



MARKSCHEME

November 2012

CLASSICAL GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES

Standard Level

Paper 1

*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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

These generic markbands are specific to Paper 1 and should be used in conjunction with the question-specific part of this markscheme. The range of possible answers and approaches listed in this markscheme is not exhaustive. Although the questions test a common set of skills, the application of these may demonstrate variation, and the range of appropriate specific knowledge may not be exactly alike across candidates and schools.

Application of the markbands

Examiners judge the answers using a “best-fit” model, as described in the following paragraph. When assessing a candidate’s work, the descriptors for each markband should be read until a descriptor is reached that most appropriately describes the level of the work being assessed. If a piece of work seems to fall between two descriptors, both descriptors should be read again and the one that more appropriately describes the candidate’s work chosen. Where there are several marks available within a markband, the upper marks should be awarded if the candidate’s work demonstrates most or all of the qualities described. The lower marks should be awarded if the candidate’s work demonstrates few of the qualities described. A response that meets most of the requirements of a particular markband, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in that markband.

In the assessment of extended responses in Paper 1, the following terms included in the markband descriptors should be considered, as appropriate to the focus of study for each topic (outlined in *Focus of assessment* on page 35 of the subject guide):

Specific features	refer to factual knowledge derived from the details of primary sources.
Features of genre	refer to genre or the conventions of genre. Candidates are expected to have developed a basic critical vocabulary in these areas, though not all areas may be relevant to the question.
Context	includes the historical, social, political, religious, or cultural knowledge to the extent that each may be used meaningfully to relate specific features (or features of genre) to the context of the society in which they were produced.

Markbands for the extended responses for Paper 1.

- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in markband 1–3, 0 should be recorded.
- 1–3** There is very little understanding of the question or relevant knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world. Appropriate skills and organizational structure are lacking. The answer is no more than a series of generalizations or a few facts that bear little relation to the question.
- 4–5** Little understanding is shown of the question, which is not addressed effectively. Although some factual details and comments are present, they are limited, often inaccurate and of marginal relevance. There is no clear and coherent argument and little evidence of specific features being analysed or related to their context. There is no reference to features of genre. Comparison and contrast are not used or not used effectively. There is also very little evidence of appropriate skills, such as selection and effective use of knowledge, and the structure is basic.
- 6–7** There is some indication that the question is understood. The question is partially addressed, and there is a limited degree of accurate and relevant knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world. Reference to features of genre is at best implicit. There is a limited demonstration of skills, focus (including relating specific features to their context) and structure. Skills of comparison and contrast are rudimentary.
- 8–10** The demands of the question are generally understood. The question may be answered with a relevant, coherent argument that is supported by limited material and/or contains limited reference to specific features and features of genre. Alternatively, the answer contains accurate knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman world but is mainly descriptive or narrative in form, with implicit analysis or explanatory comments, or is made relevant by its conclusion. There has been some attempt to relate specific features to their context and to structure an answer. Comparison and contrast are used to some basic effect.
- 11–13** The demands of the question are effectively and relevantly understood and addressed, but not all the implications are considered. Specific features are related to their context with some explicit analysis and explanatory comments, which are supported by accurate, relevant and adequate knowledge based on evidence from the ancient Greek and Roman world. The approach is either thematic or analytical or a soundly focused combination of narrative and analysis. Use of comparison and contrast is generally effective. Where appropriate there is a grasp of features of genre, at least in general terms. Where appropriate there is evidence of evaluation and interpretation.
- 14–16** The demands of the question are effectively and relevantly addressed, usually in a structured framework. Arguments are generally well developed, and clear and coherent. The answer is clearly supported by the effective use of appropriate factual knowledge based on evidence from the ancient Greek and Roman world. It also demonstrates a consistent level of analytical ability and/or a critical approach to specific features under study. Where relevant, features of genre are explained and specific features are related to their context. It makes effective use of comparison and contrast. An awareness of issues of substantiating claims may be demonstrated where appropriate. Where appropriate there is evidence of informed evaluation and considered interpretation drawn from a personal engagement with the subject.

17–20 The question is addressed in a clearly structured and focused essay that indicates a high level of awareness of the demands of the question. Arguments are clear, coherent, relevant and well substantiated. The answer demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the ancient Greek and Roman world through the effective selection and use of evidence. It also demonstrates a high level of analytic ability and/or a sharply critical approach to specific features under study, or which are strongly related to their context with a good grasp of features of genre. It makes highly effective use of comparison and contrast. Where appropriate the answer may draw on or generate wider historical or cultural views from an international perspective.

At the upper end of this markband the answer will further show an independent approach by displaying **at least one** of the following features: a highly developed awareness of contextual issues; the effective use of a wider historical or cultural perspective; a high level of conceptual ability; a successful challenge to the assumptions implied in the question.

