



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

CLASSICAL GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES

Standard Level

Paper 2

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

The purpose of Paper 2 is to give candidates the opportunity to demonstrate the following skills: comprehension, analysis, evaluation and application. Each of the questions in the source-based exercise can be classified as one of four types but questions may be classified as a mixture: comprehension/analysis, comprehension/application, or analysis/evaluation. The wording of each question will indicate the kind of answer required.

- **Comprehension:** Marks are awarded according to the extent to which the candidate can put into his or her own words the explicit message of the document or selected parts of it.
- **Analysis:** Marks are awarded according to the extent to which the candidate can make inferences, perceive internal relationships, compare and contrast documents, and persuasively explain the meaning and significance of a document or a combination of documents.
- **Evaluation:** Marks are awarded according to the extent to which the candidate can identify and evaluate different interpretations presented in the documents, or can evaluate the source material critically as evidence.
- **Application:** Marks are awarded according to the extent to which the candidate can achieve understanding of the documents, beyond what is possible from internal analysis alone, by applying relevant knowledge to them, or by placing the documents in a wider historical context.

The markscheme for Paper 2 relates to the areas for study suggested for Topic 1 and Topic 3 and tests the four skills outlined above. However, its range of possible answers is not exhaustive. Although it tests a common set of skills, it recognizes that their application may demonstrate variation, and the range of appropriate specific knowledge may not be exactly alike across candidates and schools.

SECTION A

Greek and Roman Epic

Question 1. (a) – (d) relates to Hecuba pleading with Hector not to fight Achilles and to Amata pleading with Turnus not to fight Aeneas. The accompanying sources are Sources A and B in the Source Booklet.

1. (a) **Using details from Source A (lines 1–18) and Source B (Fagles, lines 1–14 or West, lines 1–8), analyse the effectiveness of each speech.** [6 marks]

Reward careful consideration of individual aspects of the speeches suggested by the instruction to “analyse”. Candidates are likely to analyse both epics for their dramatic values and/or concentrate on rhetorical values. Generally: Hecuba is depicted as a strong maternal figure (language and stage direction create a powerful image of the breast as a symbolic bond between mother and son designed to dissuade Hector from risking death), whose speech and diction reflect her desperate appeal as she veers between argument and emotional personal address, and exploits the duty of women to bury the dead in order to strengthen her claim. Virgil’s take is perhaps less austere high tragic in its dramatization but its intimacy is moving and troubling. Technically Amata is not even Turnus’s mother-in-law, yet in the passionate threat of suicide she attempts to gain more leverage than Hecuba to Hector. The speech effectively captures the fact that she sees in Turnus a true son, whose death has further ramifications (*e.g.* political).

Award [1–2 marks] for a generalized overview.

Award [3–4 marks] for analysis substantiated with relevant references to Sources A and B.

Award [5–6 marks] for, in addition, a balanced and effective commentary on Sources A and B demonstrating sensitivity to the literary and/or cultural values of each epic.

- (b) **Compare and contrast the use of simile by Homer in Source A (lines 19–25) and by Virgil in Source B (Fagles, lines 15–20 or West, lines 9–12).** [4 marks]

For full marks candidates should show at least implicit understanding of simile as an epic convention, as implied by “... the use of” in the question. Candidates should comment on the relevance and effectiveness of the similes, as well as on a difference between authors, *e.g.* the physical menace of Homer’s image of Hector as a cornered snake, and Virgil’s pictorial images whose delicacy perhaps more aptly reflects the psychological manifestation of Lavinia’s blush (note how the theme of blood/red seeps into the following lines). Allow for individual variation of aesthetic response on the part of the candidate.

- (c) **How does Turnus’s reaction differ from Hector’s?** [2 marks]

Award [2 marks] for differentiation between, for instance, Hector’s refusal to change his position and Turnus’s passionate heightening of his resolve.

