



Coimisiún na Scrúduithe Stáit
State Examinations Commission

Leaving Certificate 2020

Marking Scheme

Classical Studies

Higher Level

Note to teachers and students on the use of published marking schemes

Marking schemes published by the State Examinations Commission are not intended to be standalone documents. They are an essential resource for examiners who receive training in the correct interpretation and application of the scheme. This training involves, among other things, marking samples of student work and discussing the marks awarded, so as to clarify the correct application of the scheme. The work of examiners is subsequently monitored by Advising Examiners to ensure consistent and accurate application of the marking scheme. This process is overseen by the Chief Examiner, usually assisted by a Chief Advising Examiner. The Chief Examiner is the final authority regarding whether or not the marking scheme has been correctly applied to any piece of candidate work.

Marking schemes are working documents. While a draft marking scheme is prepared in advance of the examination, the scheme is not finalised until examiners have applied it to candidates' work and the feedback from all examiners has been collated and considered in light of the full range of responses of candidates, the overall level of difficulty of the examination and the need to maintain consistency in standards from year to year. This published document contains the finalised scheme, as it was applied to all candidates' work.

In the case of marking schemes that include model solutions or answers, it should be noted that these are not intended to be exhaustive. Variations and alternatives may also be acceptable. Examiners must consider all answers on their merits, and will have consulted with their Advising Examiners when in doubt.

Future Marking Schemes

Assumptions about future marking schemes on the basis of past schemes should be avoided. While the underlying assessment principles remain the same, the details of the marking of a particular type of question may change in the context of the contribution of that question to the overall examination in a given year. The Chief Examiner in any given year has the responsibility to determine how best to ensure the fair and accurate assessment of candidates' work and to ensure consistency in the standard of the assessment from year to year. Accordingly, aspects of the structure, detail and application of the marking scheme for a particular examination are subject to change from one year to the next without notice.

Introduction

The Leaving Certificate course in Classical Studies is wide-ranging and varied. It presents a study of history, historiography, philosophy, literature of different genres (including drama, epic and lyric poetry) as well as art and architecture. The questions on the examination paper reflect this variety of approaches and skills; the marking scheme is therefore adapted to this differentiation between the individual topics and questions. In discursive questions examiners look for developed points in candidates' answers and award marks to the degree in which these points are developed. These points must be individual and substantial.

In general, a substantial and well-developed point is one which:

- takes due cognisance of the command words in the question e.g. comment on, describe, analyse, discuss, evaluate, give an opinion, etc.
- addresses the question directly
- establishes a clear link between the question asked and the prescribed material
- clearly expresses either argument or information
- fulfils all of the above at some length. This length depends on the context of the question but would generally comprise a substantial paragraph.

It is important to note that at Higher Level, where questions call for analysis, evaluation, comment or discussion, candidates are required to engage with that aspect of the question and not just present a narrative of the story. A display of knowledge which is not applied to answering the question directly, while garnering some marks, will not be rewarded with high marks.

As stated above, the variety inherent in the syllabus requires variety in the type of question asked and within the marking scheme. This is particularly apparent in the Art and Architecture questions (Topics 8 and 10) where occasionally a single word or brief point may suffice for full marks. In these topics correct technical terms are expected for full or high marks. The allocation of marks for each question and sub-question is set out in the marking scheme below.

The criteria for assessing some discursive questions can be seen in Appendix 1.

Examiners will approach the marking of a candidate's work with an open mind in the understanding that a candidate may present material, argument or views which are not set out in the marking scheme but which are equally valid. In considering this marking scheme the following should be noted: The detail required in any answer is determined by the context and the manner in which the question is asked and by the number of marks assigned to the answer in the examination paper. Requirements and mark allocations may therefore vary from year to year.

Examiners will make use of the full range of marks available for each question or sub-question.

Topic 1: Athens at War.

(i)

(a) Cleon was responsible for proposing the original motion for putting the Mytilenians to death. He was remarkable for the violence of his character and very influential.

First, he says that a democracy is incapable of ruling others, as he can see from how the people are now thinking of changing their minds. Because fear and conspiracy do not feature in their dealings with each other, they do not realise how they form part of their allies' way of thinking. He says that compassion is a form of weakness, dangerous to the city and it will not make you more popular with your allies who are ruled by force, not because they want to be. Leadership depends on strength, not goodwill.

His argument is that the worst thing to do is to pass measures, and not abide by them. Laws that are constantly being altered are bad. Cleverness that gets out of hand is dangerous, better to have common sense along with lack of learning. States are better run by the "man in the street" than by intellectuals. Intellectuals are dangerous because they want to show off and seem better than the laws.

This delay is bad because a delay makes the injured party less angry. Reprisal for a crime should be immediate. Anyone who argues against this will have to either persuade you that the original decision was not made at all or else he has been bribed to lead you off the right track.

He says it is your own fault for allowing these speech competitions, relying on clever speeches instead of on the facts to make your decisions. Anything novel or fancy persuades you and you are more interested in the style of an argument than its content. You are more like an audience at a lecture than a parliament discussing matters of state.

Mytilene has done you more harm than any other city. They had their independence and were never badly treated by us. So, they committed an act of "calculated aggression" rather than a revolt against unfair rule.

Nor did they learn their lesson from others who had revolted, they were just greedy and attacked us unprovoked, arrogant on account of their sudden great prosperity. We treated them too well and so they grew arrogant. As a rule, people despise those who treat them well and look up to those who make no concession. Let them be punished as they deserve. They all took part in the revolt too, not just the aristocracy and it was not just a mistake, it was a deliberate act. You must make an example of these people otherwise, all your subjects will think that they have nothing to lose by attacking you and we will have to cope with war against all our allies. You are an imperial power and cannot afford the pleasures of listening to a clever argument, listen to claims of decency or to feel pity. A sense of decency is owed only to our friends.

If you are going to pardon the Mytilenians, then you should really give up your empire so that you can go in for philanthropy. How would they have treated you if they had won? They would have shown no mercy. Do not be traitors to your own selves. Remember how you felt when you first heard they had rebelled and pay them back for it. Make an example of them for your other allies and do not grow soft.

At least three arguments. (7, 7, 6.)

(20)

(b) Diodotus then speaks. He had already opposed the motion.

A debate on matters of importance is a good thing. Haste and anger are obstacles to wise counsel, they are the mark of primitive and narrow minds. Words are the only way to deal with actions. He who says not is a fool or has a personal interest at stake. It is wrong to accuse speakers of greed / looking for his own gain; people will end up afraid to speak. Though maybe we would be better off without some speakers. The point of a debate is not for popularity it is to persuade the people what you believe is best and right. We have reached the state where if a good proposal is made, it is seen as suspect and possibly lies.

The question is not whether Mytilene is guilty, but whether we are making the right decision for ourselves. Our discussion concerns the future – Cleon says that the death penalty will be useful to us in the future as it will deter others from revolting. This argument probably appeals to you in your anger. The death penalty is not a deterrent, crimes still are carried out because people think they will succeed. Men will always commit crimes, no matter what the deterrent. Hope, desire, over-confidence in one's luck all lead to crimes including those by whole states. We must not put too much faith in the death penalty. We must not make rebels desperate by depriving them of the chance of atoning for what they have done. If Cleon's way is followed any state that rebels will never surrender because it will not be worth their while. They will hold out to the very end. That is not in our interests.

We are not like a judge, judging a criminal, rather we ought to see how we can turn this situation to our advantage. The only way to prevent revolt is to treat people fairly and if we must use force, to use it on as few people as possible.

Look at the situation now in the cities – in most cases the democracies are loyal to us and do not join with the oligarchies in revolting. If you destroy the democrats of Mytilene who did not want to revolt, you will be guilty of killing your friends and also doing what the oligarchs want. You will be proving them right. In this case vengeance is not in our interest. I do not argue for pity or compassion, rather try the guilty men, not the innocent ones. The wise are always more feared by their enemies.

At least three arguments. (7, 7, 6.)

(20)

(c) The vote was taken and the two sides were nearly equal, but Diodotus' motion was passed. A second ship was sent to Mytilene and it arrived just in time to prevent a massacre.

One point. (10.)

(10)

(ii)

(a)

The city had first surrendered to Brasidas and the Spartans. Later the Athenians had sent an expedition under Cleon with 300 cavalry and 1,200 hoplites along with some allied troops, to recover the city. First the Athenians took Torone and then moved on to Amphipolis, camping at Eion and sending for reinforcements. Brasidas took up a position on high ground at Cerdylum and waited for Cleon to move first. Cleon's troops did not really have faith in him and became impatient, so he moved them close to Amphipolis. Brasidas, aware that his army was big enough, but not good enough, rushed out of the gates and attacked with 150 hoplites. He explained to his army that the enemy was unready and would be taken by surprise, especially by the second wave of troops. While the Athenians were moving away slowly and unprepared, Brasidas attacked their exposed right wing and routed their centre. Cleon led the second attack and the Athenians, unprepared for battle, panicked and fled. Cleon was killed while fleeing and 600 Athenian hoplites were lost fighting bravely. The enemy suffered only 7 casualties. However, Brasidas was fatally wounded, living only long enough to hear news of his victory.