SECTION A

Greek and Roman Tragedy

1. Compare and contrast the extent to which Euripides and Seneca portray their characters as victims of forces beyond their control, in *each* of the three plays you have read. [20 marks]

Candidates should examine in all three plays whether characters are portrayed thus. Candidates achieving the upper range of marks should discuss aspects that both agree and disagree with the statement, with sensitivity to similarities and differences between plays. Use discretion on the number and range of characters discussed, but upper range should consider at least two in each play. The ideas which follow should be treated merely as guidance rather than as setting a limit on the scope or perspective of a candidate's answer.

Euripides versus Seneca: Euripides makes divine forces explicit by Castor as “deus ex machina” in *Electra*, and Athene and Poseidon in the prologos of *Trojan Women*. Seneca in contrast emphasises characters as victims of their own human failings.

Electra

Agree: Orestes is entirely submissive to the commands of Apollo and shows regret and extreme caution about having to follow those commands. Electra complains, arguably to excess, throughout most of the play about how she is a victim of human agents: despised by Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, forced to marry a peasant, and entirely dependent on the long-awaited return of her brother to achieve revenge. After the murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, she instantly reverts to complaining about the gods' plans for her, despite her marriage to the eligible Pylades!

Disagree: It could be argued that “forces beyond their control” work just as much in favour of Orestes and Electra as against. A series of remarkable opportunities enable them to achieve their murderous goals against all the odds; Euripides seems just as interested in exploring characters as free individuals, reacting in believable ways to extraordinary circumstances.

Trojan Women

Agree: The whole play seems to be a sustained lament on the theme of this essay, with poignant emphasis on war as an instrument of destructive forces we cannot control. Hecabe epitomises the plight of a noble character ruined and humiliated by both divine and human hostility. Best answers should include the Greek “victors” as victims, too. Athene and Poseidon are already planning the wrecking of the fleet, and Cassandra's prophecies articulate this – for the audience at least.

Disagree: The prologos of Poseidon and Athene sets up the counter view that humans cause their own suffering by free acts of criminality, specifically here the Greeks' hubris in desecrating sacred places. The Helen–Menelaus strand can be seen either way: yes, the force of Aphrodite makes Menelaus' weakness almost comically inevitable; but Euripides develops these characters as a believable estranged couple in their own right.

Phaedra

Agree: It could be argued that the central tenet of the play is the importance of self-control, and characters who cannot control their emotions with reason are indeed doomed to be victims. Phaedra epitomises this: she is entirely at the mercy of her passion for Hippolytus and the final words of the play curse her, even in death. Likewise Theseus, just returned from his immoderate venture to the Underworld, is driven by a fit of rage to destroy his undeserving son.

Disagree: The Stoic underpinning of this work insists that the forces of the passions *can* be controlled by human will applying Reason. Unlike in Euripides, the gods are virtually redundant as agents of “forces”: the battle is fought within the human personality. The Nurse preaches this doctrine to Phaedra, and Hippolytus is portrayed as a saintly figure because he totally renounces “base” urges.

Award *[0–7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations.

Award *[8–10 marks]* for descriptions of the plot with little contextualization and analysis.

Award *[11–13 marks]* for addressing the question effectively for the most part with some explicit analysis of characters as victims and explanatory comment.

Award *[14–16 marks]* for a balanced, well substantiated answer with informed analysis drawn from a personal engagement with the plays.

Award *[17–20 marks]* for sharply analytic or strongly reflective exploration, showing depth and/or breadth of understanding of tragedy, and well substantiated, engaged and individual treatment.

2. “Tragedy enables us to confront the worst aspects of human nature.”
To what extent does this view apply to *each* of the three plays you have read? [20 marks]

Candidates should examine this view in all three plays. Candidates achieving the upper range of marks should discuss themes of the plays that both agree and disagree with the statement, with sensitivity to similarities and differences between plays. Use discretion on the number and range of “aspects” discussed. The ideas which follow should be treated merely as guidance rather than as setting a limit on the scope or perspective of a candidate’s answer.

Electra

Agree: Diminishing the “heroic” qualities of his central characters enables Euripides to explore self-obsession and a ready acceptance of murder as a valid resolution of problems. To Orestes, arguably, he adds cowardice and prevarication.

Disagree: Ironically the Peasant is a beacon of decency, readily recognised as such by Orestes. Likewise the Old Man is helpful and resourceful.

Trojan Women

Agree: There are numerous examples of the brutality of the Greeks towards the Trojans, unrelenting even now that the war is won. Credit deliberate echoes of the Athenian audience’s knowledge of recent atrocities in the Peloponnesian war. Also Helen’s manipulativeness and Menelaus’ gullibility.

Disagree: Admirable examples of dignity in suffering, particularly Hecabe. Talthybius tries his best to break bad news gently and clearly regrets the decisions of the high command – but is “only obeying orders”: one of the worst aspects of human nature?