- (d) **Using examples from Source A and Source B, and at least two examples from elsewhere in the epics, examine the ways in which Homer and Virgil treat mother/son relations.** [8 marks]

Candidates may find examples in Homer of Hecuba entreating her son, Hector (Source A), and leading the dirge when Hector’s death is announced (Book 22). The main relationship is between Thetis and her son, Achilles, and there are plenty of examples here: Homer’s description of her maternal embrace and assurance, as well as her consciousness of Achilles’s short lifespan, which deepens the relations between mother and son, and our reaction to Achilles. The relationship of immortal mother and mortal son prefigures that of Venus and Aeneas. Examples in the *Aeneid* are Venus aiding Aeneas at a distance in Book 1, and the key passage in Book 2 when she reveals herself to Aeneas. Amata’s mothering role (Source B) is accentuated in the face of the collapse of the house of Latinus. Other instances are the relationship between Venus and Cupid, and between the childless Dido and Cupid, disguised as Ascanius. Candidates may draw on traditional maternal and filial roles and how these are variously treated by Homer and Virgil in particular contexts.

Award [1–2 marks] for a response that is largely irrelevant to the question, makes little and inaccurate reference to details in the epics, or draws **solely** on passages A and B.

Award [3–4 marks] for a general response with some relevance to the question, and an adequate attempt at examination.

Award [5–6 marks] for demonstration of a good understanding of how the bond between mother and son is treated/used in the epics, substantiated with references and analysis.

Award [7–8 marks] for a sophisticated response integrating both epics, offering effective analysis and a very good understanding of the use of the treatment of the bond between mother and son, and/or highlighting the differences or similarities of the treatment between epics (to a depth appropriate to the time-frame for the question).

Question 2. (a) – (d) relates to the clash between Hera and Apollo regarding the conduct of Achilles and to Juno’s justification for waging war on the Trojans. The accompanying sources are Sources C and D in the Source Booklet.

- 2. (a) With reference to Source C, and using details from Apollo’s speech (lines 1–20), describe and evaluate his criticism of Achilles’s conduct. [6 marks]**

Look out for a brief placing of the passage in context, a description of Apollo’s main points of criticism, and an evaluation of Apollo’s argument. In Apollo’s speech Homer condenses and brings to crisis point some of the main big themes of the *Iliad* – the nature of mortal worth, the overstepping of mortal bounds, a recognition of the inhumane – filtered through the comparison between mortals and immortals. Expect the candidate’s personal voice but recognize reference to the highlighted text.

Award [1–2 marks] for a generalized overview.

Award [3–4 marks] for a balance of description and evaluation substantiated with relevant references to Source C.

Award [5–6 marks] for, in addition, a more in-depth examination demonstrating sensitivity to the cultural values of the epic.

- (b) Compare the characterization of Hera in Source C (lines 21–32) with that of Juno in Source D. [4 marks]**

The emphasis is on a comparison of similarity but allow for perceived contrasts. Look for two sets of comparison with commentary or implied understanding through description. Candidates may recognize and comment both on the goddesses’ reaction to events or arguments which run against their wishes and on how they manipulate logic to suit their personal position. Candidates may comment on the character and consciousness of status.

- (c) With reference to Source D, how is the introduction of Aeolus (Fagles, lines 20–25 or West, lines 13–16) at this point in the epic useful to Virgil? [2 marks]**

Award a credible response which suggests understanding beyond the content of the passage, *e.g.* in terms of plot Virgil wants to introduce the storm which will divert Aeneas to Carthage and to the Dido episode.

- (d) **With reference to Source C and Source D, and the epics as a whole, examine how Homer and Virgil use dialogue in direct speech to enhance their narrative.** **[8 marks]**

Reward evidence of “examination” that is followed by, or integrated with, descriptive content. Dialogue in direct speech is a staple of Homer’s (oral) technique. Expect answers on the lines of:

- to create a sense of immediate dramatic impact;
- as a plot device developing turns in the plot;
- to reveal character by showing rather than telling;
- to demonstrate Homeric values (of being a “speaker of words” in addition to being a “doer of deeds”, of human worth, *etc.*)

Examples to choose from are: the altercation between Achilles and Agamemnon in Book 1, the embassy scene in Book 9, the supplicatory scenes in Book 1 and 24, and various dialogue types surrounding battling and duelling. Candidates may find similar uses in Virgil, but may pick up on possible differences in Virgil’s more “literary” approach, *e.g.* more monologues or speeches without counter-speech (but direct speech is used spectacularly in Book 4, not to mention Books 2 and relevant parts of Book 12, even if none could be labelled full dialogue scenes as you may find in Homer).