A coherent account of the battle. (12, 12, 11.)

(35)

(b) Both sides now considered how to make peace. The Athenians had suffered a serious blow and had lost confidence. They were now ready to accept terms that they would not have accepted before. They feared defection of their allies and were anxious to come to terms. Although the Spartans had won at Amphipolis, they had lost Brasidas and were also keen to make peace.

Two points. (8, 7.)

(15)

(iii)

Nicias was the Athenian general and Gylippus the Spartan general during the Sicilian war. Nicias, who ended up leading the Sicilian Expedition, was against it from the start and had spoken out against it in the Assembly. Undoubtedly, the expedition stretched Athenian resources much too far. During the expedition, Nicias felt ill and asked to be recalled. He was indecisive and constantly changed his mind. He left the wall at Epipolae incomplete which gave

the Spartans a chance to break their defences. He had a chance to escape but did not take it for fear of ruining his reputation and later when there was a chance to retreat by sea, he was too superstitious to do so because of an eclipse of the moon. His men had lost faith in him and his style of leadership did not do anything to bolster their confidence. The expedition required a bold, determined approach and he was cautious and dithering.

Gylippus arrived from Sparta when things were going badly for the Spartans at Syracuse, yet he quickly succeeded in instilling a new determination and confidence although he brought few extra forces. In contrast to Nicias, he was decisive, had the support of his men. He quickly judged the importance of the gap in the Athenians' defensive wall and took advantage of it. He had more initiative and was very decisive, following up on the breach of the wall with a solid attack, driving back the Athenians to an ever-increasingly defensive position. Finally, he got the reinforcements he had demanded and defeated the Athenians under Demosthenes. The decisiveness, judgement, inspirational leadership and follow-through exhibited by Gylippus are in stark contrast to the dithering, time-wasting and failure to follow through of Nicias.

A range of similarities and/or differences. (10, 10, 10, 10, 10.)

(50)

(iv)

(a) The reasons given by Thucydides are as follows: The previous greatest war was The Persian War, but its outcome was resolved by two naval and two land battles, so it was quite brief whereas the Peloponnesian War lasted for much longer and brought with it unprecedented suffering for Hellas. In other words, it was a much "greater" or more substantial war than any that had happened before. Obviously, his Greek-centred view comes through in that the world, for him, is of course, the Greek world. There is no other.

He says that never before had so many cities been captured and destroyed, never so many exiles or such loss of life. In this respect, he seems to view the Peloponnesian War in a similar way to that in which World War 1 was called the "Great War". Its sheer scale gave it a significance beyond all others.

He says that old stories which had seemed exaggerated now seemed possible. So, in this way, the war changed the very possibilities of existence, all previous assumptions had to be altered. He adds that to make the whole event even more catastrophic, there were many earthquakes, more eclipses and droughts, famines and of course the plague which destroyed more life than almost any other factor. All in all, he feels that it was a war which altered everything.

Three developed points. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(b) Candidates could agree using the parameters of Thucydides' argument and expanding on the greatness of the battles and other events of the War, particularly if they argue cogently that major factors in warfare, for instance the causes, people's behaviour and so on, do not really change, even if weapons do. Candidates should back up their arguments with examples

from the text. It would also be acceptable to argue against the statement using modern examples of warfare (particularly the two World Wars). Evidence of genuine engagement with the question is crucial here.

Two explained reasons. (10, 10.)

(20)

Topic 2: Alexander the Great.

(i)

(a) Darius prepared a wide, open site for the battle near the River Bumodus. He ordered his engineers to level the area for the better use of Scythian cavalry and scythe-chariots. He had an army of 40,000 cavalry, 1 million infantry and 200 chariots. He also had 15 elephants. He mistakenly felt that this would prevent a similar defeat as at Issus. He also kept his troops standing all night in case of a night attack which left them demoralised and exhausted. Darius placed himself in the centre with the Persian bodyguards. 50 chariots and 15 elephants were in front as well as Bactrian cavalry on the left wing with Scythian horsemen. On the right he positioned more cavalry and mounted archers. On the other hand, Alexander brought his troops to within 4 miles of the enemy and then took Parmenio's advice to encamp and scout out the land. He did not accept his advice to run a night attack as he felt that this would be way too risky and that it might mean that a victory would not be seen as valid later. He spoke to his men about their past glories and how courage was in their hearts from birth. He emphasised how the success of all depended on the valour of each and that this was the battle which would determine who would rule all Asia. Alexander put the Companion cavalry on his right, the Guards in the centre with the heavy infantry and the Thessalian cavalry on the left.

A coherent description of each leader's preparations. (8, 7.)

(15)

(b) Alexander led the Companions at an oblique angle screened by light troops which forced Darius's army to move across with him. Afraid of getting onto uneven ground, Darius ordered the chariots to outflank Alexander's right wing, but he was waiting for this and sent the cavalry against them. The overall plan seems to have been the formation of a hollow rectangle which meant that even if they were outflanked, they were still not defeated. This was a very clever tactic facing an army of superior size, but poorer quality soldiers. The Scythian chariots were met with the Agrianians and javelin throwers and their drivers were pulled down by the reins also the lines parted to allow some of them through. Meanwhile Alexander's infantry advanced on Darius' centre and the cavalry companions launched a swift attack on Darius's own position. When the Persian left was scattered Darius turned and fled. Meanwhile, Parmenio's wing was drawn back onto the defensive and was falling back badly, but Alexander turned and came to their aid, routing the Persian army. His tactics here: the hollow rectangle, the advance at an oblique angle, the tactics for disabling the chariots and the flexibility of his troops, able to move quickly to trouble-shoot (e.g. on the left wing) all won this battle for Alexander.

A coherent account of Alexander's actions in the battle. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(c) Darius was pursued by Alexander once he was defeated but he escaped. All of his possessions were taken, money, shield, chariot and bow. Alexander had lost 100 men and about 1,000 horses. The Persian dead were reckoned at 300,000. Alexander now took the great city of Babylon. Darius was captured by Bessus and eventually left for dead.

Two consequences. (5, 5.)

(10)

(ii)

(a) Alexander visits the shrine of Zeus Ammon at Siwah because it was a major shrine at which both Greeks and Egyptians worshipped. It was reputed to have oracular powers and Alexander wished to consult the oracle, as Perseus and Heracles had done so.

Two explained reasons. (5, 5.)

(10)

(b) His arrival at the oasis was aided by snakes / birds sent by the gods. Alexander entered the shrine and when he came out, announced that he had heard what he had come to hear, as he put it. Although this was very vague, the speculation was that he had it confirmed that he was son of Zeus Ammon and it had answered several other questions which Alexander had posed regarding his father's assassins and his future glories. Plutarch has the story of the priest at the shrine addressing him, by mistake as "Son of Zeus" instead of "My child". The event is shrouded in mystery as we get few details, but of course, that short statement of his hearing what he had come to hear spoke volumes and allowed his supporters to take from it what they wished. For many, it was the notion that Alexander was descended from Zeus Ammon.

A coherent description of what happened at the shrine. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(c) Firstly, we can see that Alexander was punctilious about worship of the gods, Olympian and local wherever he went. Siwah was not easy to reach. Secondly, he comes across as a master of propaganda in his making such a cryptic statement about the visit. He does not come out and claim to be the son of Zeus Ammon, but he certainly does imply that there is a connection there (supported by his later minting of coins with the ram's horns of the god). The whole episode adds to his mystique and the aura of divinity which had surrounded him even from birth. This episode does seem to indicate that he had the common sense not to push the claim too far. The real mystery is whether he believed it himself which we will never know. Undertaking such a needless and dangerous expedition reflects uncharacteristically poor judgement by Alexander. The trek could have been disastrous.

Two explained aspects of his character. (5, 5.)

(10)

(iii)

(a) The events began at a party where there was too much drink consumed by everyone. But even before this, Arrian tells us that Cleitus deplored Alexander's increasingly oriental style of leadership. General flattery was going on and Alexander was being compared to a god. Cleitus could not stand this. He talked about Philip and how his achievements were much greater than Alexander's. According to Plutarch, Cleitus complained about the access the Persians had to the king, but that the only happy Macedonians were the dead. He raised his hand and reminded Alexander that he had saved his life at the Granicus. According to Plutarch Alexander first threw an apple at Cleitus. Arrian has it that Cleitus was removed from the scene, but came back in, taunting Alexander. Alexander called out for him to be captured, but no one reacted, and he ran Cleitus through with a spear.

A coherent account of the events. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(b) Anaxarchus gave out to Alexander for lying on the floor and weeping. He told Alexander that he was a king and as such was like Zeus, the arbiter of justice. It was his job to govern and command and get on with it. Everything done by the ruler is just.

One explained point. (5.)

