



Coimisiún na Scrúduithe Stáit
State Examinations Commission

Leaving Certificate 2021

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) The battle of Mantinea took place in 418-417 BC. The Spartans with their allies invaded the territory of Mantinea and laid waste the countryside. Agis was leading the men into battle when an old man urged him to turn back, that the enemy was in too good a position. He then decided to try to divert a river prone to flooding towards Mantinea to force the Argives out of their high position. The Argives, mystified by the Spartan change of mind, went down to the plain. The Spartans were taken by surprise and had a very short time to prepare. The generals spoke to their armies, the Mantineans were reminded that they were fighting for their country, for power or slavery. The Athenians were told what a great victory it would be to defeat the Spartans in the Peloponnese. The Spartans called out to each other and sang, realising that sustained discipline in action is worth more than any words. The Argives sped into action. The Spartans moved slowly in time with their flute players to stay in formation. Agis saw that his line was becoming too extended to the right due to each man trying to stay protected behind the shield of the man to his right, so he ordered the Sciritae on the left wing to move left and two other units to fill the gap in the line which would open up. Two commanders refused to do this (later executed) and the gap did open up but the Spartans fought very bravely in the other areas, causing the enemy to flee. The Athenians were now outflanked but most of them managed to escape. Typical of the Spartans, they did not pursue the enemy for slaughter, but stayed put. They lost about 300 men, the enemy lost about 1100.

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

(35 marks)

(b) The Spartans had been doubted by some of their allies before this battle, but this now changed. The Spartans had been furious with King Agis for failing to capture Argos with a large force of allies and for letting the enemy capture Orchomenus. They were ready to burn down his house and fine him 10,000 drachma. But he persuaded them that he would atone for his mistakes, and he did by succeeding at Mantinea, so they allowed him to continue as King of Sparta with increased confidence.

Two points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(ii)

(a) The career of Demosthenes in the War featured a huge success in 425 BC at Pylos, over Sparta. The Athenian fleet, on its way to help Corcyra, had been driven ashore by a storm and their general, Demosthenes, who had planned to go there anyway, ordered them to fortify the peninsula. He met resistance from the other generals, and even from the men, but when they got bored, they decided to follow his orders. The Spartan fleet of 43 triremes now sailed to Pylos, where Demosthenes was facing them with a fleet of 5 triremes and only 600 men, 90 of whom were hoplites. He sent two of his ships to inform the Athenians of what was happening.

He positioned most of his men at the land side of the promontory but mounted a spirited defence with a small number at the point where he correctly assumed the Spartans would attack and prevented an out and out defeat. Demosthenes dragged up the triremes to shore and built a palisade around them, arming his sailors with very poor quality shields made of osiers. He was joined by 40 Messenian hoplites and he placed his force facing the land. He went down to the sea with 40 hoplites to stop the Spartans from landing. He made an inspirational speech to his men, urging them not to fear the enemy's superior numbers. The Spartans under Brasidas had great difficulty landing on the rocky coast. The Spartans eventually settled in for a siege. Then the Athenian fleet arrived from Zacynthus. The Spartans had not blockaded the harbour, so the Athenians sailed in. They defeated the Spartans and blockaded over 400 of them (many upper-class Spartans) on the nearby island of Sphacteria. They got possession of the Spartan fleet. Initially Demosthenes planned to starve out the Spartans, but this went on too long as the Spartans persuaded their Helots to risk getting them supplies. When a fire revealed much of the island, Demosthenes decided to attack the Spartans. They were taken by surprise and many of them were killed. They held out at the northern end of the island, but, led by a Messenian general, the Spartans were attacked from two sides and could not hold out. After consulting with Sparta, they surrendered to Cleon and Demosthenes. There were 292 of them left. The Greek world was shocked. It was a huge victory for Athens.

In 424 BC Demosthenes led an attack on Boeotia. Demosthenes' plans were betrayed by a Phocian and he was forced to withdraw. He eventually arrived and took part with Hippocrates in the Battle at Delium in which the Athenians were defeated by the Boeotians. He was a signatory of the Peace of Nicias in 421BC. In 415-413 BC, The Sicilian Expedition took place. Demosthenes was one of the generals sent out when Nicias, now ill and dispirited, had written to Athens suggesting calling it off. Demosthenes arrived with Eurymedon and 73 ships with 5,000 hoplites. The fleet was attacked immediately with some losses. There followed a battle at Epipolae where Demosthenes risked a night engagement. He breached the Syracusan wall but was defeated by a Boeotian army and many Athenians were killed, some jumping off a cliff. Demosthenes now suggested that the Sicilian force should return home and concentrate on defending Attica. Nicias was eventually persuaded to do this, but a lunar eclipse changed his mind and they stayed on. There followed an attack by the Spartan general, Gylippus who was very successful. Along with the Syracusans, they blockaded the Athenians inside the port. There was one last naval battle. Demosthenes was the Athenian commander along with two others. The Athenian ships, confined and vulnerable, were defeated by the enemy who tricked them into delaying their escape by land. Led by Demosthenes, about 6,000 of them were separated from Nicias and were attacked and forced to surrender. Nicias's troops were also captured and mostly killed. A total of 7,000 Athenian prisoners were held in the stone quarries at Syracuse. Both Demosthenes and Nicias were executed (against the will of Gylippus).

A coherent account (12, 12, 11.)

(35 marks)

(b) Candidates may argue either way here. Points in favour would include his role at Pylos where he combined shrewdness and daring to attack a place which he had rightly identified as a key location. His quick thinking ensured that the Athenian fleet arrived on time to help them to defeat the Spartans and his clever strategy made the most of his very limited resources before the fleet arrived which allowed the Athenians to hold off the Spartans who greatly outnumbered them. He was plainly very inspirational in the success of his small number of troops on this occasion. His daring attack on Sphacteria was a huge success and gave the Athenians great leverage for the next few years in the war. In Sicily, largely his advice seems to have been solid. He saw that there was not much future in the expedition and tried to persuade Nicias to leave. He did manage to breach the Syracusan wall in a daring night attack.

Against: He was not so successful at Delium, though whether he can be entirely blamed for this is debatable. The superior tactics of Pagondas and the flame-throwing device used by the enemy were decisive. In Sicily, though he tried to persuade Nicias to leave, he did not succeed. He was defeated in the night attack at Epipolae and finally in his attempt to escape from Syracuse and was executed there.

His qualities as leader include boldness and daring (bordering at times on recklessness), great imagination, personal courage and the ability to inspire others.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iii)

(a) In 416 BC the Athenians led an expedition to Melos, a Spartan colony. The Athenians had 38 ships with 1,200 hoplites, 300 archers and 20 mounted archers and about 1,500 allied hoplites. They sent representatives to the governing body to persuade the Melians to surrender. They suggest that fine words which are meaningless or untrue are pointless, that “the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept.” They said, we are here for the good of our own empire and we want to spare you the destruction of your city, so by surrendering you would save yourselves from disaster. If we were too friendly to you, that would be to show ourselves to our subjects as weak, we cannot afford that. We rule the sea and as you are an island, we need to control you to secure our empire. If you are sensible, you will see that you cannot win and so should surrender. “Hope is an expensive commodity”. Instead, be practical and don’t place your hope in vague notions. The gods are as likely to be on our side as on yours. It is natural to rule whatever one can, we are merely acting in accordance with natural law. Don’t imagine that Sparta will come to help you, that is foolish. They don’t tend to do the honourable thing unless it suits them. Look at your chances of survival against us. Our record in sieges is excellent, a foolish sense of honour can lead to destruction. It is always a good idea to treat your superiors with deference.

Three points (7, 7, 6.)

