
CLASSICAL GREEK (PRINCIPAL)

9787/02

Paper 2 Prose Literature

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

The specimen paper is for general illustrative purposes. Please see the syllabus for the relevant year of the examination for details of the prescribed texts.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Section A (35 marks)**Principles of marking the translation**

- (a) full marks for each section should only be awarded if grammar and vocabulary are entirely correct. However, one minor error that does not substantially affect meaning, does not prevent the award of full marks
- (b) more specifically, examiners should check that verbs – tense, mood, voice and person (if appropriate); nouns and adjectives – case, number and gender are written or identified correctly
- (c) the number of marks awarded for each section reflects the length of the section and its (grammatical) difficulty
- (d) examiners should take a holistic approach. When work is entirely (see (a)) correct, full marks should be awarded. When work has some grammatical errors examiners should award the middle marks for that section; when work has considerable errors examiners should award the lower marks for that section.

Principles of marking the commentary questions

- (a) examiners should be guided both by the question-specific answers and by the extent to which candidates demonstrate understanding of the text and appreciation of the language used
- (b) while answers need not necessarily be structured as an argument, they will be more than a checklist of points
- (c) the question-specific notes describe the area covered by the question and define its key elements. There is no one required answer, and the notes are not exhaustive. However, candidates must answer the question set and not their own question
- (d) examiners, teachers and candidates should be aware that there is a variety of ways in which a commentary question can be answered. The exemplar answers provided in the indicative content are exemplary, and should not become a model for teachers and candidates
- (e) when answering the commentary question, candidates are rewarded for the following:
 - a sound and well-expressed understanding of the meaning or tone of the passage (depending on the question)
 - accurate observation and reference to the Greek either of meaning or of interesting use of language
 - sophisticated discussion of meaning or language (or both).

Indicative content**Plato, *Symposium* 201d–215a3****1 Plato, *Symposium* 201e–202a Translation [10]**

καὶ ἦ, οὐκ εὐφημήσεις; ἔφη· ἦ οἶει, ὅτι ἂν μὴ καλὸν ἦ, ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὸ εἶναι αἰσχροῦν;

μάλιστα γε. [4]

ἦ καὶ ἂν μὴ σοφόν, ἀμαθές; ἦ οὐκ ἤσθησαι ὅτι ἔστιν τι μεταξὺ σοφίας καὶ ἀμαθίας; τί τοῦτο; [4]

τὸ ὀρθὰ δοξάζειν καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ ἔχειν λόγον δοῦναι οὐκ οἶσθ', ἔφη, ὅτι οὔτε ἐπίστασθαί ἐστιν [4]

—ἄλογον γὰρ πρῶγμα πῶς ἂν εἶη ἐπιστήμη; —οὔτε ἀμαθία—τὸ γὰρ τοῦ ὄντος τυγχάνον πῶς ἂν εἶη ἀμαθία; [4]

—ἔστι δὲ δήπου τοιοῦτον ἢ ὀρθὴ δόξα, μεταξὺ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀμαθίας.

ἀληθῆ, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, λέγεις. [4]

Mark out of 20 and then divide by two.

EITHER

2 Plato, *Symposium* 204a–d

- (a) Lines 1–9 (τίνας οὖν . . . ὧ φίλε Σώκρατες, αὕτη): what is Diotima arguing here and how does the language make the argument clear? [10]

Diotima is arguing that both lovers of wisdom and Eros are members of the same intermediate class between the wise and the ignorant. (Both lovers of wisdom and Eros desire what they currently lack.) Eros' intermediate nature is explained in the preceding myth, and is the result of being born to a wise and resourceful father (Resource) and an unwise and resourceless mother (Poverty). Thus, Eros is in a state half way between wisdom and ignorance. Eros is a *daimon* rather than a god.