Award **[1–2 marks]** for a response that is largely irrelevant to the question, shows little and inaccurate reference to details in the epics, or draws **solely** on passages C and D.

Award **[3–4 marks]** for a general response with some relevance to the question, and an adequate attempt at examination.

Award **[5–6 marks]** for a demonstration of a good understanding of how dialogue is used to enhance the narrative, substantiated with references and analysis.

Award **[7–8 marks]** for a sophisticated response integrating both epics, offering effective examination and a very good understanding of the use of dialogue in direct speech in both epics, or highlighting the difference in use between epics (to a depth appropriate to the time-frame for the question).

SECTION B

The Peloponnesian War: Greece in Conflict

Question 3. (a) – (d) relates to Thucydides’s historical method; to his description of the end of the Sicilian expedition; and to Plutarch’s description of the treatment of Athenian prisoners. The accompanying sources are Sources E to G in the Source Booklet.

3. (a) **Referring to examples in Source E, evaluate Thucydides’s claims concerning the accuracy of his work.** **[6 marks]**

Look for three examples with a discussion of each. For full marks the points must offer a relevant evaluation of Thucydides’s claims concerning the accuracy of his work. Examples may include his method of recreating speeches, his empirical observation, his checking and evaluating of accounts, and favouring utility over the “romantic element”.

- (b) **Paying close attention to the passage in Source F, summarize and explain the treatment of the Syracusans towards their prisoners over the ten weeks.** **[4 marks]**

Reward an effective summary in the candidate’s voice, that is combined with an attempt at interpreting Thucydides’s description, or a concise overview with an attempt at an explanation of Syracusan motives. Very generally, the quarries made a naturally fortified detention camp, and in Thucydides’s description this bears a marked similarity to modern day concentration camps. This leads to questions about ancient ideas on punishment, the treatment of the defeated, and so on, but also may bring up points about the particularity of the case: unexpectedly the Syracusans had a large body of prisoners on their hands, which raised practical considerations. The decision to differentiate prisoners may receive comment.

- (c) **Discuss the significance of *one* piece of additional information in Source G.** **[2 marks]**

Reward a credible discussion of one piece of additional information.

- (d) **Describe the advantages of Thucydides’s practice of providing detailed description, and discuss at least *three* examples of this elsewhere in his work. [8 marks]**

Advantages may refer to:

- how detailed description may help to reinforce Thucydides’s notion of historical significance and historical truth by conveying accuracy through detail;
- the advantages for the modern reader in helping to convey a sense of past times and experiences, regardless of whether the approach is considered historical.

The aim of the question is to allow the candidate to consider the point of, and various effects of, the detailed description in Thucydides. Candidates may have their own favourite set-pieces in mind but significant descriptions may be found, for instance, in:

- the construction of Pericles’s Funeral speech “in full” (with the usual caveats concerning Thucydides’s method for recreating speeches);
- the graphic description of the plague at Athens;
- the description of the capture of the Spartans on Sphacteria;
- the description and commentary on the launch of the Sicilian expedition (with psychological explanations of motivation, economic explanation, and pictorial dramatization).

In the best answers expect Thucydides’s interest in causation to come through.

Award [1–2 marks] for a superficial discussion of the advantages of detailed description, with scant attention to context and little evidence of understanding.

Award [3–4 marks] for a relevant discussion of the advantages of detailed description, with some evidence of understanding, but with limited application and context.