(20 marks)

(b) The Melians say: This dialogue is one where we cannot win because of your threat of attacking with a huge force. We can only choose between surrender and attack. All men should act with justice and fairness, you would wish it if you fell. How can it be good for us to be slaves and you to be masters? Could we not remain neutral? We are not connected with you, we are not one of your colonies. Surely other neutral states will become your enemies when they see how you are treating us? Will this not strengthen your enemies? Surely the only honourable thing for us to do is to refuse slavery. Sometimes the outcome of war is not so predictable, fortune can change, at least if we stand firm, we still have hope. We trust in the good will of the gods because we stand for what is right. The Spartans are our kinsmen and are on our side they will help us. It will be in their interest. If they don't come themselves, they might send others. We put our hope in them and in the gods. We have had our freedom for 700 years and will not just hand it over now.

Three points (7, 7, 6.)

(20 marks)

(c) Candidates may argue **either** that the Athenian arguments are not very noble, but in terms of realpolitik are quite valid and in fact, very honest, if not merciful, or that the Athenian arguments are those of the bully who thinks that might is right and have no moral weight at all. Either view is fine, as long as a reason is given.

Impression. (ex. 10.)

(10 marks)

(iv)

(a) By now, there had been an agreement between the Spartans and the Persian king to oppose Athens. Alcibiades was looking for a way to be recalled to Athens and saw that friendship with Tissaphernes was his best bet. He sent word to Athens, that if they were willing to be ruled by an oligarchy instead of a democracy, he could help to get Tissaphernes on their side as the Persian king would not work with a democratic Athens. The great families of Athens now saw this as a chance to seize power. The leaders of the Athenian fleet at Samos decided to try to encourage this development and to overthrow the democratic government. The troops were told that they would be paid by the Persian king which appealed to them. Phrynicus argued that this was a bad idea and that it was just a ruse for Alcibiades to seize power. He pointed out that democracy had kept the rich in their place, but an oligarchy would mean ordinary citizens could be killed without a proper trial. Phrynicus tried to warn the Spartans about what was happening to get help from them. But he was betrayed to Alcibiades, who now denounced him for being in league with Sparta. Representatives now arrived in Athens from Samos, to persuade the people to accept Alcibiades back and to accept government by oligarchy. There was an outcry, but Pisander pointed out that they had no hope unless they got Tissaphernes, the Persian satrap and the great king on their side. He also said that the constitution could be easily changed later on. The people were persuaded. A law was passed stating that a maximum of 5,000 could be in the government, but in fact it would be far fewer. Several opponents of Alcibiades were assassinated, and there was a general state of terror in

the city. Everyone was suspicious of everyone else and afraid to speak out. A committee of 10 was appointed to draw up proposals. There was to be a body of 400 men in the Council. This was the idea of Antiphon, a very clever backroom politician. He was brilliant, but not trusted by the people. Thus, a small number of men got rid of the century-old democracy in the city. The council chamber was, in fact, taken over by 400 men with knives and a crew of thugs who sent the chosen council home with pay. Some were executed, others exiled.

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

(35 marks)

(b) The Oligarchy failed because of internal and external weakness. From the start, the troops at Samos were not impressed with the 400. The army was not supportive of the Oligarchy and said that with command of the sea, they did not need the support of Athens. They now elected Alcibiades as general, and he persuaded them not to attack Athens. The 400 now split. Some of them were angry that the 5,000 existed only in name. They were all afraid of the return of Alcibiades. There was an attack on Euboeia which led to a revolt there and complete panic in Athens. Piraeus now had no navy to defend it. Attempts at peace failed. Meanwhile opposition grew in strength. The Assembly deposed the Council of 400 and recalled Alcibiades. Power was handed to the 5,000. Many of the leaders of the oligarchy fled, others were rounded up, put on trial and executed. Key factors here include: the lack of support from the navy at Samos; the prevalence of suspicion and treachery inside the city; the failure of the 400 to act decisively as one and the revolt and defeat at Euboea causing panic.

Two points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

Topic 2. Alexander the Great.

(i)

(a) The answer should include Olympias as the main woman in his life: his relationship with her when he was young and how he sided with her in the row with Philip; his comment to Antipater that 10,000 of his letters would not be worth one of her tears; his complaint to her later in a letter about how she was charging too much for the nine months in her womb. Other possible inclusions (two or three of the following), would be Ada of Caria, (his “adoptive” mother) whom he seems to have got on very well with, but became exasperated with on account of her feeding him too much and fussing over him; the women of Darius’ family whom he treated with great courtesy and respect and insisted on reassuring after the Battle of Issus, also here candidates might mention his patience with the mother of Darius who mistook Hephaestion for him; Barsine, his mistress and confidante; Thais, who challenged him to torch the palace of Darius (Plutarch’s story of the burning of Persepolis); Darius’ daughter whom he married; Roxane -mother of his child; the Syrian woman whose advice he took which avoided a plot against his life. His encounter with the Pythia could be included also. Timocleia at Thebes and Alexander’s merciful treatment of her and her children even though her brother had fought against him at the Battle of Chaeronea.

Engagement, 16; Development, 16; Overall Evaluation, 8.

(40 marks)

(b) This is obviously a subjective question. Candidates may be either impressed, or not with his treatment of women. Either stance is fine. It is essential that they back up their opinion with specific references to the text.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(ii)

(a) There are several aspects of orientalism which would have to be described. These include his partial adoption of Persian dress; his inclusion of Persian nobility in his inner circle and his attempt to introduce proskynesis, the Persian custom of prostration, among the Macedonians. Other valid inclusions would be his excessive punishments (e.g. that of Bessus); the huge scale and extravagant Persian marriages at Susa; ever increasing luxury and comfort and the integration of Persian troops into the command structures of the army (especially the appointment of the 30,000 epigoni) to the detriment of the Macedonians who felt ignored.

A description of at least three forms. (12, 12, 11.)

(35 marks)

(b) It seems that Alexander and some of the men close to him found the Persian style appealing. The Persian court was very luxurious and sophisticated. This caused a lot of tension in the camp. It may have appealed to Alexander that the Persian style of kingship was much grander and more majestic than that of Macedonian kings. He wore the headgear of the

Persian king, but never went so far as to wear trousers. The Persians bowed down low, even prostrating themselves on the floor, before their king. This might have appealed to his ego, and he did try unsuccessfully to introduce this custom among his Macedonians. On the other hand, he may have taken on some of the trappings of Persian style just to appeal to his new subjects and to be more acceptable to them and soften their hearts. It has been suggested that he was attempting a type of fusion between the eastern and western parts of his empire.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iii)

(a) Candidates should describe the location of the camp; the ploys used to keep Porus guessing and awake at night; the bringing of boats from the Indus; the splitting of the army into three; the location of the crossing point, a heavily wooded promontory, Craterus back at the camp with much of the cavalry; Meleager at the halfway point; Alexander and the picked troops crossing the river; weather conditions; the mistake about the islands. The belated arrival of Porus's son with a small army and his failure to tackle Alexander as he landed on the riverbank.

A coherent account of how the crossing was accomplished. (5, 5, 5.)

(15 marks)

(b) Once they had crossed and travelled to the battlefield where Porus had ranged his troops, (including 4,000 cavalry, 300 chariots and 200 elephants), after a skirmish in which Porus's son's troops had been beaten off, Alexander first delayed, to allow his men to get their breath back. He decided not to go against the centre where the elephants were placed at intervals along the line of Porus. He counted on his superior cavalry and focused his attack on the left wing of Porus's line. Once the mounted archers had started to fire, he attacked with one cavalry unit and sent Coenus and Demetrius over to the left wing to come around the back and attack Porus's left wing from behind. Only after the cavalry charge were the infantry phalanx to move. By now, the Indians' ranks were thrown into confusion and many of them sent back among their own elephants who killed as many of their own side as of the enemy. During the battle, at a signal, the forces of Craterus arrived from across the river and joined in the attack. Porus lost about 20,000 infantry as well as two of his sons. Along with a straight account of the battle, the candidate should analyse the key factors which allowed Alexander's army to win: his swift and unexpected river crossing; his holding back of much of the cavalry till after the elephants were dealt with; his clever deployment of the contingent under Coenus (brilliant strategy), in order to win the battle at a decisive point. Porus' deficiencies may also have contributed to Alexander's victory.