Candidates could comment on the following details from the Greek text to explain how Diotima's choice of language makes the argument clear (the argument is in part a transitive one: X therefore Y; since Y therefore Z; to note is also that the argument is Diotima's and not necessarily Plato's):

- δῆλον δὴ, ἔφη, τοῦτό γε ἤδη καὶ παιδί – note the confident assertion that is clear (*δῆλον*) even to a child (*καὶ παιδί*)
- ὥστε ἀναγκαῖον ἔρωτα φιλόσοφον εἶναι – the relationship between love and wisdom is said to be necessary (*ἀναγκαῖον*)
- μεταξὺ εἶναι σοφοῦ καὶ ἀμαθοῦς – a further qualification here: love situated between (*μεταξὺ*) wisdom and ignorance
- τῶν καλλίστων ἢ σοφία, Ἔρως δ' ἐστὶν ἔρως περὶ τὸ καλόν – the transitive argument is made most clear here. The juxtaposition of *Sophia* and *Eros* stresses the nature of the argument
- πατρὸς μὲν γὰρ σοφοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ εὐπόρου, μητρὸς δὲ οὐ σοφῆς καὶ ἀπόρου – the intermediate nature of love is described here as being a result of mixed parentage: note the balance of the adjectives
- ἢ μὲν οὖν φύσις τοῦ δαίμονος – an emphatic conclusion.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

(b) Lines 9–21 (ὄν δὲ σὺ . . . γενέσθαι αὐτῷ): what impression do you get here of the relationship between Diotima and Socrates? [15]

Diotima is very much in the role of teacher, and Socrates is in the unaccustomed position of being her pupil. This reversal of their expected roles is possibly humorous, and it is interesting that Socrates is learning from a woman. Diotima explains Socrates' mistake in that he had identified Eros with the beloved rather than with what feels like love. Diotima treats this as an understandable error, but nevertheless puts Socrates right by explaining that what feels like love has a totally different character.

Socrates accepts Diotima's correction and the force of her refutation of his earlier position. He then humbly asks her to explain what function Eros performs among men, if he has such a nature.

Candidates could comment on the following details from the Greek text to reinforce their points:

- σὺ ἀήθης ἔρωτα εἶναι, θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν ἔπαθες – arguably, this is a little patronising or, at best, understanding
- ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ/σὺ λέγεις, – Diotima is careful to try to understand what Socrates was saying
- διὰ ταῦτά σοι – Diotima patiently goes through Socrates' argument on account of these things
- τῷ ὄντι – a certain statement of the situation in reality
- οἶαν ἐγὼ διήλθον – Diotima casts herself as the teacher
- καλῶς γὰρ λέγεις – Socrates agrees that she is right
- πειρώσομαί σε διδάξαι – Diotima casts herself as the teacher again
- ὡς σὺ φήεις, etc. – but also seeks agreement with Socrates.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

OR

3 Plato, *Symposium* 212c–213a

(a) Lines 1–12 (καὶ ἐξαίφνης . . . πάνυ πολλάς): how does Plato create a vivid description of Alcibiades' entrance? [15]

Plato vividly describes Alcibiades as drunk (even before he has arrived at the symposium), shouting loudly. He demands to be taken to Agathon, the host, but he has to be led by a flute girl and some of his other companions. As he stands in the doorway, he is described as wearing a thick wreath of ivy and violets with a number of ribbons round his head. The wreath of ivy and violets is associated with Dionysus and thus is particularly appropriate for a drunken reveller. The ribbons are associated with victory.

Candidates could comment on the following details from the Greek text to reinforce their points:

- Alcibiades has a sudden effect (ἐξαίφνης)
- with a lot of noise at the doors (πολὴν ψόφον) as if revellers (ὡς κωμαστῶν) and flute-players are there (ἀνλητρίδος)
- Agathon instructs his slaves – the drama of direct speech and the (scripted) untruth he proposes (λέγετε ὅτι οὐ πίνομεν ἀλλ' ἀναπανόμεθα ἤδη)
- it doesn't take long for Alcibiades to emerge (οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον)
- he's audible (Ἀλκιβιάδου τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούειν ἐν τῇ ἀνλῇ . . . καὶ μέγα βοῶντος) but completely drunk (σφόδρα μεθύοντος)
- Alcibiades wants to know where Agathon is (ἐρωτῶντος ὅπου Ἀγάθων) and is giving orders (κελεύοντος), though he needs to be supported (ὑπολαβοῦσαν)
- the (comic) image of Alcibiades standing at the door wearing all sorts of ribands (ἔστεφανωμένον αὐτὸν κιττοῦ τέ τινι στεφάνῳ δασεῖ καὶ ἴων, καὶ ταινίας ἔχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πάνυ πολλάς).