(5)

(c) Candidates should express a personal view of the accounts of Arrian and Plutarch. They could argue that Alexander was king and that, as Arrian says, Cleitus owed him more respect and should not have belittled him in company. You could argue that Cleitus should have voiced his complaints in private and that he provoked Alexander beyond endurance by making him seem ridiculous in public. Also, if true, Plutarch's account of how Cleitus is pulled away, but gets back in to escalate the row would feature here. This would validate the excuses made by the two writers to some extent. Candidates could also include Arrian's assertion that Alexander's extreme remorse after the event reflects well on him. On the other hand, Cleitus was the brother of Alexander's nanny and he had saved Alexander's life at the Granicus. Nothing could excuse the drunken murder of an old friend, even if he were being disrespectful and insulting. It is a blight on Alexander's kingship that he allowed himself to get so out of control as to do this. His own grief afterwards is evidence of his guilt. Candidates could argue that Arrian and Plutarch's attempts to mitigate Alexander's guilt reflects their bias in his favour and marks their lack of objectivity.

View to be substantiated by two references. (8, 7.)

(15)

(iv)

Candidates should give a good overview of the scale of Alexander's achievements including the consolidation of his control of the Greek world and his borders; his expedition east where he conquered Asia Minor so very quickly and by 331 BC had beaten the Persian king Darius to gain

control over the Persian Empire. His military successes are almost unparalleled in history. His extending of the boundaries of the Persian Empire as far as modern day India and Pakistan makes his expedition quite remarkable. His army was almost completely successful and remained unbeaten in pitched battle. His mastery of siege warfare was second to none as shown in Tyre, Gaza and Aornos. The devotion of his men to the very end (with a few hiccups) was also notable. The achievement of all of this at such a young age makes his career quite an extraordinary one. Most of the answer will probably focus on the second part of the question – his character. Candidates could argue either way, that his personality was terrible or that his faults could be excused, on the basis of his overall greatness and that you have to weigh up his achievements against the minor nature of his flaws. Either case is fine, as long as the candidate backs up their case with reference to the texts.

Alexander's main faults could be described as cruelty, violent temper, over indulgence in alcohol, and in latter years, a tendency to paranoia and hasty judgement, as well as a dictatorial streak. References here could include the destruction of Thebes and the slaughter of its citizens; the barbaric treatment of Bessus; the brutal punishment of Hermolaus and the killing of Philotas and Parmenio. Also, relevant here are the Cleitus episode, the demand for proskynesis and the treatment of Callisthenes; his behaviour after the death of Hephaestion and the burning of the palace at Persepolis. His rupture of the truce in India, his appalling judgement in the crossing of the Gedrosian desert and his treatment of Abulites who had failed to get food for his horses; his excessive reaction to the death of Hephaestion, including the slaughter of the tribe of Cossaeans; his misreading of the situation at Opis when he tries to send home the Macedonians (even sending 13 of them for execution); his increasing willingness to listen to accusations of treachery and his increasing wild reliance on superstitions and omens, "he was a slave to his fears"; also, over the years, it seems that his drinking had certainly increased and contributed to his poor judgement. Candidates should mention a range of these references to back up the theory that his character was "terrible", the list does not need to be exhaustive.

Some candidates may not agree that his character was terrible. Arguments that they might use here include the basic argument of Arrian, that no one is in a position to criticise Alexander owing to the extraordinary nature of his achievements, that he was so remarkable that the standards applying to ordinary men do not apply to him. You could argue that his very nature, including his wild ambition, ego and even violence, was what enabled him to achieve all that he did. Also, one could argue that, yes, he had lapses in judgement, he did have flaws and made terrible mistakes, but that to describe his nature as "terrible" is not accurate. References here might include: his loyalty and generosity to his men; his willingness to suffer as they did (helmet of water in the desert); the men's reaction to his injury at the Mallian Siege; his treatment of Porus after the Hydaspes; his repayment of his men's debts. Again, a selection of references will be enough here to back up the main argument. Candidates should show a genuine engagement with the thesis and be rewarded for their own opinion, as long as it is backed up with reference to the texts.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

Topic 3: Life and Thought in the Late Roman Republic.

(i)

(a) Possible themes to focus on are: love (maybe as a sickness rather than a joy); the intensity of his passion and his suffering; the fickleness of women; the importance of friendship; sympathy for those who mourn; the pain of the loss of a brother; the importance of generosity of spirit. Candidates should use at least four of the poems for quotations or references to back up their ideas.

Two developed points on each theme. (7, 6, 6, 6.)

(25)

(b) Catullus shows himself to be a man of very extreme emotions, when he loves, it is with all his being as the Lesbia poems reveal. His feelings are all consuming and it is all or nothing for him. He reveals his devotion, doubts and uncertainty, especially his capacity to feel both love and irritation at the same time. He often describes love as being almost like an illness or an addiction. He even describes the painful determination to be cured in *A Prayer*. Catullus's wonderful range of emotions from bleak to ecstatic is revealed in his love poems. Catullus's poem to his dead brother is extremely touching and speaks of a close bond with his brother. His kind, compassionate and loyal qualities as a friend are evident in *Consolation, The Same* and *At a Brother's Grave*. He obviously feels acutely the grief of loss and empathises with others who are in that situation. Candidates should mention his own losses (of Lesbia and of his brother) and his sympathy for others.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15)

(c) The themes of Catullus are universal and timeless. His poems are deeply personal and very emotional. In treating of love, loss, friendship and family, they are as relevant now as they were when he wrote them. All of his themes are current. If a candidate wishes to argue to the contrary, they might make the point that his ways of treating the themes are dated and alien to modern sensibilities in some ways. Candidates would need to refer to at least one specific poem in this answer.

Two explained reasons. (5, 5.)

(10)

(ii)

Plutarch is critical of the treatment of Cicero by Mark Antony and Octavian, as is evident in this quote. He seems to be referring to Mark Antony, in particular in these words. He was the one with the real grudge against Cicero and it appears that the two men had always been "suspicious of each other because of the very wide difference in their ways of living." Theirs was a quintessential clash of styles. Cicero feared that Antony would seek supreme power after Caesar's murder while Antony knew that Cicero was in sympathy with Brutus and the conspirators. The immediate cause of Antony's hatred was Cicero's failure to attend a crucial

meeting of the senate called by Antony who almost sent soldiers to bring Cicero by force. Cicero subsequently backed the young Octavian against Antony as well, of course, as delivering the vicious Philippics against Antony. Cicero blamed Antony for the loss of three Roman armies and the destruction of the Senate. Cicero's main charge against Antony was that Antony had tried several times to force a crown on Julius Caesar and make him king and thus had behaved like a slave. It was during the festival of the Lupercalia when Antony was naked. Antony insisted on recording his efforts in the public record. Next, he condemned Antony for using force to intimidate his opponents. He said that Antony had surrounded the Senate with armed men and that the Forum was full of 'the world's most savage people.' He claimed that Antony had shunned Rome and consorted with thieves and riff-raff. He said that his ambition was to reign in Rome and that he was trying to replace law and courts by tyranny. So, Antony, despite the apparent pleading of Octavian bore a terrible grudge on account of these accusations from such a pre-eminent public figure and would not rest until he had his revenge. Once reunited with Octavian, he was in a position to push for it.

Plutarch makes it clear that he feels that Cicero did not deserve the treatment he received and that it was the disastrous combination of power with Antony's passionate loathing of Cicero that allowed it to happen.

In short, Cicero was doomed, even though Octavian supposedly argued against his proscription. He was hunted down and caught leaving his villa at Formiae in a litter. When his killers Herennius and Popilius arrived, his own slaves refused to give him away, but he was betrayed by a freed slave of his brother's. He died with dignity, offering his throat to the killers, and asking them to give him a proper death, even though what they were doing was not proper. His grace under extreme duress here is remarkable and contrasts with the brutality of Antony's power and passion.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iii)

(a) Sallust is a fierce critic of the Rome of his day. He thinks that Rome has become corrupted by leisure and wealth. Lust for money has grown and this avarice is the root of all evils, according to him. He says that arrogance, insolence and disrespect for the gods now prevails, lies and hypocrisy abound and the desire for money has made men effeminate and cruel to their fellow men. Avarice unchecked, demoralised people and Asian influence has led the Romans to women and drink. Then a love of art and luxury followed and disrespect for sacred things. Every man is out for himself.

Three developed points. (7, 6, 6.)

(20)

(b) In Sallust's "Greatness and Decline of Rome", he blames the lust for power and money as the root of all evils. Avarice and ambition were like a plague spreading through the state. Sulla allowed his followers to rob and pillage without restraint. His armies in Asia learned of

licence and luxury. He says that when Rome feared a common enemy, all was well amongst them, but then when peace reigned, problems occurred.

In the city of Rome the institution of parties and factions created strife among the citizens. The nobles abused their position. A small elite ruled to their own advantage and were very hard on the ordinary people. The community split and tore the state to pieces. Anyone who opposed the power of the aristocracy was killed, such as Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Sallust says that this is the usual way when nations divide into factions, the winning faction fails to act with moderation and terrible bitterness ensues.

