel.**

**[30 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **causes and during:** Achilles can be cleared of any initial responsibility as Chryseis was given to Agamemnon and Briseis to him by general agreement; similarly Agamemnon’s mistreatment of Chryses is clearly a dangerous move given his association with Apollo and shows arrogance and impiety on Agamemnon’s part; Achilles (at Hera’s instigation) intervenes quite unprovocatively as Apollo punishes the Greeks (‘come let us consult some prophet ..’), then reassures Calchas he will not be harmed if he speaks; Agamemnon ‘leapt up’ with ‘eyes .. like flames of fire’ to threaten Calchas, but did agree to return Chryseis despite the threat to his honour; should Achilles have kept quiet – ‘No, give the girl back now’ may be seen as too much for Agamemnon to stomach under threat as he is; Agamemnon’s threat to Achilles to take ‘your prize’ escalates the situation but his desire is to move on (‘we can deal with all that later’); Achilles’ name- calling of his leader and threat to quit the war further escalates the situation (‘shameless swine’ etc); can Agamemnon ignore this and keep face? Whose fault is his threat to ‘come in person’ to take Briseis? Is Achilles’ intention at this point to ‘disembowel’ Agamemnon (prevented by Hera / Athene) over-reaction? Athene seems to suggest Achilles is basically in the right at this point; Nestor’s intervention may cool things a little but each is now entrenched in his position; credit for students recognizing the importance of personal honour in the Homeric context
- **after the quarrel:** does Agamemnon’s sending of the stewards (rather than going ‘in person’ as threatened) represent cowardice or good sense on his part (or both)? Does Achilles’ measured response remind us favourably of Agamemnon’s cursing of the unfortunate (and quite innocent) Calchas? Achilles’ subsequent meeting with Thetis may create sympathy by introducing his imminent death (‘so short a life’ etc); does this excuse what may be seen as his selfish lack of concern for his fellow warriors – in sending Thetis to Zeus (‘persuade him to help the Trojans’) to punish Agamemnon ‘for giving no respect’? Credit for noting that Zeus in return seems almost comical in his response to Thetis’ approach, not venturing any opinion on either man’s actions, but simply trying to keep the peace on Olympus; during Books 3-8 the quarrel continues with Achilles’ request granted by Zeus and the Trojans on top: should this have been enough revenge for Achilles?



- **the Embassy:** a key issue; if sympathies may have been generally in favour of Achilles up to now, does the balance shift here? Nestor persuades Agamemnon to send the Embassy, telling him off without rebuke ('your arrogant temper ...'; 'you dishonoured a man ...' etc); would it have helped if Agamemnon had gone personally? Credit for discussing the effectiveness of the three speakers in 'selling' Agamemnon's (very generous in a material sense) offers: in particular does Odysseus live up to his reputation for wise words here? How effective are Phoenix's attempts to introduce a personal note? Does the main responsibility for what follows (below) lie with Achilles for rejecting the offers, or Agamemnon for inviting rejection by the way he has failed to address the non-material issues (honour and loss of face etc)?
- **Books 11 and 16:** in Book 9 Achilles seems to have relented; he will return to battle but not yet; does Nestor's talk with Patroclus in Book 11 offer Achilles a chance to return with his face saved? Could Achilles have foreseen Patroclus' likely over-ambition when allowing him to lead the men back to battle in Book 16? Does his 'I want you to win me great honour and glory' miss the point: is he putting at threat these qualities by risking his friend's life? Is Agamemnon or Achilles the more responsible for Patroclus' death (or does Patroclus' failure to obey his instructions absolve both?); how important is it that Achilles clearly blames himself totally ('I have destroyed Patroclus')?
- **the ending of the quarrel:** it is Achilles who technically ends the quarrel ('so I now renounce my anger' – Book 19); in contrast Agamemnon responds with 'I was not to blame', before accusing Zeus of robbing him of his wits; he then reoffers the gifts of Book 9: does Achilles' dismissal of the importance of the gifts reflect a failure on his part to appreciate that part of the heroic code (everything has a value) or Agamemnon's failure to understand throughout that this has not been about material possessions (hence Achilles' remark that he wished Briseis had died)? Credit students who briefly consider whether neither might be to blame (both seen as puppets of the gods etc) or whether the whole quarrel needed to be played out to bring about a predestined sequence of events which is not complete at the end of the poem.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

**Assessment Objectives Grid****Unit 2A Homer Iliad****Section 1****Either  
Option A**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	3	0	3
<b>02</b>	2	0	2
<b>03</b>	5	5	10
<b>04</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**or  
Option B**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>05</b>	1	0	1
<b>06</b>	1	0	1
<b>07</b>	3	0	3
<b>08</b>	5	5	10
<b>09</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Section 2****Either  
Option C**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>10</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**or  
Option D**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>11</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**Overall**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>100%</b>