A coherent account of the battle. (9, 8, 8.)

(25 marks)

(c) Alexander's treatment of Porus shows us his noble side. Although Porus had been soundly beaten, he treated him with dignity and respect. Instead of humiliating him, he was impressed with his courage and self-possession and allowed him to remain in control of an

expanded territory. We see that he could be very magnanimous in victory and not allow war to stand in the way of his assessment of an opponent.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(iv)

The start date here is the year of the Battle of Gaugamela. Candidates will probably find it easier to agree with this statement, though it is fine if they choose to make the opposing argument. For his decline, evidence might include a selection of the following: his barbaric treatment of Bessus; his treatment of Philotas and Parmenio: the death of Callisthenes over the attempt to introduce proskynesis; his increased drinking as mentioned by Hermolaus before his execution after the Pages' Plot; his drunken row with Cleitus where he killed one of his closest comrades; his petulance at the Hyphasis when the men wanted to go home; his crazy stunt at the Mallian Siege where he was badly wounded; his really bad idea of crossing the Gedrosian Desert when he had been told how dangerous it was; his excessive partying at Carmania and the enormous wedding at Susa in Persian style; his treatment of Abulites who had failed to get food for his horses (he ran his son through with a pike); the fear of his men when they were asked to hand in their names for debt repayment; his excessive reaction to the death of Hephaestion, including the slaughter of the tribe of Cossaeans; his mis-reading of the situation at Opis when he tried 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"; over the years, it seems that his drinking had become a major issue.

Candidates may wish to argue against the statement which is legitimate as long as they can provide evidence that Alexander's character had, for a long time before Gaugamela, been deeply flawed and had shown signs of temper and poor judgement earlier in his career. A central piece of evidence here might be the destruction of the city of Thebes. They could also point to episodes later in his expedition where he shows sound judgement and steadiness of character. These might include: his treatment of Porus; his continuing effective leadership; his stand-down at the Hyphasis; his selflessness during the Gedrosian Desert crossing; his paying his men's debts; his reconciliation with his men after Opis; his men's continuing devotion to him as seen when he was injured at the Mallian Siege. Thus, it is arguable that his character did not change significantly as time went on.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

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

(i)

(a) The Catiline Conspiracy was Catiline's plan to kill the consuls and to take over Rome. He had dramatic plans for solving the debt crisis in Rome and rallied many plebeians to his side along with several disaffected patricians. Cicero received news from Crassus, clear evidence of the conspiracy, which he then brought to a meeting of the Senate. The Senate gave the power to the consuls to deal with the matter as they saw fit. Catiline was condemned in front of the senate by Cicero and fled to Etruria to join his forces. He stirred up support in other cities. The envoys of the Allobroges a disaffected tribe, now arrived in Rome and were contacted by the conspirators but agents betrayed Lentulus's meetings with them to the Senate. Lentulus and the other conspirators were arrested, and their incriminating letters read out. Still a very young man, Caesar spoke out against the death penalty for the conspirators and persuaded many. But the speech of Cato in favour of execution, changed the minds of the senators and cast suspicions on Caesar's connection with them. Cicero rounded up and killed the leaders. Catiline was denounced and led a small army which was defeated at Pistoria where he fought very bravely himself.

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

(30 marks)

(b) Sallust describes Catiline as very vigorous, able to withstand incredible physical hardship from an early age. He portrays him as talented but depraved; reckless and cunning; generous but totally dishonest. He was extremely ambitious to an enormous degree and envious of the possessions of others. He was haunted by poverty and a sense of guilt. Catiline's followers, based on the relevant Sallust extract, included criminals, bankrupts, idlers, and those who longed for war to change their situation. He was filled with ambition. On the plus side, Plutarch notes his courage and his determination to fight to the bitter end.

Two developed points. (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(ii)

(a) The Battle of Pharsalus in 48 BC was the decisive battle between Caesar and Pompey in Greece. Already Pompey had lost ground by failing to follow up his victory at Dyrrachium. Even before the battle began, Caesar had pre-empted Pompey by moving contingents of cavalry round to counter his troops. Crucially, Pompey decided to order his men not to charge forward but to stand still and receive the enemy's advance. Initially, the battle was evenly poised but Pompey was slow in using his cavalry to encircle Caesar's left flank. It was then that Caesar threw his reserve cohorts of 3,000 men at the enemy cavalry. This infantry aimed their javelins at the faces of the horsemen who, in their inexperience, panicked and fled. Caesar's men then turned in on Pompey's infantry, while his tenth legion attacked from the front. Pompey saw what was happening, he left the battle in a daze, abandoning his men to their fate.

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

(35 marks)

(b) Candidates will likely have a poor opinion of Pompey's leadership here. Plutarch paints a picture of a thoroughly disunited republican force with Pompey being the target of scorn and derision, already on the back foot after Dyrrachium, and more or less forced to fight. On the day, he was probably wrong (a) to put so much trust in an inexperienced cavalry and (b) to order his line not to advance at a run. Worst of all, he abandoned his men and left them to their fate. His leadership was weak and lacking in conviction.

Impression mark. (15)

(15 marks)

(iii)

(a) There is plenty of material in Plutarch to support this view of Publius Clodius. He was enormously popular but wild. There were rumours of an incestuous affair with his sister. He was a major party-goer and his name was linked with many women of his day. His most notorious escapade was while he was having an affair with Pompeia, wife of Caesar while he was praetor. He dressed as a female flute-player and sneaked in to the Bona Dea festival in the house while all men were banned from the premises. This was found out by a servant of Caesar's mother and there was a huge scandal. This was not just a social scandal, but also a religious one as he had broken the sacred rules of the festival. However, his popularity was such that Caesar, recognising this, refused to testify against him in court. He campaigned viciously against Pompey and hated Cicero, harassing him continually, eventually succeeding in having him banished and destroying his house. He finally died in an ambush of a rival politician called Milo. Overall, he was a wild, outrageous character for whom there seem to have been no moral boundaries.

Three pieces of evidence. (10, 10, 10.)

(30 marks)

(b) Clodius's career casts light on the darker aspects of Roman politics at the time. Although, in theory, the republican institutions and laws were still in place, it is clear from his career that a lawless, amoral demagogue could wield enormous power using very questionable tactics. His popularity with the Roman plebeians meant that he could get away with intimidation and borderline thuggish treatment of his enemies (Pompey and Cicero) and even extremes of public scandal (the Bona Dea episode). Caesar's fear of testifying against him in court reveals a threat from the mob, never far from the surface. Thus, Roman politics of this period could be described as akin to gang warfare or mafia type control of the state. A drawing of parallels with aspects of modern politics in this answer should be credited.

Two points. (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(iv)

The poems of Catullus show him to be a man of very strong emotions. He feels various types of love very intensely and human relationships are very important to him. He is a man who takes love and friendship very seriously and is very open about expressing his feelings.

Catullus is a loyal friend and is very open and expressive in his love for his friends. This is evident in his poems *Evening With Licinius* and *Consolation*. He is loyal and generous in his praise of his friends, notably in *To Cicero*. He is warm in his condolences. His nature is very spontaneous, and he was probably a good companion with a fine sense of humour as seen in *Evening with Licinius*, which his friends must have appreciated. He comes across as a kind and loyal man.

He seems to have had a particularly close bond with his brother and his love for him is evident in the poem *At a Brother's Grave*. He is capable of deep empathy which is clear in his expressions of sympathy on loss, as in *Consolation, The Same and At a Brother's Grave*). His poem to his dead brother is very touching and reveals a man of deep attachment and compassion.