A treatment of at least three factors. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(iv)

(a) Cicero's letter to Lucceius is a letter of appeal to the historian Lucceius to immortalise Cicero's name. He says that he was too embarrassed to speak to him about it face to face. "A letter does not blush". He praises his friend's genius and hopes that he will be the subject of his writing while he is still alive. He suggests the way Lucceius might treat the subject, in singling out his role in unmasking and destroying the Catiline Conspiracy. He says that he might as well be completely shameless in asking to be celebrated now that he has begun. He reminds Lucceius that he has already referred to him very favourably. He justifies his own presumption in his claims and urges Lucceius not to hold back on Cicero's own greatness in the affair. He explains to Lucceius why the episode itself is so important and interesting and that he himself has been the object of much unfair treachery in connection with it. He argues that it is a great and dramatic story which will interest everyone who will be moved much as readers are moved by the great stories of Thucydides and Herodotus. The uncertainty in the fortunes of men is always interesting to us.

A coherent description of the contents of the letter. (12, 12, 11.)

(35)

(b) From this letter we learn that Cicero is vain and rather needy in terms of public recognition. He is pushy and very self-important, playing up his own outstanding place in Roman history. He is very unsubtle and quite blatant in his self-promotion and boasting.

Two explained aspects of his character. (8, 7.)

(15)

Topic 4: Roman Historians.

(i)

(a)

Those for Augustus argued that he had been driven to civil war by filial duty. Rule by one man had cured the distracted country. He had ruled continuously for longer than any other. The borders were safe, citizens were protected by law and Rome had been beautified. There was rule of law and respect for Rome's allies. Those against Augustus claimed that filial duty was a pretext for his own ambition and that the real motive was a lust for power. They said that he had been ruthless in tricking people, getting the army on his side, and had treated badly anyone who was not on his side, including proscriptions and land confiscations. They also said that peace was won at a terrible price, a peace stained with blood. The disasters of Lollius and Varus were mentioned and the judicial murders. The validity of his marriage was questioned, and it was suggested that Livia had been a terrible choice. He had not shown honour to the gods in having himself so worshipped and he had appointed Tiberius as his successor, knowing his faults, in order to heighten his own glory.

Four points to include a combination of praise and criticism. (10, 10, 10, 10.) (40)

(b) Tacitus presents the debate in adversarial form as a lawyer would. It seems fair, but on closer reading, his positive points are quite brief, and the negative points are more detailed. Clearly too, his negative points are expressed more forcibly, and so register more strongly with the reader, especially as they come after the positive ones. Rhetoric is obviously at work, and the end result is to disparage Augustus and his reign.

One explained point. (10) (10)

(ii)

(a) The men's grievances were related to their demands. They included the anger of the troops at the failure to pay their dues; brutal treatment by officers; over-long length of service and that they had not been discharged when they were supposed to be. There was also jealousy of the Praetorian Guards, whose pay and conditions were much better. They also found the country they were serving in harsh and remote. They demanded a sixteen-year term of service with bonuses at the end, pay of four sesterces per day and no call-back to service after discharge. Punishments were to be eased and work was to be easier.

Three points to include grievances and demands. (10, 10, 10.) (30)

(b) In Pannonia, Tiberius' son Drusus first read out a letter from his father granting some concessions but postponing others. This did not satisfy the mutineers. However, the strange appearance of the moon that night caused the men to think that "heaven was sickened by their

crimes". Drusus took advantage of this lucky event to undermine the unity of the soldiers and to persuade many of them to bow to authority. He promised to send a delegation to Rome and to recommend a favourable hearing from the emperor. He followed up with the execution of the ring leaders.

OR

In Germania, Germanicus urged the men to return to proper discipline, he did have quite a lot of support among them, but when this failed, he went as if to kill himself with his sword, he was taken back to his tent by his friends. He promised discharge after 20 years with the last 4 years on defence duties only and double bonuses. Germanicus had to pay out of his own money. In Upper Germany he was criticised for not sending his wife Agrippina and his son, Caligula out of danger. In the end, Germanicus made an eloquent appeal to the men there and they rounded on the ringleaders of the mutiny and killed them.

Two points of explanation of either man's handling of the mutiny. (10, 10.) (20)

(iii)

(a) Early in his reign, Nero was much under the influence of his mother, Agrippina, his tutor, Seneca, and his adviser, Burrus. He promised to model himself on Augustus. At first, he was merciful and generous, he kept personal and state matters separate and boosted the power of the Senate. Seneca and Burrus "collaborated in controlling the emperor's perilous adolescence". Nero ended secret trials and tried to cut down on the corruption of court favourites and freedmen.

Two explained factors. (8, 7.) (15)

(b) As time went on, the deterioration in his behaviour and the emergence of the worst aspects of his personality affected the mood and morale of the city. His personal vanity became an obsession and far more important to him than matters of state. This was coupled with a vicious determination to get rid of anyone he saw as obstructing him. He murdered his mother, wreaked horrible vengeance on the Christians after the fire and took over a huge area of the centre of Rome for his personal estate. His monstrous ego which seemed to know no bounds took over which caused a great deal of resentment. He decimated the senatorial class with a series of murder / forced suicides and there was a conspiracy against him which failed. This was followed by a revolt in Gaul which spread to other provinces. Rome was now like a rudderless city which contained a personal fiefdom. There was an air of fear because of the number of deaths and anyone who tried to speak sensibly to him was suspected of disloyalty and disposed of. He surrounded himself with sycophants and so the rule of the city was neglected while he obsessed about his poetry competitions. He had grandiose plans which came to nothing and the people rejoiced when he died.

Three aspects of his character explained by specific events. (12, 12, 11.) (35)

(iv) This is an open question. Much will depend on how the individual candidate responds to it. Candidates may agree or disagree with the sentiment, as but they must back up their arguments with reference to the texts. There should be evidence of a genuine personal engagement with the statement. Some key points might include:

There is no doubting that Tacitus is a serious historian with a strong moral purpose in writing history. His accuracy is more difficult to ascertain, but overall, he does, as he states, attempt to be objective and impartial in his treatment of his subjects. His powerful dramatic sense (as seen in such set pieces as the rise and fall of Sejanus, the deaths of Agrippina, Seneca and Messalina which are powerfully described), the sweep of his narrative that ranges across much of the Roman Empire. He has a generally impartial attitude to his subjects (though he is subtly biased against Tiberius). It must also be said that his facts are almost always accurate. Tacitus is also fascinated by the psychology not just of individuals but also of groups (the senate, the army during the mutinies in Germany and Pannonia). He is much more informative than Suetonius on the major arenas of the provinces, the legions and legislation and his history has a broader sweep with more of what we would recognise as historical analysis.

As for Suetonius, who is undoubtedly the more entertaining writer, he is also generally trustworthy in the recording of facts and often goes so far as to give conflicting evidence without bias. In addition he does include a lot of rumour and anecdotes, which makes his account much more lively, if not as reliable. He does not match Tacitus's high moral tone nor does he have that historian's biting judgment of human failings. He is very readable and entertaining with a wealth of gossip and scandalous stories about the Caesars. He gives us great insights into the private lives of the emperors, where Tacitus takes a much wider and more analytical view.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

Topic 5: Greek Drama.

(i)

(a) From the start, Aristophanes' attitude to Aeschylus is clear. He is portrayed as the champion of old-fashioned virtues such as honesty, justice and courage. All of these are qualities required by Athens in its time of trial (the Peloponnesian War). He inspires loyalty and trust. Although he is shown as angry, it is a fine and noble anger which is justified. The much-admired Sophocles takes his side too. The characters in the plays of Aeschylus are noble heroes and so are good role models for the people of the city. His language is grand and formal, not cheap, everyday language. He speaks for the gods, not for strange abstract ideas. His values are those of old-fashioned patriotism, duty and respect and he states his ideas clearly and wisely.

A coherent description of the poet's portrayal. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(b) On the other hand, he makes it clear why Euripides is not chosen. Euripides is unclear because his ideas are expressed in a rather confusing fashion. He is portrayed as being too clever for his own good and is described as a "slippery customer", unlike the grand, austere, and straight Aeschylus. There are too many doubts in his plays and instead of clear instruction recommending loyalty and decency; there is too much cleverness and sophistry in his ideas. His language is often crude, and his subject matter frequently deals with the darker side of human nature. He puts criminals and mean characters on stage who are corrupt, immoral, idle and disloyal. He apparently does not prioritise love of country. He is popular with the low life in Hades. He is portrayed as petulant and having notions about his own intellectual superiority. There is no doubt about his brilliance as a poet, but he is not described as the man who can save Athens in its time of need. Compared to the answers of Aeschylus, his answers are useless.

Two explained points. (10, 10.)