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

(b) Lines 12–19 (ἄνδρες, χαίρετε . . . συμπίεσθε ἢ οὐ): what do you find striking in these lines? [10]

Alcibiades admits and even stresses how drunk he is but that he is still capable of making an articulate speech. He has come to give the garland to Agathon and he is going to move it from his own head to Agathon's. He describes Agathon as the wisest and most beautiful (the use of superlatives is striking) and this is why he deserves the crown. He is the beloved, the appropriate object of Eros. (However, later on in the dialogue Alcibiades admits that Socrates deserves these titles.) Alcibiades expects his listeners to laugh at him because he is drunk, but it is striking that he stresses that he speaks the truth. This phrase makes it clear that he is saying something important. He ends his speech by asking whether he may join the drinking party on these conditions. The use of two short questions, one after the other, is striking. It is no surprise that everyone agrees that he should join them.

Candidates could comment on the following details from the Greek text to reinforce their points:

- very drunk (*μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα*)
- rhetorical questions, giving alternatives (*δέξεσθε συμπότην, ἢ ἀπίωμεν ἀναδήσαντες μόνον Ἀγάθωνα, ἐφ' ᾧπερ ἤλθομεν;*)
- urgency (*νῦν δέ*)
- explanation of purpose in lines 15–16
- superlative and flattering adjectives (*σοφωτάτου καὶ καλλίστου*)
- self-mockery or asking whether he is to be mocked because he is drunk (*ἄρα καταγελάσασθέ μου ὡς μεθύοντος*)
- confidence in what he's going to say (*ἐγὼ δέ, κὰν ὑμεῖς γελάτε, ὅμως εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω*)
- offers alternatives (*ἀλλὰ μοι λέγετε αὐτόθεν, ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς εἰσὶν ἢ μή; συμπίεσθε ἢ οὐ*).

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

Herodotus 6. 74–84, 94–117, 132–40**4 Herodotus 6.95 Translation****[10]**

ἐσβαλόμενοι δὲ τοὺς ἵππους ἐς ταύτας καὶ τὸν πεζὸν στρατὸν ἐσβιβάσαντες ἐς τὰς νέας, ἔπλεον ἑξακοσίησι τριήρεσι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην.

[5]

ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἠπειρον εἶχον τὰς νέας ἰθὺ τοῦ τε Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ τῆς Θρηίκης, ἀλλ' ἐκ Σάμου ὁρμώμενοι παρὰ τε Ἰκάριον καὶ διὰ νήσων τὸν πλόον ἐποιεῦντο,

[7]

ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, δείσαντες μάλιστα τὸν περίπλοον τοῦ Ἄθω, ὅτι τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει ποιούμενοι ταύτη τὴν κομιδὴν μεγάλως προσέπταισαν·

[5]

πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἡ Νάξος σφέας ἠνάγκαζε πρότερον οὐκ ἀλοῦσα.

[3]

Mark out of 20 and then divide by two.

EITHER

5 Herodotus 6.77–80

- (a) Lines 1–9 (ὄκως ὁ ... ἐφύλασσον): pick out the verbal repetitions in these lines. Why do you think Herodotus uses this technique? [10]

Candidates could pick out the following repetitions:

- ὄκως/ὄκοϊόν
- κῆρυξ/κῆρυξ/κηρύγματος
- σημήνειε/σημήνη
- ἄριστον/ἄριστον
- πολλοὺς/πολλῶ/πλεῦνας.

Cleomenes realises that, because the Argives do what his herald says, there is something for him to exploit, using his herald to impart misinformation. The repetitions stress the fact that the Argives do this but that the Spartans, though ordered to, do not (i.e. eat breakfast). It is an arresting little passage, perhaps with some comedy, though there is much death and violence involved.

It is possible that the repetitions allow this apparent inconsistency to be carried off so well.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

- (b) Lines 10–25 (ἐνθεῦτεν . . . τὸ χρηστήριον): illustrate Herodotus' skill as a story-teller from this passage. [15]

Candidates could comment on the following points:

- the fast pace, moving from the quick description of Cleomenes' ruse, to the mass murder of the Argives, to the burning of the grove, to, finally, the realisation of transgression
- the portrait of Cleomenes himself is sharp and economically produced
- the move from narrative to direct speech
- the reporting of Peloponnesian custom as context
- the use of oracle/prophecy (to mislead).