Award [5–6 marks] for evidence of a satisfactory understanding of the advantages of detailed description, and of how these could be exploited (*e.g.* for survival or control) in the changing context of the war.

Award [7–8 marks] for, in addition, evidence of sound analysis in responding to the question, with an evaluation of examples corresponding to a number of advantages.

Question 4. (a) – (d) relates to changing relations between Athens and Sparta during the war. The accompanying sources are Sources H to J in the Source Booklet.

- 4. (a) With reference to Source H, evaluate the arguments of the Athenians as to why it would be inadvisable for the Spartans to break the peace. [6 marks]**

The Athenians put forward various arguments *e.g.*:

- if the Spartans defeat the Athenians and take over the empire, their appalling management record will make them lose the political good will they enjoy now;
- currently the Spartans do not suffer from been drawn into other states' difficulties;
- to enter war is to risk suffering unpredictable outcomes;
- the Spartans should abide by the treaty and settle differences by arbitration;
- by breaking the treaty they would be breaking the gods' sanction;
- if the Spartans begin a war, they can be sure that the Athenians will come to meet them in battle, no matter where or in what form.

So the Athenians' stance is a mixture of hypothesis, advice on the practicality of such a decision on personal and general principles, diplomatic suggestion, and veiled threat. Since candidates are required to look at the arguments with reference only to this excerpt, they may evaluate Athenian arguments along the lines of persuasion, strength of argument, logic, and so on. None of the arguments address the fear of Athenian expansion (Thucydides's main reason for the outbreak of war), or the fact that the threat of meeting Spartan opposition "in any and every field of action that you may choose" is precisely not borne out by events.

Award [1–2 marks] for arguments that are unclearly restated, with little or no effective evaluation.

Award [3–4 marks] for arguments that are clearly addressed and evaluated.

Award [5–6 marks] for arguments that are clearly addressed and evaluated with greater sophistication of historical and/or cultural understanding.

- (b) With reference to Source I discuss the reasons why both sides were coming closer to securing peace. [4 marks]**

No more than [2 marks] should be awarded for straightforward description of the passage. Evidence should be rewarded of knowledge from elsewhere which may amplify Thucydides's shorthand, *e.g.* "the island", the early Spartan attempt at negotiation, Delium, Amphipolis, Cleon, Brasidas, *etc.* His crisper definition of what kind of Spartans were caught and his mini biographies of Brasidas and Cleon refine the search for causes.

- (c) **Describe what additional information Source J adds to Thucydides’s description of Cleon in Source I.** [2 marks]

Any credible response should be rewarded, *e.g.* Source J corroborates Thucydides’s accusation, amplifies Thucydides’ unsupported remarks, *etc.*

- (d) **With reference to Sources H, I and J, and your own knowledge, examine the consequences of the war up to the Peace of Nicias in 422–1.** [8 marks]

This question gives candidates an opportunity to consolidate their knowledge of passages and events up to 5.13, and to identify and weigh consequences. The ground covered may include:

- a description of the practical and psychological consequences of Pericles’s plan not to meet the Spartans in the field on land;
- the effect of the plague;
- the Theban attack on Plataea;
- the steady spread of involvement of states across Greece;
- the revolt of Mytilene;
- political turmoil in Corcyra;
- the Pylos episode and consequences for Sparta, *etc.*

Consequences may include, but are not limited to:

- **Political:** alliance shifts, the quest for city-state autonomy, catalyst moments for attempts at a shift in power between oligarchic and democratic factions.
- **Social:** upheavals in social order, acts of atrocity, the effects of losses in battle.

Award [1–2 marks] for superficially discussed consequences, with scant attention to context and little evidence of understanding.

Award [3–4 marks] for relevantly discussed consequences, with evidence of understanding but with limited application and context.

Award [5–6 marks] for evidence of a satisfactory understanding of consequences, and the effect of these in the changing context of the war.

Award [7–8 marks] for, in addition, evidence of sound analysis and development in responding to the question, with an evaluation of a range of consequences for Athens, Sparta, and other city-states.