In terms of romantic love, Catullus shows himself to be a man of very intense 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 is passionate both as a lover and as a hater and, indeed, he swings from one emotion to the other. Lesbia seems to have taken him over completely and almost deprives him of the use of his senses. This is no ordinary lover but one who can think of nothing but his mistress. In *Happiness*, he is tongue-tied and almost in a dream world as he gazes on his girl. *A Prayer* is the poem of a man trying desperately to emerge unscathed from a love which has been thrown back in his face. Just as he gave everything in love, he is now in danger of losing everything. Catullus is a highly passionate lover, he feels things very acutely and often in a contradictory way, so he feels both pleasure and pain in his poems to Lesbia. He is very honest and direct in his descriptions of emotion.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

Topic 4. Roman Historians.

(i)

(a) When Octavian, the grand-nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar heard of the assassination of Julius Caesar and that he was declared his heir, he went to Rome to claim his inheritance against the advice of his mother and step-father. At first, he and Antony got on badly and fought against each other (where Octavian was very brave), but a truce was arranged between them, and they set up the Second Triumvirate with Lepidus. Together, they defeated the assassins of Julius Caesar at Philippi. He seems to have behaved very brutally towards the vanquished after this war. He also cruelly treated the survivors of a siege at Perusia. He defeated Sextus Pompeius in the war of Sicily and then he banished Lepidus and confiscated his estates. According to Tacitus he “won over the soldiers with gifts, the populace with cheap corn, and all men with the sweets of repose”, and so grew greater by degrees. By this time, Antony was in the east and had started an affair with Cleopatra. Octavian defeated them in the naval battle of Actium in 31 BC and was now sole ruler of Rome.

Engagement, 14; Development, 14; Overall evaluation, 7.

(35 marks)

(b) The qualities shown by Octavian/Augustus include a remarkable confidence and assurance for one so young. He showed diplomatic flair when required, combined with a steely determination to succeed. He had a capacity to manipulate people and to play them off against each other and revealed a brutal efficiency in disposing of his enemies. He had an awareness of when to strike and when to hold back and a sense of how to win the people over to his side. Candidates should choose two or three of these and use examples from the text to illustrate them.

Two qualities explained. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(ii)

(a) Tiberius was old and tired of his responsibilities. The ever-ambitious Sejanus worked hard at persuading him to go. Rome and all its hostile elements, its tensions and dangers had become unbearable to him. He had become even more anti-social and reclusive as time went by. Leaving Rome was something he had done before (when he had spent many years on Rhodes).

Two supported reasons. (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(b) The departure of Tiberius gave Sejanus a much freer hand to work towards supreme power. Although Tiberius continued to act as head of state, his permanent absence made for less effective rule. It was during this period that the deaths of some of Agrippina’s children took place.

Two effects explained. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(c) Suetonius' account depicts Tiberius as engaging in the most depraved and vicious actions on the island of Capri. He says that Tiberius let affairs of state slide. He engaged in secret orgies, vicious passions and idle malevolent thoughts. His lusts were criminal, and he lived like an oriental tyrant, drinking and feasting excessively. Freeborn children were victims of his lust as he was fascinated by innocence and youth. Slaves procured and even sometimes kidnapped his victims and he invented new vices. He had rooms done up with indecent images and indecent manuals. He had boys and girls dressed as pans and nymphs around his grounds in grottoes of debauchery. He was fascinated by innocence and youth. He used even small children to pleasure him, sometimes while swimming. He raped two boys and when they protested, he had their legs broken. He listened to many false accusations coming from Sejanus in Rome and many were punished on his command. Candidates should comment rather than just recounting them, and perhaps make a judgement on how likely the allegations are to be true.

Two substantiated comments on his lifestyle. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iii)

(a) The circumstances in which Claudius became Emperor of Rome are often seen as amusing and ridiculous. Claudius had been kept away from the imperial court by Augustus. He had buried himself in study and was not taken seriously by many because of his physical disability and the fact that he was considered "weak-minded". The story is that he was hiding behind a curtain and was spotted by a common soldier who dragged him out and brought him to the other soldiers who did not know what to do. They carried him to their camp in a litter, trembling. By now the consuls and the Senate had taken control of the Forum and Capital. But the people surrounded the Senate House and called for Claudius while the Senate disagreed as to what should happen. He gathered the soldiers and offered them 1500 sesterces each for their support and they agreed. He was the first of the many emperors to buy the support of the army.

Two points (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(b) Was his rule good for Rome and the empire? Candidates need to supply good references for either argument. For instance, they might mention his conquest of Britain, his public works including the building of new aqueducts for Rome and a new harbour at Ostia. He drained the Fucine Lake. He organised the insurance of grain importers against loss and showed interest in the affairs of the provinces (notably the rioting between Greeks and Jews and extended citizenship to parts of Gaul. He was cruel, timid and suspicious and too influenced by wives and freedmen. He executed 35 senators and 300 knights.

Three developed points. (12, 12, 11.)

(35 marks)

(iv)

Tacitus's claim will probably be contested on account of his bias against Tiberius which is very clear. He does give a very detailed and clear account of events in general, but his dislike of Tiberius is obvious. He is not especially kind to Augustus either in that he devotes far more time to the accounts of his detractors than his admirers after his death. But the real vitriol is reserved for Tiberius whom he patently loathes. Even in the earlier part of Tiberius's reign, when he does good things, Tacitus ascribes only the worst of motives to him. When he does something good, it is only out of hypocrisy and deceitfulness, according to Tacitus. He does acknowledge that good things were done, but he never allows that Tacitus' motives were good, only cruel and immoral. According to Tacitus, the generosity of Tiberius was insincere and if he did good deeds, it was for the wrong reasons. Without being very specific on the facts, he paints a picture of a vicious, arrogant and mean tyrant. Without fully backing it up, he implies that Tiberius brought about the death of Germanicus, and there is a very interesting contrast in the language Tacitus uses when describing Germanicus (it is always flattering). He even implies that Tiberius was responsible for public ruin. His actions against Sejanus and his friends portray him as the enemy of the city itself. The language he uses when describing Tiberius seems laden with dislike and thus, his claim to be impartial and without indignation, while possibly made with sincerity, does not really hold up.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

Topic 5. Greek Drama.

(i)

(a) Prometheus is pushed by the Chorus to explain why he is being punished so brutally by Zeus. It takes him time finally to reach the nub of the matter which is that he stole fire from the chariot of Helios, in order to give it to humans. This was against the expressed orders of Zeus as fire was the property of the gods only. Prometheus justifies this by explaining that fire was the "grand resource" of humans. Without it they would die of cold, they could not cook food and they could not make anything out of metal. For Prometheus, humans are his creation, and he has taught them everything they know, therefore they are worth saving. He places great store on loyalty to one's friends and for him, plainly it is a driving motivation in his defiance of Zeus. Without fire, mankind was doomed and so, for Prometheus, it is obvious that they had to be provided with it.

At least three attitudes developed. (9, 8, 8.)

(25 marks)

(b) The attitude of all of the other immortals, those who are the friends of Prometheus as well as his enemies, is that it is shocking that he gave fire to man "whose life is but a day". For Zeus, it is a crime of disobedience which must be brutally punished as he already had planned to

annihilate the human race and had been defied by Prometheus. Strength is fully in line with this view as he just unquestioningly assumes that Zeus must be right. Hermes also takes the view that it is insanity to take the part of feeble humans against the might of Zeus. Even Oceanus and Hephaestus, who have much sympathy with the plight of Prometheus, think that he was stupid to have done this. For them, the ephemeral nature of humans means that it is ridiculous that they should possess fire. The chorus, who openly declare their friendship for Prometheus also tell him that he was wrong.