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

OR

6 Herodotus 6.112–13

- (a) Lines 1–12 (ὡς δέ σφι . . . ἀκούσαι): how does Herodotus create a compelling account of the beginning of the battle of Marathon in these lines? [15]

Candidates could comment on the following points:

- the religious context in line 1
- the Athenians at a run (*δρόμῳ*), to be picked up later
- the precise detail of the distance between the opposing sides
- the Persian view of the Athenians (note the intense vocabulary – *μανίην, πάγχεσθ' ὀλεθρίην*)
- the good reason given for the Persian view (small numbers, no cavalry or archers)
- *κατεΐκαζον*
- three uses of *βάρβαροι*; note also *Μηδικήν* and *Μήδων*
- the evaluation of Athenian performance (*ἀξίως λόγου*); they show no fear of Persians as all Greeks had done before.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

- (b) Lines 13–21 (*μαχομένων . . . τῶν νεῶν*): on the basis of these lines, what is your view of Herodotus as a military historian? [10]

Candidates could comment on the following points:

- there seems to be a lot of precise detail about wings, centre, sea, inland
- unless you know the geography of Marathon well, it is difficult for all these details to give a clear picture of what actually happened
- perhaps Herodotus is more interested in the chaotic nature of the battle than in precise detail.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

Section B (25 marks)

All questions in this section are marked according to the mark scheme below. Candidates will not tend to show **all** the qualities or weaknesses described by any one level. Examiners will attempt to weigh up all these at every borderline to see whether the work can be considered for the higher level.

To achieve at the highest level candidates need to demonstrate excellent control of their material, an ability to select and analyse, in addition to thorough and empathetic understanding of the texts studied. Credit is given for reference to the wider social and political context, and for engagement with secondary literature, where appropriate. Candidates are likewise credited for effective use of technical language and for a well-expressed and well-structured response.

Examiners should take a positive and flexible approach and reward evidence of knowledge, especially any signs of understanding and careful organisation.

Marks are awarded in the following ratio:

AO1: 10 marks

AO3: 15 marks

Level	AO1 descriptor	Marks	AO3 descriptor	Marks
5	Thorough historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Specific detail as well as wide-ranging knowledge of the text.	9–10	Close analysis of the text. Authoritative selection of appropriate material. Engagement with secondary literature, where appropriate. Confident use of technical terms. Well-structured, well-developed and coherent response.	13–15
4	Sound historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Specific detail or wide-ranging knowledge of the text.	7–8	Clear ability to analyse the text. Relevant selection of material. Familiarity with secondary literature, where appropriate. Some use of technical terms. Clear and logically structured response.	10–12
3	Some historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Fair knowledge of the text, though superficial and/or lacking in general context.	5–6	Some analysis of the text. Material selected but not always to best effect. Some reference to secondary literature included, where appropriate. Occasional correct use of technical terms. Uneven structure and development of the response.	7–9
2	Limited historical, political, social and cultural knowledge. Partial knowledge of the text/wider context.	3–4	Weak analysis of the text. Material unfocused. Attempt at correct use of technical terms but some confusion. No progression of argument.	4–6
1	Very limited evidence of knowledge of the text/wider context.	1–2	Very limited attempt at analysis of the text. Basic material. Limited evidence of technical terms. Little attempt at structuring the response.	1–3
0	No rewardable content.	0	No rewardable content.	0

Indicative content

EITHER

Plato, *Symposium* 201d–215a3

EITHER

- 7 How important is the picture of the divine and the beautiful presented in these lines and in the rest of the *Symposium* that you have read? [Plato, *Symposium* 206b–206e] [25]**

For AO1, candidates could note that the divine is related to birth, and indeed (centrally, as well) to all living creatures. The divine and the beautiful are intimately related; so much so, in fact, that one cannot exist without the other. The final thing to comment on is that love is not of the beautiful but of giving birth in the beautiful.

For AO3, on its relation to the rest of the *Symposium*, candidates could note that the central question of the dialogue is to come up with a good definition of Eros. The passage given presents one way to approach the task of definition; this passage should be related to the rest of the dialogue to consider what the key constituents of Eros are, and to what extent the divine and the beautiful affect them or are affected by them.

OR

- 8 ‘Grand and inspiring but, in the cold light of day, wholly absurd.’ Discuss this view of Plato’s *Symposium*. [25]**

For AO1, candidates should show knowledge of a range of arguments from the excerpt. They could also gain credit by demonstrating knowledge of the rest of the *Symposium*. They should show an understanding of the literary techniques Plato uses in the *Symposium* and how he seeks to persuade his readers.