(20)

(ii)

Candidates should deal with both aspects of this question: Firstly, do they agree that he is a hero and secondly, that he is flawed? Some may choose to argue that he is not heroic at all, merely stupid and willful, which is perfectly valid if backed up with reference to the text. Most will probably agree with the statement. Prometheus has risked his own well-being for the sake of others (humans) and there is a strong case to be made for his heroic status. Also, as a character he dominates the play from start to finish. Prometheus had nothing to gain personally from his disobedience to Zeus and a great deal to lose. Everyone in the play fears the tyrant Zeus except for him. His punishment is hideous and long-lasting, but he remains firm in his belief that he has done the right thing. As for his flaws, one could argue that he is

unnecessarily confrontational in his dealings with Zeus and might have negotiated in a more reasonable and successful way with him. His boasting that he knows how Zeus might be overthrown and his refusal to divulge the means results in his punishment worsening. He is high-handed and rude even in his dealings with his friends (particularly Oceanus) and is criticised by them, including the Chorus who are on his side. He is described as a bad doctor fallen ill who cannot cure himself and as a good counsellor of others, but not of himself. He is intransigent and stubborn. Hermes points out that he might be an even worse tyrant than Zeus if he had power. But his one soft spot is for humankind who are disregarded as worthless by the other immortals “man, whose life is but a day”. It is difficult not to concede his heroic status in the way he stands up for the underdog whose fate was to be annihilated if Zeus had his way. So, candidates may argue that he is not a hero at all, merely flawed, or that he is a flawed hero, as long as their arguments are backed up with references to the text.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iii)

(a) Jocasta enters the play quite late, in the middle of the row between Oedipus and Creon. We learn that she is Oedipus’s trusted wife and confidante, the mother of his four children as well as the sister of Creon. She is the widow of Laius, the slain king. She has, along with the two men, effectively one third of the power in Thebes and seems to be the voice of reason and calm, urging Oedipus to drop the charges against her brother and to settle down. He plainly thinks very highly of her advice and says that he rates it much higher than that of the others. Her character is that of the peacemaker and the devoted wife. She is a strong woman too, not afraid to attack prophets (including Tiresias) and taking a very firm line with her quarreling husband and brother.

Jocasta is not a believer in oracles or prophecies. When she hears that it is such a thing that is worrying Oedipus, she dismisses them as “neither here nor there”. She explains to him that life is a matter of chance, no one can tell anything about the future and there is no point even thinking about it. As proof, she tells him the story about the baby son of herself and Laius and how he was supposed to kill his father, and couple with his mother, and that in consequence he was left out to die on Mount Cithaeron. A feature of the story (that Laius died where three roads met), shakes Oedipus into a memory which worries him even more. So, while trying to reassure him, she is, in fact, the one who begins to confirm his worst suspicions. This of course, leads to the terrible discovery of who he is. As the facts start to emerge, Jocasta’s attitude is one of denial. She begs Oedipus not to pursue the question of his parentage and runs into the palace to end her own life before the terrible truth emerges. Of course, her main role in the play is that she is both Oedipus’s mother and his wife, the mother of his children.

A coherent description of Jocasta’s role. (14, 13, 13.)

(40)

(b) His rage subsided when he entered the chamber and he gently cut her down and laid her on the bed. Then he ripped off her brooches and used them to gouge out his own eyes. In this reaction, we see the rage against her followed by the tenderness and love in the gentle way that he lowered her down onto the bed.

One developed point. (10)

(10)

(iv)

Candidates should explain how Medea's powers of manipulation evoke reactions of fascination and horror as well as describing how she does manipulate the other characters in the play. Medea first gets the Chorus to promise their silence by her powerful speech making common cause with them as a woman; she tricks Creon into allowing her and the boys to stay one more day by appealing to his one weak point, his fatherhood; she manipulates Aegeus into promising an oath that will guarantee her sanctuary in Athens by promising him help to have a child; worst of all she uses the two children to give the gifts to Glauce to persuade her to let them stay; she manipulates Jason in their second encounter where she plays on his conceited and gullible nature in order to get him to think that she has been "foolish" and now is sorry and has come around to his view. All of these are valid examples of her astonishing power to manipulate others. The sheer cleverness of her scheming, the accomplishment with which she persuades these characters is fascinating. The fact that she, a mere woman, and a foreigner, outwits them all, adds to our fascination. She evokes great revulsion by her horrific deeds: the killing of Glauce and Creon; the slaughter of her own two children, a crime just as appalling today as it was when Euripides described it. Another factor, which candidates might add to the horror evoked, is revealed by her complete lack of remorse, even triumphalism, once she has committed her crimes.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

Topic 6: Ancient Epic.

(i)

(a) Athene, throughout Homer's *Odyssey*, provides support and help to the hero Odysseus and to his family. Candidates may include the guidance given to Telemachus and Penelope here, but most of the answer should focus on the help Athene gives to Odysseus himself. The first five books of the *Odyssey* feature Athene's prompting, guidance and practical help given to the depressed and hapless Telemachus, ensuring that he stands up to the Suitors and goes on a journey to find out if his father is still alive. Athene also helps Penelope who prays to her often and receives guidance about what to do. Frequently Athene enhances the beauty of Odysseus,

Penelope and Telemachus for greater effect. As for Odysseus himself, it is Athene who prompts Zeus to send down Hermes to order Calypso to let him go. She ensures that he does not die as he swims to the Phaeacian coast. She inspires Nausicaa to go to the river to wash clothes and gives her the courage to deal with Odysseus when she meets him. She shrouds him in mist to protect him. Athene's most significant help occurs once Odysseus is back in Ithaca. She speaks to him and disguises him as a beggar in order that he might see who is loyal and good in his palace, and who is not. She prompts Penelope to set up the competition with the bow and the axes. Crucially, she helps Odysseus and Telemachus in the Battle in the Hall, ensuring that the Suitors' spears do not hit their mark and that the hero and his son (and Laertes, given extra strength), are successful. Finally, she faces down the families of the Suitors and orders them not to seek revenge.

A coherent description of the help which the goddess gives. (12, 12, 11.) (35)

(b) Candidates might argue that it would have been more impressive if Odysseus had succeeded by his wits alone, but key to the significance of the role of Athene is the moment when the two characters meet. Then Pallas Athene speaks of how they are both shrewd and cunning and that they have a lot in common. She plainly admires Odysseus greatly and it is impressive that he is singled out for special help by one of the major Olympian gods. This is a mark of how great a hero he is and of the justice of his mission, rather than a sign of his weakness.

Two explained reasons. (8, 7.) (15)

(ii) Candidates may agree or disagree with this statement, as long as they back up their arguments with reference to the text. If they are agreeing, they might use the following arguments:

His admirable qualities could include his bravery in battle (in Troy and against the Rutulians); his loyalty to his men, killing stags for them when they arrive in Africa, keeping up their morale in Book 1 even though he is sick at heart, his refusal to run from Troy despite the advice to save himself, his devotion to his father and how he carries him out of the city, his refusal to feast with Dido till his son is fetched from the ship, his leaving Dido when instructed by the gods, his devotion to his father's memory in Sicily, his brave descent into the Underworld; his devotion as a son (his visit to the Underworld) and as a father (calls for Ascanius when he is in Carthage); his devastation at the loss of Creusa and when he meets Dido in the Underworld; his steadfastness against all odds; the devotion of his men to him as shown in Idomeneus's speech at Carthage; his fight against the Latins and Italians to win his kingdom; his revenge for the death of Pallas. Throughout, his goal is his mission to reach Italy and to set up a new kingdom for the Trojans. His loyalty to the gods and to his people underpins everything he does. Above all, his pietas / devotion to duty is admirable, he does not let anything stand in the way of his mission which is willed by the gods, including his own feelings. He carries a huge burden of

destiny. It often means that he cannot always be spontaneous in his actions and seems almost like a puppet of destiny than a freely acting character.

Whether or not he is likeable is a personal response, the obvious areas that a candidate might criticise include: his devotion to duty making him a bit of an automaton, always putting his destiny first rather than his feelings; his lack of emotion and warmth when dealing with Dido; his lack of humour and light-heartedness – he is quite dull; his tendency to despair and depression at times. In addition, his killing of Turnus at the very end seems cruel. Candidates may also argue that his mission and sense of duty give Aeneas a whole other dimension as a hero. He is not just a killing machine who fights and triumphs without thinking of what he is doing. The fact that he has been given a mission and that he must step up and take it on even when it doesn't suit him personally, makes him a more believable character. We see that he has moments of doubt and uncertainty, even moments of despair and at times he is compelled to do things he does not want to in order to carry out his duty.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iii)

(a) Anchises has a crucial role in the Aeneid. He is the father of Aeneas, lover of the goddess Venus and the object of Aeneas's deep devotion. He is like a lodestar to the hero who seems to look to his father for guidance and inspiration in all important matters. We first encounter him in Aeneas's account to Dido of the fall of Troy. We see that Aeneas will not leave the city without his old father and would rather die than desert him. When Anchises, convinced by the signs from the gods, agrees to leave, Aeneas carries him out of the city, one of the great images of filial devotion in the ancient world. The hero's father acts as a guide and advisor to Aeneas in the early part of his voyage. When Anchises dies in Sicily, Aeneas is devastated by his loss and makes every kind of sacrifice and ritual to honour his father. Of course, Anchises has asked him to visit him in the Underworld and that is the other part of the epic where he features largely. Virgil describes Aeneas's determined struggle to get to the Underworld and then the poignant meeting between father and son, where Aeneas tries to hug him but cannot. Anchises points out his son's future descendants which he names for Aeneas. This is proof positive for the hero that he holds a great destiny in his hands and must proceed with it, no matter what. Another role that Anchises fulfills in this book is the promotion of the greatness of Rome. He tells Aeneas that other states may be more clever, more artistic, more eloquent, but that Rome is destined to rule the world and to impose civilisation on lesser nations.

A coherent account of Anchises' role. (12, 12, 11.)