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

(25 marks)

(ii)

Candidates will probably agree with this statement which would be very difficult to argue against. Candidates should deal with both parts of the statement, i.e. the humour in the play and its underlying seriousness. *Frogs* is funny in several obvious ways which are easy to describe and to give examples of, but in terms of the seriousness contained, candidates would need to include reference to the Peloponnesian War which was reaching a crucial phase and the failed Oligarchic Coup both of which feature a lot in the play. The issue of whether or not to look for peace and the issue of whether or not to restore citizens' rights to those who took part in the coup are both dealt with. Aristophanes gets involved in the debate about whether or not to accept the offer of peace by the Spartans. The chorus makes a strong plea for the restoration of the rights of those who took part in the coup on the basis of all they have done in the past and the fact that their talents are needed now. Another topical issue is the potential recall of Alcibiades. The two poets are asked their views on this, and Aeschylus argues forcefully in favour of Alcibiades' recall. Other serious issues which are dealt with through humour include: the difficulty of daily life during the War; the corruption amongst officials and insights into the personal lives of politicians. There are numerous examples of Aristophanes using humour to get across his message, especially in Act 2. Examples of humour could include slapstick and visual humour, sexual innuendo, and witty plays on words. Also, Aristophanes uses ridicule and satire to send up individuals. Candidates should make clear the reasons why they think the serious aspects of the play are important. Credit should be given to contemporary comparisons where humour and seriousness are combined to great effect.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

(iii)

(a) Oedipus has sent for the blind prophet Tiresias to try to interpret the words of the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi. He is slow to arrive and Oedipus is impatient. Even when he does arrive, he seems reluctant. He asks to be sent home and does not want to speak at all. At first Oedipus begs him to speak and then loses his temper when Tiresias refuses. He calls him scum of the earth and in response, Tiresias implies that he is not who he seems and has his own secrets. Tiresias is forced to speak in response to the threats of physical violence by Oedipus

and gives some information to Oedipus, but not all. He says that he is not who he thinks he is, that he should find out who his parents really are, and he tells him “You are the murderer you hunt”. He says that he lives steeped in guilt with his family, mired in corruption and does not know the truth of his marriage. He says that one who today is rich will end up a blind beggar and that today will bring about Oedipus’s “birth and destruction”. Oedipus jumps to the conclusion that Tiresias and Creon are plotting to frame him for the murder of Laius and he accuses him of being a false prophet. He threatens him with physical violence again and calls him a fraud, he points out that Tiresias failed to solve the riddle of the Sphinx, but he solved it himself. Tiresias finally leaves with a dire warning to Oedipus about his identity.

A coherent account of the meeting. (9, 8, 8.)

(25 marks)

(b) Oedipus, with all the confidence of an intelligent man who has solved difficult problems before, jumps to the obvious conclusion. He works out that the person who would gain from his fall would be Creon, who would become king. He also works out that it was Creon who arrived with the news from Delphi about the solving of the murder and that Creon had suggested calling for Tiresias to interpret the message. Another thing that makes him suspicious is that both Creon and Tiresias were around at the time of Laius’s death, but did not follow up the murder investigation.

One explained point. (10.)

(10 marks)

(c) Candidates should deal with the behaviour of both men in this episode. It is a subjective question, but responses could include Tiresias’s lack of co-operation and his failure to explain this, so he comes across as just obstructive; his speaking in riddles which enrages Oedipus; perhaps also the idea that he is trying to protect Oedipus by his silence. For Oedipus, mention would need to be made of his impatience, his violent temper which erupts very quickly when Tiresias doesn’t speak out and his propensity for using violence to get his way. Also, candidates may mention the speed with which he jumps to conclusions and latches onto a mistaken belief that Creon and Tiresias have plotted against him.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iv)

Parenthood is a central theme of Euripides’ *Medea*. Candidates will agree with the statement and should offer some of the following evidence: Everyone in the play comments on parenthood in one way or another. The central event of the play is infanticide. Points might include: the only person who seems really devoted to the boys is the Nurse, who is not their mother; Jason is a careless parent who thinks he cares for his boys, but it is clear that he has not even bothered to try to keep them in Corinth. But he is genuinely devastated at the end when he cannot even touch them. Creon is a completely devoted father who loves his daughter dearly and tries to protect her but fails. Essentially, he dies because he embraces her in her poisoned state. It is an appeal to his parenthood that persuades him to relent and allow

Medea to stay one day. Aegeus, King of Athens is a man who longs to be a parent, he is tormented by his lack of children and has travelled to Delphi to try to see what he must do. Medea uses his childlessness to further her plan. The Chorus are Corinthian women and it is interesting that one of the ways that Medea gets them on her side is by saying how dangerous childbirth is. There is also a choral ode on how those without children are much luckier than parents. Finally, Medea herself. She is a mother who loves her children (see how hard it is for her to steel herself to kill them), but she does not love them enough. They are more important as weapons to use against the man she hates. Euripides deals with a wide range of attitudes to children and parenthood throughout the play.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

Topic 6. Ancient Epic.

(i)

At the start of *The Odyssey*, Telemachus is a self-pitying youth. He is depressed and wishes that he had brothers to help him to stand up to the Suitors. Disconsolate, he feels sure that his father's bones are being washed by the rain. The turning point for him is the visit of Athene, disguised as Mentos. He welcomes her to the palace, but he is ashamed of the behaviour of the Suitors. Athene urges him on and tells him it is time to grow up. She also reassures him that he definitely is the son of Odysseus, as he had been doubtful about this. He rises to the challenges set by Athene but has a few false starts. He first stands up to his mother and orders her back to her chamber, reminding her that he is head of the house. He is brave enough to address the Suitors and call them to assembly. He arrives at the assembly, (the first since the departure of Odysseus), where he speaks eloquently about the destruction of his household by the Suitors. He asks for support against the Suitors but breaks down and weeps. He announces that he is taking a ship to Pylos to enquire about the whereabouts of Odysseus. The Suitors doubt that this will even happen. He receives more encouragement from Athene, disguised as Mentor. His dealings with his mother are interesting. He is very rude and dismissive towards her, ordering her to go to her room, but she is pleased at this as it shows his growing independence. He even instructs Eurykleia not to tell Penelope about his journey in search of his father. He acquits himself well in his visits to Sparta and Pylos where he impresses Nestor, Menelaus and Helen and grows in stature as he obviously impresses his hosts. Menelaus calls him the "true son of your father". When he returns, he escapes from the Suitors' plot and is the second person Odysseus reveals himself to. He takes a confident and important role in helping his father to defeat the Suitors. He is still not a fully-fledged hero, he can't string the bow and he leaves the door to the weapons room open, but he fights bravely and comes of age. Again, he is cold and impatient with his mother when she treats Odysseus with suspicion, failing to understand what is going on. But overall, thanks to Athene and his own efforts, he becomes a worthy son to his father, and his right-hand man.

A coherent description of his new-found confidence. (12. 12. 11.)

(35 marks)

(b) The initial attitude of the Suitors to Telemachus is that he is a figure of fun, despised as helpless and weak. After the visit of Athene their attitude towards him changes. They are amazed that he calls an assembly. They are shocked when he stands up and eloquently addresses the assembly. When he breaks down and weeps, Antinous speaks out and says that it is all Penelope's fault. Antinous gives Telemachus an ultimatum. He should send his mother away to her father's house. Telemachus refuses and calls on Zeus for a day of reckoning. Zeus sends two eagles as a sign of calamity for the Suitors. Of course, they are dismissive of this. Eurymachus issues threats against Telemachus. They sneer at him and suggest that his expedition won't even happen. Antinous is surprised that he has actually gone. Telemachus' new found confidence makes them nervous about him and Antinous decides to get rid of him. They plot to ambush his ship as he returns from his trip to search for his father and plan to murder him. They are disgusted when they realise that he has evaded their ambush and are determined to kill him. But Amphinomus says that it would be a very bad idea to kill Telemachus unless the omens sent by Zeus condoned it.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(ii)

Candidates should deal with all three headings in the question. First, suspense. This is built up by Aeneas's reluctance to tell the tale because of how harrowing it is, he says that even Ulysses would weep to speak of it. The suspense of the trick of the horse is very well done, as we realise how close the Greeks came to being uncovered, as Laocoon tries to unveil it and as the weapons jangle inside. There is great suspense in the build up of lies told by Sinon. Again, it seems to be by a hair's breath that he even survives to speak. The suspense while Aeneas is on the roof, hearing the furious noises of battle, is made vivid by the simile of the hapless shepherd witnessing a terrible storm. Added elements of suspense which create great atmosphere in the poem are the moment where Aeneas is about to kill Helen but is stopped by his mother. We also briefly wonder if the hero is going to get his family out of the city as his father initially refuses to leave and then he has to return to try to find Creusa. There are many heart-stopping moments of suspense in this tale.