For AO3, candidates should analyse and evaluate a number of different arguments from the excerpt. They should discuss the effect of Plato’s literary artistry, and consider whether the *Symposium* deserves being described as a grand and inspiring work. Candidates are likely to refer to passages such as the myth of Eros’ birth, or Diotima’s account of how Eros can lead someone to the contemplation of beauty in itself as positive evidence for this. Note also the absurdity of arguing that the first step towards philosophy is pederasty.

Candidates are likely to come to different conclusions about whether the arguments are wholly absurd. They should gain credit for a rigorous search for logical errors and fallacious arguments. However, candidates who show some sympathy for Plato’s ideas and his attempt to present them in the *Symposium* in an amusing and engaging way should also gain credit.

OR

9 Discuss Diotima's view that philosophical activity arises from *Eros*. [25]

For AO1, candidates should demonstrate a detailed knowledge of Diotima's account of *Eros* and how she thinks philosophical activity arises from it. Diotima defines *Eros* as the desire for the eternal possession of the good. The function of *Eros* is procreation in what is beautiful, and this procreation can be physical or spiritual. A noble lover will be attracted to someone who is beautiful both in body and soul. She moves on to give an account of how a young man might be educated in *Eros*. At the higher levels, he would move from loving beautiful souls to wanting to create beautiful things, such as poetry or good laws. This is the stage at which philosophical activity arises from *Eros*. According to Diotima's account, the highest form of *Eros* is love of absolute beauty itself, eternal and absolute. This will lead a man to true knowledge and understanding.

For AO3, candidates should analyse and evaluate this account of *Eros*. They should certainly point out some of the logical errors in the account, e.g. just because we might always desire good things, this does not mean that we should desire to possess good things forever and thus desire immortality. The whole account seems to depend on Plato's belief in the existence of moral and aesthetic absolutes (his theory of forms). However, he provides no arguments that these absolutes exist, and how they would determine our moral behaviour. Candidates who show sympathy for Plato's ideas and who provide a reasonable explanation as to why they find Diotima's view convincing, should also gain credit.

OR

Herodotus 6. 74–84, 94–117, 132–40

EITHER

10 Discuss to what extent the thematic interests and narrative techniques on display here by Herodotus are typical of the other parts of book 6 that you have read. [Herodotus 6.134–5] [25]

For AO1, candidates could note that Herodotus is reporting a story told by all the Greeks, but specifically by the Parians. There is a distancing technique with 'they say' inserted, though there is a lot of detail about the Parian slave woman. Candidates should note the religious context of the story and, in particular, the idea of religious authority determining human action; there is the pen portrait of Miltiades and his failure (the great man brought low), as well as the Parian view of the priestess' transgression.

For AO3, candidates could comment on the following points:

- distancing techniques
- apparently irrelevant detail (colour)
- religious detail
- great men brought low.

Valid and relevant points not mentioned above should be rewarded.

OR

11 How good is Herodotus at explaining events? [25]

For AO1, candidates should show knowledge of how Herodotus explains a range of different events, such as the Athenian victory at Marathon and the events leading up to the eventual failures and deaths of Cleomenes and Miltiades, etc.

For AO3, candidates should analyse and evaluate Herodotus' explanations. They should consider how he refers to different sources and how he draws his own conclusions. They could discuss what makes a good explanation and what deficiencies make an explanation less satisfactory. They could consider whether Herodotus attaches too much importance to the virtues and failings of particular individuals, such as Cleomenes and Miltiades, in his explanation of events. They could also discuss how Herodotus uses religious explanations.

OR

12 'More an entertainer than an historian.' Discuss this view of Herodotus. [25]

For AO1, candidates should show knowledge and understanding of how Herodotus engages his readers with a range of stories in Book 6. They should discuss different narrative techniques, such as reference to different sources, obscure connections, implicit comparison (e.g. Cleomenes and Miltiades), the use of set speeches, the reference to particular detail to create pathos, etc.

For AO3, candidates should analyse and evaluate what is distinctive about Herodotus' narrative style. They could discuss his use of surprise in his narrative, e.g. ironic interpretation of oracles and prophecies. Candidates who demonstrate a close understanding of Herodotus' Greek should gain particular credit: e.g. if they give examples of his use of repetition of significant words and phrases to engage the reader/listener in his narrative. They should also gain credit for showing awareness that Herodotus wrote his history for public recitation, thus he could be considered an 'oral' author in the Homeric tradition. This last fact is important for any discussion of entertainment versus history, as is the nature and reliability of evidence presented by Herodotus.