(35)

(b) Fatherly devotion is apparent in *The Aeneid* in several instances. Firstly, Anchises' devotion to his son and his support in his fulfilment of his great destiny are clear (see above, candidates need not repeat relevant points here). Secondly, we see Aeneas's devotion to his son, Ascanius. He holds him by the hand as they run from Troy and will not dine with Dido, until he is fetched from the ships. It is the reminder from Mercury that he must not deprive his son of his rightful inheritance that causes him to leave Carthage. The other example of fatherly devotion is the story of Evander and his son Pallas who is tragically killed in the Latin wars, described with great pathos by Virgil.

A treatment of the devotion of one father and one son. (8, 7.)

(15)

(iv)

(i) Candidates should show a good knowledge of both characters. Both men are doomed to die at the hands of the heroes of the epics, (Cuchulainn and Aeneas). Both fight and die in single combat. Both men have a great sense of personal honour. Both are worthy of respect and admiration. However, there is more to say on the character of Turnus than on that of Ferdiad. Ferdiad's main feature is that he is the close friend, almost brother of Cuchulainn. The tending of each other's wounds is very touching. The key feature of Ferdiad is that he grew up with Cuchulainn and is killed by him because of a nasty trick. Turnus is a more rounded character. Virgil uses powerful similes (boulder / volcano / lion) to describe his heroic and passionate character. He is very Homeric. We witness his deep love for Lavinia (in contrast to Aeneas whose feelings about her are not described), and his personal pride, his prowess in battle and his leadership qualities. He is brought down by Fate and by his seizing of the sword - belt of Pallas. When both men die, the reader is sorry for them for different reasons.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(15)

Topic 7: Writers of the Augustan Age.

(i)

(a) Tactics used by Hannibal in his victory at Cannae included: his using the Numidian cavalry to provoke the Romans into a battle which caused strife in the camp; sending them to attack the Romans collecting water from the small camp which stirred them into action; when Varro led the Romans out, Hannibal sent in the Balearic slingers first with other light-armed troops. The main line up was the Spanish and Gallic cavalry on the left wing by the river; the Numidian cavalry on the right wing and the centre composed of infantry with the Gauls and Spaniards in the middle, but heavily weighted African units at each side. 40,000 infantry and 10,000 horsemen. Hannibal and his brother Mago were in the centre, Hasdrubal on the left flank and Maharbal on the right. First the light armed troops engaged, then the Carthaginian

left engaged with the Roman cavalry on the right in a close-quarter action. When the main infantry collision took place, the Gallic and Spanish centre (in a curved shape), fell back, drawing in the enemy who rushed towards the centre. Then the African infantry moved in from each side, encircling the Romans who could not use their superior numbers. Thus, the Romans were shut in and exhausted as well as fighting fresh troops. Another tactic was his trick of the 500 Numidian horsemen who feigned surrender, but had swords concealed in their breastplates. The Romans disarmed them and placed them in the rear. But when the battle was at its height, the Numidians took out their swords and attacked the Romans from the rear, targeting their hamstrings and backs. This caused panic and now Hasdrubal sent the African cavalry in pursuit of the fleeing Romans, replacing them in the centre with Gallic and Spanish cavalry. Candidates may use a diagram to help them to illustrate their answer.

A coherent explanation of Hannibal's defeat of the Romans. (10, 10, 10.) (30)

(b) The leadership qualities most admired by Livy are apparent in the characters of Hannibal and of Paulus, one of the Roman consuls. Livy certainly does admire Hannibal as a military commander, his description of Cannae shows that he is impressed with how Hannibal cleverly defeats a superior-sized army by luring them into a trap and fooling them in such a way that their larger numbers count for nothing. His control of his varied battalions is evident from the effective way he deploys them and the trick he gets one unit to play on the Roman cavalry. He describes also how Scipio, even though he defeated Hannibal at Zama, still greatly admired his deployment of his troops there. However, he does suggest that Hannibal's nerve failed him when he did not follow up his great victory at Cannae by marching straight to Rome as suggested by Maharbal. Livy suggests that this idea was too great for Hannibal's mind to grasp, implying that while he was a superb general, perhaps there were limits to his imagination and nerve. He has unconditional admiration for the leadership qualities of Paulus and contrasts them with the boastful arrogance and cowardice he ascribes to Varro. He highlights Paulus's desire to minimize the loss of life to his armies. He points out that even when he disagrees with Varro's decision, Paulus is a team player who continues to cooperate with the doomed plan. He describes how Paulus fights bravely himself, setting an example to his men, and gives up only when he was gravely wounded. He is selfless and refuses the offer of a horse to make his escape, preferring to die with his men. Livy clearly sees these actions as those of a noble military leader.

Two qualities supported by references. (10, 10.) (20)

(ii)

Candidates should deal with two elements here. One is the quality of Ovid's storytelling, the other is the moral purpose of the tale. The story is a simple one, beginning with a description of two trees intertwined. Ovid describes the gods, Jupiter and Mercury visiting the people of Phrygia and receiving no welcome. They are warmly received by Baucis and Philemon, an

elderly couple. Most of the story is taken up with a lovingly detailed account of the very plain, but generous hospitality of the old couple, complete with homely touches about the food and furnishings. The twist in the tale is when the couple notice that the wine-jug keeps refilling itself and they realise that the pair are gods. They go to kill their goose, but the gods stop them. They lead the pair to the top of the hill and they watch the whole plain being flooded but their own humble cottage is turned into a magnificent temple. The gods offer the old couple a wish and they confer. In keeping with their humility, they just wish to serve the gods, and, in a lovely, romantic touch, they wish to die together, so neither must go to the other's funeral. It is a simply told tale, which has great charm and love at its heart.

Its moral element lies in the couple's acceptance of their humble condition and making the best of it and especially in their willingness to offer hospitality "beyond their means". The two gods have had the doors of the other locals slammed in their faces. This lack of hospitality has been brutally punished with a flood. But the simple kindness and willingness to share what little the old couple had is rewarded handsomely by the gods. Ovid's power to engage the reader while making a moral point should be emphasised.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iii)

Candidates should deal with both the dark intensity of Propertius and his humour. In terms of the dark intensity, probably the best references will include: "you who were born to hurt me" from *Two Requests*; the comparison of his lover leaving him to the demolition of Thebes or the fall of Troy in *Gone*; his implication of stalking of Cynthia on her visit to Clitumnus. But the two most obvious examples here are *Cynthia* and *Cynthia is dead*. One, with its blatant expression of sexual violence and terror of death and the other with its gothic imagery of the dead Cynthia which is quite disturbing also. Finally, in *The God of Love*, Propertius describes the arrows of Cupid and how "once hit we're never free from pain". Thus, his view of love is a negative one, for him, love hurts.

As for his humour, this is best revealed in *Susceptibility* where Propertius light-heartedly jokes to his friend about how he cannot resist love. Anywhere he sees a pretty girl, he falls in love and although he knows it is a form of madness, he cannot help it. To some degree his lighter side is evident in *Love and Peace* where he advises others who are battle-crazy to go off and fight, he intends to drink wine, dance and fall in love. There is humour too in *Gone to Clitumnus* where Propertius sends up the country life as unbearably dull. He intends to follow Cynthia and go hunting (for birds and hares, not anything scary) which is a laugh at himself as a city dweller.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iv)

(a) Horace thinks about death a good deal. He constantly reminds us that it awaits us all and that it cannot be avoided or even postponed. We will have died, our goods cannot come with us and our heirs will not grieve for long. Our expensive wine will be spilt on the marble floor. When we reach the Underworld, our pedigree, good character or eloquence will not make any difference. It doesn't matter, which gods we worship, it is inevitable and will happen. When it happens, no one can buy even an extra minute. Even Diana or Theseus could not bring back their loved ones from the dead. *This day's thine own, the next may be denied, To-morrow and her works defy. Gather Ye Rosebuds and Enjoy the Present Hour* are the poems featuring the theme that death is certain, so we might as well enjoy today. One of the pieces of advice that he gives is to stop hoarding for the future as in *We All Must Die, Ode to Spring* and *Enjoy Your Possessions....* as it is pointless. We should therefore enjoy each day and make the most of friends, wine and what we own. Horace's view of the afterlife is a gloomy one. There is no sense of there being any happiness in the underworld.

Three developed points. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(b) Despite his preoccupation with death, Horace certainly comes across as a person who knows how to enjoy life. Indeed, the two aspects of his philosophy are linked. "Thou wast not meant for aye" so you might as well enjoy life to the full. It is clear from his poems that he loves his friends very much and enjoys good company, and flirting. "Be wise! Drink free!" and "lay hold upon the present hour and snatch the pleasures passing by." He does not believe that dwelling on the future is any good and sings the praises of simple pleasures, a sunny day by a river, sitting with friends by a warm fire. "Long as I live, I shall prefer a gay, good-natured, easy friend to every blessing Heaven can send". The very ephemeral nature of life's pleasures seems to give him more reason to enjoy them. His great appreciation of the beauty of nature is evident in his poems and his good humour, including his ability to laugh at himself is clear in *The Bore* and *Journey to Brundisium*.