As for drama, the story of the trick of the horse can hardly be beaten for drama, it is so wildly ambitious and clever, relying on the wits of the fiendishly brilliant liar, Sinon. There are great moments of drama in his own fictional story. Other moments of high drama, brilliantly described include the shocking and graphic deaths of Laocoon and his two young sons; the briefly successful foray of Aeneas and his friends when a group of Greeks mistake them for comrades and are slaughtered; the awful moment when Aeneas and his friends are caught by the Greeks and simultaneously by friendly fire; the violent arrival of Pyrrhus in the palace and his killing of Polites and Priam made so poignant by the simile of the family like doves in a storm. Each of these descriptions is almost cinematic in its drama and excitement.

The story of the fall of Troy is of course a great tragedy in itself. The veil is pulled back and Aeneas can see the gods themselves partaking in the destruction of the fine city. In terms of individual tragedies, there is the death of Coroebus who is caught trying to rescue his love, Cassandra; the acutely emotional description of the brave death of the old king Priam; Aeneas's own loss of his wife Creusa, confirmed by the appearance of her ghost. Each loss is described with great pathos and imagery by Virgil, always conscious of the terrible cost of war. Overall, as a story filled with suspense, drama and tragedy, the fall of Troy is very hard to beat.

A treatment of all three elements, but not necessarily to the same extent. However, there is scope for a candidate to argue that another book, other than book II, features better suspense, drama or tragedy.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

(iii)

Odysseus does show the qualities of a great action hero in the Odyssey. Candidates will probably list what these qualities are, and they might include: bravery; determination; resourcefulness; decency; loyalty; charisma. Evidence of these qualities (or similar), are shown in his faithfulness to family and home (he prefers to go home to his wife, Penelope even when offered immortality by Calypso); his clever and brave defeat of the Cyclops; his visit to the Underworld; the nobility of his behaviour at Phaeacia; his cleverness in dealing with the Sirens; his treatment of Eumaeus, his loyal swineherd; his brave facing down of the Suitors; the devotion others have to him; the effect he has on women; his combination of cleverness and physical bravery; the fact that he is rated so highly by the gods. A great action hero has to overcome almost impossible odds and he certainly does this. The enmity of Poseidon and a lot of bad luck make his return to Ithaca very hazardous and long drawn out, but he never gives up. His near-death experience on arrival at the land of the Phaeacians is a good example of how he might easily have given up but does not. His battle against the Suitors seemed to have the odds stacked against him, but nothing daunted, he manages to defeat them with his son and servant. He does get the help of Athene, but it could be argued that her help is offered on account of his being such an exceptional hero.

As for his flaws, candidates might mention his dalliances with other women/goddesses; his curiosity and avarice which got himself and his men into such awful trouble with the Cyclops; the possible flaws in his leadership of his men which led to conflict at Circe's island and even worse, to the setback with the bag of winds. Not all of his men trusted him fully. He arrived back on his own. His temper with the innocent Euryycleia is unappealing and it could be argued that his punishment of the maidservants in the palace was very harsh.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

(iv)

Unlike Penelope in the *Odyssey*, Medb is central to the *Táin* throughout the story. She is anything but passive and is one of the main movers in the plot, leading the army to get the Brown Bull. She is a military commander and a very dominant personality and engages in battle. Penelope remains at home, is at the mercy of the Suitors, even though she uses her intelligence to try to hold them off. She is ordered about by her son and except for her decision to hold the competition with the bow, she does not actively influence the events in the poem. She is a more subtle character than Medb and a more conventional woman, but equal to her husband in smartness as evidenced by their reunion episode. Medb is more outrageous and wild, perhaps deliberately portrayed as a woman with too much power and too masculine for her own good whereas Penelope is largely passive, even with her son when he scolds her. Medb's trick which results in Cuchulainn killing Ferdia in a duel is low whereas Penelope's trick on the Suitors is designed to protect herself from their advances. Her trick on Odysseus's return is clever, but not aggressive. At several points Medb's bodily functions are described whereas Penelope is always beautiful and aloof.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

Topic 7. Writers of the Augustan Age.

(i)

(a) Livy's patriotism is very obvious in his *Preface*. He makes clear his belief that Rome is the greatest nation in the world, but he decries the lack of values in Rome in his own day. He starts by saying that Rome is suicidally eating its resources. He says that the city is suffering from moral rot, standards have fallen and are, in fact, collapsing, he says "our defects are unendurable to us – and so are their cures". He blames the onset of meanness and vicious extravagance, avarice and imported riches and says that Rome is in danger of annihilating itself. He says that frugality and simplicity have been replaced by their opposites with disastrous consequences for the Rome of his day.

Livy uses his stories about the ancient past to highlight certain qualities that he hopes modern Romans will emulate. He admires courage, patriotism, co-operation and harmony between classes. The relevant extracts here are *Horatius on the Bridge* and *Class Warfare*. Qualities might include the outstanding physical courage of Horatius and how he puts the safety of the city ahead of his own life; his moral courage, loyalty and dedication to the common good, even when the odds are so much against him; Horatius' coolness under pressure and his sacrifice for the good of all. In the *Class Warfare* story the qualities that stand out in the story Mennenius Agrippa tells the protestors are the willingness to sacrifice oneself for the common good, the prevailing of common sense over self-interest, the ability to solve civil strife by talking instead of conflict and above all, the capacity to compromise and act patriotically rather than in one's own interests. In the story of Cannae, Paulus goes into battle against his better judgement because of his team spirit. He knows that he cannot desert his comrades. Paulus's heroic stand where he refuses to save himself and dies with his men is in stark contrast to the loudmouthed cowardice of Varro. Livy patently admires greatly the combination of bravery, team spirit and patriotism above all.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

(ii)

Candidates will probably agree with this statement. To begin with, he tells his friend in *Susceptibility* that he cannot resist falling in love with every beautiful woman he sees. This does not seem like a good omen for his fidelity. Propertius comes across as an unhappy and jealous lover. In *Two Requests*, he addresses his new love as one who is bound to hurt him. Even before he has the relationship, he knows that love will not be happy for him and so it is unlikely to be happy for his partner. From *Gone to Clitumnus* it is clear that he is a very possessive person and doesn't trust his lover to be true to him. It is as if he wants to own her. There is almost a stalker quality to his attitude to Cynthia in the country. This implication of ownership is clear in *Gone* as well. He is very bitter about his ex-girlfriend and the damage he feels that she has done to him. Even in the light-hearted *Cupid*, he says that it is appropriate for love to

be shown as arrows which cause great pain. His violent approach to Cynthia in *Cynthia* shows us that he is a fearful man who seems to cling to his lover in a needy way and sometimes even brutally, not in a happy, well-adjusted way. Although he loves love, it does not seem to give him any ease and it is difficult to see how this would have worked out well for the object of his affection. It would appear that any women involved romantically with Propertius would have faced a great deal of jealousy, moodiness and insecurity and possibly even violence. If candidates wish to argue against the statement, there is the argument that the intensity of Propertius's feelings would mean that his partner would never be bored. If one longed for drama and the obsessive desire for being possessed, Propertius might be the right man. He also clearly has a good sense of humour. But the price would be very high.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

(iii)

(a) A straightforward description is required. Horace left Rome with Heliodorus and went to Arica for the night and on to the Appian Way where they decided to split the journey into two days. Horace decided moodily not to eat as he was nervous of the food. Later a racket broke out - the bargemen taking on their fares and getting the mule going. But even as the barge moved on, the noise of the animal life on the water kept him awake. Two old men then sang sad songs. One of them fell asleep and snored loudly. The bargeman fell asleep too and then at sunrise they discovered the donkey hadn't moved at all. On to Feronia and Anxur where they met Maecenas and Virgil. Horace's eyes start to bother him. Then at Sinuessa they met Plotius Tucca and Varius Rufus. Horace was delighted to see his friends. They moved on to Capua where Virgil got a stomach ache. The others played tennis. At Beneventum the cook set the kitchen on fire cooking thrushes. They go on to the house of Trivicus where the fire is smoking really badly with green logs. On to a town so barbarous he cannot even say its name. Water is dearer there than wine, even bread is hard to get there. Canusium has no good food. You might as well attempt to gnaw a stone there.