Phaedra

Agree: Phaedra’s nature is utterly driven by sexual obsession: lurid fantasies, humiliating behaviour, the apparent absence of any moral sense. Theseus is little better: hot-tempered and devoid of compassion.

Disagree: Hippolytus upholds high moral principles to the end. The Nurse tries to champion rational compromise (*N.B.* in this version Phaedra throws herself directly at Hippolytus without the Nurse acting as “go-between”.) Readers who espouse Stoic (moralistic) ideals will indeed be confronted by the worst aspects of human nature, but only to confirm that they have access to the best.

Award [0–7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.

Award [8–10 marks] for descriptions with little contextualization.

Award [11–13 marks] for addressing the question effectively for the most part with some analysis within the framework of tragedy.

Award [14–16 marks] for a balanced, well-substantiated answer with informed analysis drawn from an effective understanding of tragedy and a personal engagement with the plays.

Award [17–20 marks] for sharply analytic or reflective exploration, showing depth and/or breadth of understanding of tragedy, and well substantiated, engaged and individual treatment of the chosen aspects.

SECTION B**War to Peace in Augustan Rome and Empire**

Since there is no “set text” for this topic, it is particularly important to be flexible in crediting those aspects which candidates have evidently focused upon in their studies, though the principles of the generic markbands for Paper 1 (pages 4–5) remain valid. The ideas which follow should therefore be treated merely as guidance rather than as setting a limit on the scope or perspective of a candidate’s answer.

3. Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies used by Augustus after his victory at Actium in 31 BCE, and up to 23 BCE, to consolidate his power. [20 marks]

Candidates may evaluate his strategies chronologically by reference, for example, to his pursuit of Antony and Cleopatra to Egypt, annexation of Egypt under his direct authority to avoid other senatorials using it as a power base, spectacular “triple triumph” on his return to Rome, strategically staged “handover” of some areas of power, control of vital “military” provinces, campaigns in Spain to eradicate final military challenges, dynastic plans already evident to secure the succession (marriage of Marcellus to Julia), resigning the consulship but acquiring “tribunician power”.

Strategies under discussion may include military, political, propagandistic, religious, and the beginning of the public building programme.

Award [0–7 marks] for general comments that are limited in focus or relevance.

Award [8–10 marks] for limited evidence and evaluation of Augustus’ strategies.

Award [11–13 marks] for evidence of Augustus’ strategies satisfactorily understood and their implications addressed with generally consistent analysis.

Award [14–16 marks] for evidence of informed engagement with the question, with relevant examples, showing understanding of historical context and effective interpretation supported by clear argument.

Award [17–20 marks] for an answer showing a range of cogent examples, an in-depth understanding of Augustus’ strategies, and a strong grasp of historical context, supported by clear and developed argument.

4. **To what extent did Augustus’ reforms improve the quality of life across the Empire?** [20 marks]

A response of a high standard should take into account various types of reform and evaluate to some extent their likely effect on the provinces.

Some understanding should be shown of a range of problems Augustus sought to address: for example, provincial government determined by power struggles in the senatorial class, greed of governors determined to recoup their expenditure on games, corrupt practices of the hierarchy of officials in each province, virtual autonomy of governors over the use of military forces under their command – sometimes to launch aggressive campaigns for personal glory.

Discussion of “improvements” might include:

Provincial Governors now owed their position to Augustus and were answerable to him: they were more likely to want to impress him by efficient administration and evidence of improving their province.

Reform of the army to make it permanent, professional and stable, owing loyalty directly to Augustus; stationed mainly in frontier provinces to secure boundaries within which peaceful enterprises could flourish, while increasing job opportunities in the army for provincials, especially as auxiliaries.

Romanization through a vigorous programme of urban centres, especially *coloniae*. This promoted increased trade, exploitation of mineral resources, improvement of food supplies, *etc.* More opportunities for locals to feel part of the empire through local government and administration.

Fairer financial administration as equestrian procurators, answerable to Augustus and securing promotion by their efficiency, supervised a more regular taxation system in which locals were more willing to participate, promoting economic growth.

Religion: local pride and self-promotion through holding priesthoods at newly-inaugurated temples. This was a basis for festivals, games, *etc.*

Award [0–7 marks] for general comments that are limited in focus or relevance.

Award [8–10 marks] for evidence of knowledge of a limited range of aspects of reforms and an understanding of their effect.

Award [11–13 marks] for evidence of Augustus’ reforms effectively understood and their implications addressed with generally consistent analysis.

Award [14–16 marks] for evidence of informed engagement with the question, with relevant examples, showing understanding and considered interpretation, supported by clear argument.

Award [17–20 marks] for an answer showing a range of relevant examples, an in-depth understanding of Augustus’ reforms and their effects, and an identifiable historical/cultural grasp supported by clear and developed argument.