Three developed points. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

Topic 8: Art and Architecture in Greek Society.

(i)

(a) This is a krater, it was used for a monument on a tomb; there was a hole in the bottom for pouring drink offerings to the dead.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10)

(b) The scene shown is the prothesis (or lying in state), probably of a noble figure. There is a funeral procession with the dead person lying on a bier; mourners with their arms raised;

horse-drawn chariots and their charioteers; armed warriors and animals along with geometric patterns.

A brief description of the scenes. (7, 7, 6.)

(20)

(c) It belongs to the Geometric Period (ninth and eighth Century BC). The typical features include: a profusion of geometric ornament (including meander, chequerboard, stripes and other patterns) arranged in tiers; stylised animal and human figures in silhouette (very two-dimensional), heads in profile with a dot for the eye; glazed with a dark brown wash. All of these features, along with the shape and size of the vessel, are typical of the period.

Two explained reasons. (10, 10.)

(20)

(ii)

(a) The building shown is the Erechtheion (or Erechtheum) on the Acropolis in Athens.

Two points. (5, 5)

(10)

(b) The design of the building is unique in that it is built on three levels and has two porches. On the east side is a portico of 6 Ionic columns, a very tall Ionic porch with elegant columns on the north side, and a porch with 6 karyatids on a low wall instead of columns on the south side. On the west side, there is a high wall with engaged columns above. The central chamber was divided lengthways into two rooms. There were windows on the east and west sides. The north porch probably contained the spot where Poseidon's trident was supposed to have landed. There is an unusual feature in the frieze which is made of white marble figures attached to a background of black marble. The decorative features are remarkable in their delicacy especially the guilloche patterns on the column bases in the north porch and the necking decoration on the column capitals. The north porch has a very decorative doorway as well as an ornate coffered ceiling.

A description to include both elements of the design and decoration. (10, 10, 10) (30)

(c) The building is made of Pentelic marble, but the black marble figures of the frieze are set on an Eleusinian limestone background. Gilding and coloured glass beads were also part of the décor.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10)

(iii)

(a) Relief sculpture is the technique of carving two and three dimensional figures in stone which are still attached to that source stone.

One point. (10)

(10)

(b) Photograph D shows the girl Europa being carried across the waves by Zeus, disguised as a bull.

One explained point. (10.)

(10)

(c) The two eras are: D (Europa and the Bull is Middle Archaic (580-535 BC) and E (Aesclepius) is 4th Century BC.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10)

(d) The main developments here concern the depiction of the human form and the rendering of drapery. In D the figure of Europa, shown in bas or low relief, is quite stylized. She is almost cartoon-like, sitting in a three quarters position with her head in profile, one hand on the bull's head, the other resting on its haunch. Her face is not realistic, a very generic profile and her legs are barely indicated under the drapery. Her hair is highly stylized, with curls in a pattern across her forehead and a big plait straight out from her head, down her back. In Photograph E, the figure of Asclepius from the 4th century is shown in a similar pose, but there the similarity ends. He is rendered in high relief. His languid figure looks very lifelike, even down to the little folds in his belly. His legs are clearly delineated and there is wonderful detail on the sandal straps at his crossed ankles. One of the most dramatic developments is in the rendering of his clothing. His robe falls in a dramatic swathe below his right side and is pulled tight across his lap, tucked up between his knees in a naturalistic way. His face is also quite generic, but not stylized, with hair and beard in realistic waves. The execution of anatomy, drapery, posture, hair and the face has all become far more natural and realistic.

A description of three developments. (7, 7, 6.)

(20)

(iv)

(a) This depicts a brave Gaul fighting against the armies of Pergamon. He has just killed his wife and is about to kill himself, rather than be captured by the enemy.

One point. (5.)

(5)

(b) This was made in Pergamon.

One point. (5.)

(5)

(c) This sculpture is typical of the Hellenistic style in many ways. Firstly, its subject matter is novel. These figures are not Greek, which is indicated by the hairstyles and by the clothing of the dead woman. Secondly, the sheer drama of the subject matter is very Hellenistic. This is the very moment that the husband has killed his wife, as we look, her dead weight is slipping from his grasp, in contrast he is full of life and vigour, striding forward as he looks back at the approaching enemy. But, of course just at this moment, his sword has pierced the skin of his

chest and is about to plunge into his heart. The Pergamene School of sculpture was all about high drama and tension, you could not find a better example of that than in this piece. The contrast between the taut, muscular, straining body of the man, with every muscle and vein standing out and the limp, lifeless body of his wife with her swooning drapery could not be greater. It is a thoroughly Hellenistic piece of work, with the depiction of human anatomy *in extremis* and full of high drama and emotion.

Three points of explanation. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(d) Candidates may choose either one. Either way they should be able to give one or two examples to illustrate their points. If Classical, they might mention the purity, restraint and the elegance of Classical sculpture. They might prefer the calm elegance, the perfection of proportions and the simplicity of much of it. If Hellenistic, candidates may prefer the power and drama of much Hellenistic sculpture with its vivid storytelling, its turbulent and exciting quality and its powerful depiction of the human form at moments of high tension and emotional extremes.

Two reasons. (8, 7.)

(15)

Topic 9: The Philosopher in Society: A Study of Socrates and Plato.

(i)

(a) The simile of the cave involves Socrates explaining to Glaucon the image of a cave full of people chained to the wall and facing away from the entrance. There is a fire behind them and therefore shadows on the wall. So, they assign names to the shadows on the wall, which are all of the world they can see. Therefore, they assign great importance to the shadows and their analysis. This is as close to reality as they get. The philosopher is the man who is freed from the cave, he therefore can see that the shadows are not reality, that there is more outside, even though he often reaches this awareness with difficulty (blinded by the light and drawn back to what he has always thought was reality). But eventually he realises that the sun is the source of all light. The philosopher returns to the cave with the news that there is a reality outside that the prisoners have not seen. They, of course, are sceptical about his new “reality” and turn on him.

A coherent account of the simile. (10, 10, 10)

(30)

(b) The philosopher must free himself from the cave, no matter how difficult this journey to the truth is. He must try to enlighten his fellow men as to the truth, even though it will not enrich him or make him at all popular. He must try to draw the “prisoners” away from false reality (shadows) to the real truth (the sun).

Opinion to be supported by two points. (10, 10.)

(20)

(ii)

Firstly, it is obvious that Plato was very idealistic and perhaps naïve in his aspiration to apply his philosophical principles in a real ruler of a state. Also, one could argue that he is to be admired for wishing to put into action the theories in which he strongly believed. On his first visit to Syracuse, Plato felt that it was now or never that he might achieve what he wished because his friend, Dion was there and Dion, along with other friends, had urged him to visit to try to inculcate a philosophical view in the ruler of Syracuse. He felt that it was a unique opportunity to put his ideas into practice and feared being a man of words and no actions. He felt that this trip offered him a chance of having more self-respect which concerned him deeply. He also worried that Dion, who was his friend, was in danger and might need help. On his second visit, Dionysius assured Plato that, if he arrived, Dion's affairs would be settled satisfactorily, whereas, if he did not they might not. He was a good friend and was prepared to put himself at risk out of loyalty.

Plato seems to have been quite naïve in his aspirations for influencing Dionysus to rule as a philosopher king. He did influence Dionysus to some degree, but the two men quarrelled when Dionysius was insulted by what he had to say about tyranny. His close friendship with Dionysus's brother-in-law, Dion complicated matters. Dionysus did not trust Dion. Indeed, he tried to have Plato assassinated, which did not happen, though he was sold as a slave in Athens. When he returned to Syracuse for the second time, he tried to instruct Dionysius II in philosophy. The young king had a wild lifestyle and was not much given to a philosophical turn of mind. But Plato seems to have had some success in firing him with great ideas, at least initially. But enemies of Plato poisoned the young tyrant's mind against him and he exiled Plato's friend Dion. Plato intervened on Dion's behalf and got himself into trouble. He demanded his friend's recall, but this did not happen. Furthermore, Plato was not allowed to leave Sicily for some time. Eventually after a while back at his Academy in Athens, Plato was persuaded to return by Dionysius on the basis that his presence might help to sort out Dion's affairs, but it did not. Dion was never allowed to return by Dionysius, and his property was confiscated. Again, Plato was not allowed to leave until Archytas intervened and he left. Later, Dionysius captured the town of Syracuse, but was killed in a plot. All of this was far from the lofty ambitions of the ideal state which Plato had hoped to bring to fruition in Syracuse when he first visited there but in terms of his character, it reveals a somewhat idealistic and even innocent man with very noble impulses and a great deal of loyalty. He lacked the hard-nosed realism that might have served him in the arena of politics.

Engagement: 20, Development: 20, Overall Evaluation: 10.

(50)

(iii)

(a) Socrates states that the only really important difference between men and women is that men beget children and women bear them. Thus, he says, there is no real reason why they

cannot be fully educated, contribute to the state in the same way and generally do the same jobs. He bases his argument on the observation of guard dogs who can be both male and female. Difference in gender does not affect their performance of the job. Likewise, bald and long-haired men do not perform tasks noticeably differently. The main difference, he maintains, is in how they are educated and trained.