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

(35 marks)

(b) Yes or no is acceptable here, with points from the poem to back it up. The main points to make here are Horace's attitude to friendship, he is obviously devoted to his friends and loves them dearly; he says that there is nothing he prefers in life to the company of a good friend. He also has a good sense of humour and gives a funny description of the drunken men on the barge, the kitchen going on fire and the donkey who hadn't moved all night. He can laugh at himself, for instance he mentions wryly how the others eat while he is too fussy to touch the food. Negative points might include that he does seem very fussy (e.g. the noise of the insects... etc. at night, the quality of the food outside Rome, his eye-infection) and perhaps a bit self-indulgent. Although in his other poems he loves the countryside, in this poem he is a bit of a complainer.

Two reasons explained. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iv)

(a) It would be difficult for candidates to argue against this statement. The opening of the poem is very stark and dramatic, “She never saw, poor girl, her death there...” The reader is plunged straight into the horror of the story. Orpheus’s heartfelt grief is depicted in a very moving way, how he sang all day and night of his loss and even entered the Underworld to try to get her back, so great was his grief. There is a poignant description of the souls of the dead and a dramatic depiction of the darkness and gloom of Hades, with the evil smells, stagnant water and terrible punishments. There is no description of his meeting with Hades and Persephone, but Virgil switches straight to the moment where Orpheus has almost reached the upper world with his wife behind him. There is a very dramatic account of his momentary lapse “pardonable you’d say, but Death can never pardon”. To the sound of thunder, Eurydice bewails her fate and is hauled back down while Orpheus is devastated with the double grief of losing her twice. The drama is added to by the description of the animals and even trees following the beauty of his music, as he travels to the darkest, coldest regions of earth. In a horrific turn, he is torn limb from limb by spurned maenads. But in a gothic twist, his severed head still calls Eurydice’s name. All of this is almost cinematic in the scene switching and vividness of the descriptions.

Three explained reasons. (12, 12, 11.)

(35 marks)

(b) Virgil’s masterful use of imagery in this poem makes a powerful impact on the reader, examples which could be mentioned include: the fog, phantoms, swamp and gloom of the Underworld; the souls like little birds among leaves; the snake-haired furies and three headed hound; Eurydice’s disappearance like a wisp of smoke; Orpheus weeping under ice-cold stars; the simile of the nightingale lamenting her young; finally the image of the head of Orpheus plucked “from the marble-pale neck...” with his cold tongue calling out her name. The beauty and horror of the images bring the grief and pain of the poem to life.

Two developed points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

Topic 8. Art and Architecture in Greek Society.

(i)

(a) The temple was built in the early classical period – about 470-460 BC.

Early Classical (10.)

(10 marks)

(b) The temple was built of local stone (conglomerate) covered in stucco, but its tiles and decorative features were made of marble. The temple is a peripteral temple in the Doric order. It has 6 columns along the front and back and 13 along each side, the standard proportions for a Doric temple of the era. It has a ramp, a pronaos, and an opisthodomos. It has two rows of columns in the naos and a stairs leading to a gallery for viewing the colossal statue of Zeus made by Phidias. It has a stylobate on which the column shafts are placed directly. The column capitals are made up of abacus and echinus. The columns are fluted in the Doric style and topped by the entablature. This consists of architrave, frieze of metopes and triglyphs above the taenia and regula with guttae below. Above the frieze there are more guttae below the mutule above which there is the cornice and the slanting cornice.

Four points of description with correct architectural terms. (5, 5, 5, 5.)

(20 marks)

(c) The main decorative features are the two pediments and the twelve sculpted metopes over the entrance, (all made of marble). On the east pediment there are figures representing the start of the chariot race of Pelops. The more famous west pediment shows Apollo calming the riot of Centaurs at the Lapith wedding. He dominates the scene which includes the women being manhandled by Centaurs, writhing figures and, in the corners, reclining women. It is a very successful composition where all the figures inter-relate. The twelve metopes show each of the tasks of Heracles, again, a mix of quiet and action-packed scenes. The one shown is the Golden Apples of the Hesperides being handed over by Atlas to Herakles, with a stately Athena looking on.

Three aspects of the sculptures fully described – east and west pediments and metopes: (7, 7, 6.) Reference could also be made to the later statue of Zeus. (20 marks)

(ii)

(a) The vase is an amphora, (two handled vessel), which was used as a container for wine and other liquids.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(b) The two figures are Achilles and Ajax, Greek warriors during the Trojan War. They are playing a game such as chess or draughts.

Two correct names. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(c) The painter was Exekias.

One correct name. (5.)

(5 marks)

(d) This vase is beautifully decorated in the Attic/Athenian Black Figure style. Exekias made the pot and painted it (according to the inscription on the vase). The painting is wonderfully detailed and is done in an “elegant yet forceful style” (Richter). The two figures stand out in the intensity of their poses, creating a lovely symmetry, with only slight variations between them, notably the helmet of Achilles. This symmetry is enforced by the two shields, their curves beautifully suited to the curve of the amphora and the four spears at contrasting diagonal angles. The delicacy of the detail on the faces, hair and beards is remarkable as is the fineness of the patterns on the warriors’ cloaks. The clarity and elegance of the scene is outstanding and the palmette pattern on the necking of the pot as well as the little heart shaped leaves on the handles are very finely done. Richter uses the term “quiet distinction” for the style of Exekias.

Three points relating to the quality and style. (9, 8, 8.)

(25 marks)

(iii)

(a) This is a kouros or young male figure. It belongs to the Late Archaic period which is approximately 540-480 BC.

Two points. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(b) This statue would have been used as a grave marker, but candidates could also mention a votive offering to a god.

One point. (10.)

(10 marks)

(c) This sculpture, known as the Anavysos Kouros is typical of its period in several ways. It is a young, male figure standing in a very rigid pose with hands clenched by his sides and his left foot stepped forward, so it is a typical archaic kouros. Also, it has very stylised hair carved in detailed patterns and not very naturalistic. His face is also very symmetrical with the archaic smile. The elements that show that he is late archaic include: the fact that his muscles are contoured rather than shown by lines and grooves, especially around his chest and shoulders: his appearance of weight bearing is more realistic than earlier kouros; his arms and legs are more realistic looking than earlier kouros and his face is less flat than earlier examples. He is definitely archaic but sculpted at the point where artists were moving towards a more realistic style, using the observation of reality.

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

(30 marks)

(iv)

(a) The statue is the bronze Delphi Charioteer.

One point. (5.)

(5 marks)

(b) It was part of a monument commemorating a victory in the Pythian Games.

One point. (5.)

(5 marks)

(c) It belongs to the Early Classical period (c.480-450 BC).

One point. (5.)