Three points. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(b) No, Socrates does not believe that they are equal in every respect. He does say that in general, men will perform duties better than women do. He seems to accept that within each category, men are superior to women and he does also mention the superior physical strength of men. So full equality in every way is not suggested here.

Two points of explanation. (8, 7.)

(15)

(c) Candidates may argue either way, provided they engage with Socrates' arguments and back up their own with examples/references. Obvious points may include that few jobs today have a gender bar, except some very heavy physical labour and there are plenty of examples of successful women in all walks of life.

One explained point. (10.)

(10)

(iv)

(a) Physical education is seen as essential for the development of balanced people. The mind is more important than the body, but when it is properly trained, physical training will follow naturally. It will result in discipline and resilience. Drunkenness (and girlfriends and the wrong kinds of music) will be avoided. Men will be fitter, more energetic and alert. Guardians should not train like ordinary athletes. A better-adjusted training regime is needed for soldier-athletes to make them watchful, observant, healthy and able to endure the inevitable changes of diet and temperature on campaign. There is a big emphasis on training for war. Socrates urges people to look after their health. He warns against the idle life. Socrates sees the intellectual and moral development of the individual as paramount and physical education must contribute to it. He is keenly aware of the dangers of an education which is devoted exclusively to sports – it produces people who are dull and philistine, uncivilised and rough. Likewise, he warns against a purely literary training because it makes men soft, over-sensitive and ineffective. There must be a balance, “the perfect blend of the physical and intellectual sides of education”.

Three points. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(b) Food should be supplied by the other, lower classes to the Guardians who should not have to waste their time on supplying it. They should eat together in barracks or messes, there should always be enough, but not too much of it. Drunkenness is out completely. Roasted meat is best and there should not be any luxuries such as seasoning or fancy foods. Plain food is best

for the body but filling our bodies with gases and fluids, like a stagnant pool, drives the medical profession to invent names for our diseases like flatulence and catarrh.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10)

(c) Candidates may argue either way for the relevance of Socrates' ideas on physical education today. They will probably make the point that his notion of a healthy mind in a healthy body is still strongly held today and that, if anything, in recent times even more scientific connections have been made between physical health and mental health. The cult of the gym in the 21st century is very much in tune with a lot of what he has to say about physical fitness.

Two explained reasons. (5, 5.)

(10)

Topic 10: Roman Art and Architecture.

(i)

(a) bb – the cardo; c – the old forum; g – theatre; f – market; n – triumphal arch

(5 x 3 marks)

(15)

(b) The city of Lepcis Magna in modern day Libya was built on a Phoenician settlement at the time of Augustus in a chessboard pattern. The forum lay at the base of the promontory and the basilica was beside it on one side and three temples on the other, the central one dedicated to Jupiter and Augustus. South west of this was the market and the theatre both built by the same benefactor. The market is splendid with two circular halls and the stones with the standard measures inscribed on them. The later part of the city is further south in line with the bending main road (cardo). The insulae are elongated here to fit the site. Tacitus says there were fortifications here in 69 AD. In 109 AD the city received the rank of colonia and shortly afterwards, under Hadrian got a huge bath building. But the greatest of its buildings date from the reign of Septimius Severus who came from here. There was a new colonnaded street built near the baths, a magnificent new forum and basilica which are outstanding. The forum is enormous (1,000 X 600 ft.) surrounded with colonnades and arches springing from eastern style leafy capitals. The basilica had three aisles with an apse at each end, over 100 ft. high. Its columns were of red Egyptian granite and green Euboean marble with pilasters of white marble decorated with carvings of Heracles and Dionysus. Caracalla completed the building. Severus's reign also saw the addition of a highly decorative four-way monumental arch at the meeting of the cardo and the decumanus.

Treat three stages of the town's development. (10, 10, 10.)

(30)

(c) Wheeler says that the city "over-reached itself" in the building of this harbour and that it was never used as it silted up.

One point. (5.)

(5)

(ii)

(a) The emperor Constantine.

One point. (5.)

(5)

(b) The Basilica Nova is in the Roman Forum. It was started by the emperor Maxentius and finished, sometime after 313 A.D. by Constantine. The three enormous cross vaults of the nave rise to 114 feet (almost 35 metres). The side aisles consist of three arched bays. At the western end there is an apse (rounded end), at the east end there is an entrance hall with five doorways. It was roofed with bronze tiles. It had a magnificent interior: Its floors and walls were decorated with mosaics of multi- coloured marble. The ceiling featured octagonal coffers and the many windows allowed the whole space to glow with “kaleidoscopic light”. Constantine added another apse on the north side and another entrance on the south side.

A full description. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(c) The function of basilicas was basically as an indoor extension of the forum or market area. Its rough equivalent today would be the town hall. It usually held municipal offices and an area which could be used as a law court.

One explained point. (10.)

(10)

(d) Basilicas in Britain tended to form one long side of an enclosed forum. They often had a colonnade and usually had a range of offices at the back. The main entrance was on the long side. This combination of hall and courtyard may have developed from the basic design of the headquarters of a typical military camp.

One explained point. (10.)

(10)

(iii)

(a) In this painting the central event is four Trojans, highlighted in bright colour, dragging the massive wooden horse of the Greeks into the town, thus ensuring Troy’s destruction. The focus is on them as they haul the great weight of the horse. Children dance about in celebration. The soldiers stand still holding banners or weapons in the distance. Other Trojans are looking on, more obscure in the background. There is a lone figure running towards the horse and on the left, Cassandra rushes in from the battlements to warn them. The gods (Minerva and Neptune) watch from a height on the left of the painting, waiting for the city to be destroyed.

A description of what is going on. (5, 5, 5.)

(15)

(b) The artist conveys the drama of the scene in several ways, through what is a very fresh, spontaneous, quite simple looking painting. Firstly, the almost impressionistic brushstrokes are very vigorous and lively with a great sense of motion and energy in their simplicity. The leaning

Trojan figures are impressive, conveying the slog involved in hauling the horse. The splayed legs of the horse imply it is heavy with the weight of Greeks. The strong diagonals are dramatic, especially the men dragging the horse, highlighted in the foreground. The use of light and shade, while uncomplicated is very striking and doom-laden. The stillness of the soldiers in the background suggests they believe the conflict is over and makes a great contrast with the urgency of the running figure (possibly Laocoon) warning of doom. There is the suggestion too that the gods watch the unfolding drama, powerless to prevent the impending fate of Troy, or even relishing it. You could speculate that one of the figures sitting to our left in the foreground is a smug Sinon observing as his schemes have the desired effect. Although it is little more than a sketch the painting captures all the main elements and characters in Troy's fall.

A discussion to include three elements of the painting. (9, 8, 8.)

(25)

(c) Any one of: the wall painting of Achilles being revealed; the painting of the women offering gifts to Dionysus; relief panel of Dionysus and Icarus.

One point. (5.)

(5)

(iv)

(a) The main point of difference here is the stiff formality of the Septimius relief compared to the relaxed nature of the Ara Pacis. The figures in the Ara Pacis relief are standing in poses which are very naturalistic and subtly different. They are facing slightly different directions. Their togas are varied in the way they are swathed around the bodies and the faces are extremely individual and distinctive. The Septimius Severus panel figures are almost lifeless and without variety. The poses are artificial, and the drapery folds are quite stylized. The Ara Pacis gives each character his individual personality.

Two developed points. (10, 10.)

(20)

(b) There is no coherent perspective in this relief of Septimius. Candidates may point to extraordinary position of the chariot (so high up) and horses (which do not seem to be connected with the chariot) and to the way in which figures are placed more or less on top of one another.

Comment to include two references. (8, 7.)

(15)

(c) The best answers will show an understanding of how the portrayal of the emperor Augustus underlines his wish to be treated as 'first among equals'. It is impossible to pick out one figure from this group who is an obvious leader. He is not marked out from the other figures in any way. In contrast, Septimius is the centre of the relief. He faces the viewer directly in the middle of the chariot. His head dress means that he is above all the other figures in the relief. It is clear that the cult of the emperor has changed and grown dramatically. Augustus as the first emperor was at pains to convey his humility and wanted to come across as

“primus inter pares”. Severus, however, was cultivating the cult of personality of the emperor which is clear in these two panels.

Two points. (8, 7.)

(15)

Appendix 1

Classical Studies – Leaving Certificate – Higher Level
Discrete criteria / breakdown marking

Engagement	Engagement with the question	e.g. Understanding of question, Focus/addressing the question, Clear aim, Quality of ideas, Relevance of material	40%
Development	The extent to which ideas are developed	e.g. Depth of treatment, Analysis of ideas, Choice of references, Use of supporting/illustrative material, Management of material, Accuracy	40%
Overall Evaluation	The overall quality of the answer	e.g. Coherence of discussion, Structure of argument, Cogency of ideas, Overall persuasiveness, Convincing, Sustained piece, Comprehensiveness of response	20%

Marks to be displayed on paper

E- ?/20

D- ?/20

OE -?/10

Total-?/50

	Weighting	Marks out of 50	Marks out of 40
Engagement	40%	20	16
Development	40%	20	16
Overall Evaluation	20%	10	8