(5 marks)

(d) The Charioteer is typical of this period in several ways. First it is a good example of the "severe" style, the face is very solemn and serious, and the pose is quite majestic. It is in "arrested motion" which is typical of this era, a pose where the figure looks as if they are about to act or move, but there is an air of serenity and stillness. The figure is not totally symmetrical in its stance as earlier statues were which makes it more realistic. The elegance, simplicity and naturalism of the drapery is also very typical of early classical sculpture as is the assured sculpting of the feet and arm. It is simple and graceful. The fact that it is hollow-cast bronze is also typical of the period.

Three typical features. (7, 7, 6.)

(20 marks)

(e) The sculptor would have moulded the figure out of clay. Then he would have covered this clay with a thin coat of wax. Inserting straws or thin pipes, he then would have put another layer of clay over that. Next, he would have poured molten bronze (a mix of copper and tin) through the straws where it melted the wax and took its place. After it had cooled down, the outer layer of clay would be removed, and the bronze statue finished with extra details (engraved hair, eyes of precious stones). A sketch or sketches may be used as part of this answer.

A coherent description of the method. (5, 5, 5.)

(15 marks)

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

(i)

(a) Socrates does not blame philosophers for being useless. Rather, he blames democratic society for not valuing philosophy properly. He uses the Sea Captain simile to show how society does not appreciate its philosophers. He says that the study of Philosophy is very difficult and takes a long time therefore it should be undertaken only by those who are exceptional. He says that even potentially good philosophers may be corrupted by the evils of society – good looks, money, public acclaim and the lures of popular success. He allows that there are bad philosophers who give philosophy itself a bad name and singles out the Sophists who claim to teach philosophy but do not. Thus, true philosophers are highly useful but those who just pretend to study it give all of them a bad reputation. The Large and Powerful Animal simile may be included here too.

Engagement, 14; Development, 14; Overall Evaluation, 7.

(35 marks)

(b) Candidates may agree or disagree with Socrates on this. They should show personal engagement with the question and refer to the text in their answer.

Two reasons explained. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(ii)

(a) Socrates explains that all humans are mutually dependent. None of us is fully self-sufficient. Therefore, it makes sense for people to gather into groups and each to use our personal aptitude for the good of the community. Essentially, he says that there should be only a few types of workers: farmer; builder; shoemaker; weaver and maybe a few others. The common good is paramount. Each person can contribute using his own specialised skills.

Two developed points. (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(b) Glaucon says that this society would be too basic, so Socrates says that typically, we go on to improve our standards to include more refined and luxurious items (food, furniture, perfume... etc.). This, in turn leads to the formation of larger cities, bigger communities and the need for more land. It also leads to a greater specialisation and sophistication. This, in turn, leads to a variety of professions and trades.

Two developed points. (10, 10.)

(20 marks)

(c) The growth of large cities means there is a greater demand for food and other goods, this leads to a desire for more land (which belongs to one's neighbour and has to be fought for). It also ends up in competition with neighbouring communities for trade. Hence the need for armies and the inevitable outbreak of wars.

One developed point. (10.)

(10 marks)

(iii)

(a) Socrates' views on the place of music in an ideal education are interesting for the central place music should have in his ideal system. Firstly, for Socrates, it is taken for granted that music is an integral part of life, not an optional extra. It is understood that music has a profound effect on the person and a deep influence on our thoughts and actions which is why it matters so much. He is mostly concerned with the type of music listened to by the Guardians and the implication is that our behaviour is deeply linked to the effect certain types of music have on us. Socrates says that certain types of music have a bad influence on our actions and should be avoided, whereas others (e.g. marching songs for soldiers such as the Dorians and Phrygians use) are good in their effect. Some of the types of music which should be rejected include dirges and laments and drinking songs. Certain types of instruments are better than others and he is keen that the rhythm and modes of music should match the accompanying words.

Three points. (7, 7, 6.)

(20 marks)

(b) Socrates justifies his views on certain types of music on the basis that he believes music can have such a profound effect on human behaviour. For instance, laments and sad songs are depressing and lower the spirits whereas drinking songs lead to drunkenness, idleness and waste of energy. On the other hand, rousing, appropriate music can raise the spirits and spur people on to noble actions.

Two explained points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(c) Candidates may agree or disagree with Socrates. They should show a personal engagement with the question and refer to the text in their answer. Contemporary examples should be credited.

Two views to be treated. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iv)

The sources for this answer are Plutarch's Life of Dion. Firstly, students should note the extraordinary devotion of the young Dion to Plato and to his philosophical ideas and of his ardent desire to put them into practice in his native Syracuse. They may argue either way as to whether he lived up to them. In fact, Dion did try to live up to Plato's philosophy in many respects: He made every effort to persuade both Dionysius I and Dionysius II to rule according to Plato's principles; He wanted only the best for his city and its people and on his successful return as leader to Syracuse, he avoided any hint of tyranny and tried to rule wisely despite the appalling fickleness of the Syracusans and their bad treatment of him; He invoked his philosophical training "to overcome anger, envy and the spirit of rivalry," and forgave Heraclides; He maintained a modest, frugal lifestyle (rather as Plato prescribed in The Republic). He did do his best, but the one thing for which Plato (and Plutarch) criticise Dion is his spirit of

unbending superiority. He lived a sober life but was a bit of a prig and made no secret of his disapproval of the less strict behaviour of others which alienated people easily. He believed that he was superior to most other people and was extremely critical. He was not capable of compromise.

Engagement, 20; Development, 20; Overall evaluation, 10.

(50 marks)

Topic 10. Roman Art and Architecture.

(i)

(a) **aa**, decumanus or main gates; **d**, forum; **e**, town hall/basilica; **j**, theatre; **k**, baths.

(5 x 2 marks.)

(10 marks)

(b) Trajan founded Timgad in North Africa (modern day Algeria) as a colonia for retired soldiers of the third Augustan legion. This was a very useful way to occupy retired soldiers, to reward them with a settlement and to help to protect the frontiers of the empire with the presence of experienced legionaries.

Three points. (5, 5, 5.)

(15 marks)

(c) Firstly, the structured nature of the plan shows that this was a very well organised and ordered place to live. It clearly shows the influence of the Roman castrum or military camp which is not surprising. The citizens certainly had defence in mind, but the presence of the triumphal arch shows a love of show. Also, the existence of so many buildings outside the walls indicate that life here must have been largely peaceful. The usual civic buildings show a typically Roman town administration, the forum, basilica and civic offices are all here. Graffiti shows that the citizens of Timgad liked to play games, hunt and enjoy life. The existence of so many bath buildings is testament to how seriously they took their leisure time. Public toilets were, again, a typical feature of Roman town life. A theatre seating up to 4,000 shows us that they loved their drama. A very elaborate and expensive library building is evidence of an educated and sophisticated approach to life in the town. Several large churches outside the walls shows that Christianity was well established here during the later empire.

Three points. (9, 8, 8.)

(25 marks)

(ii)

(a) The amphitheatre in Photograph F is the one at Pompeii, the amphitheatre in Photograph G is the Colosseum in Rome.

Two correct identifications. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(b) The Pompeiian amphitheatre is the earliest example of a stone amphitheatre, and it is very simple. It is open and flat compared to the Colosseum. The sloping of the *cavea* or seating area is very gradual and shallow. It had a peculiar entranceway which meant that all spectators essentially entered up a double set of steps, through a bottleneck at the top and then walked down to their seats. It had a capacity of about 14,000 and is very plain in style. The Colosseum or Flavian Amphitheatre held 45-50,000 spectators and was a very elaborate structure built on a series of ascending vaults. Its exterior had three tiers of arches and columns (Doric on the ground floor, Ionic on the first floor and Corinthian on the third floor), on top of this was a level with pilasters topped with poles for the huge awning. It had entrances through most of the arches on the ground floor for ease of movement of large numbers of people and it had an elaborate system of underground tunnels and cages for the animals below the arena. It was a much grander structure in terms of scale, complexity and decoration than the one at Pompeii.

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

(25 marks)

(c) The information about the function of these buildings is among the most fascinating in telling us about Roman life. The events which took place here included animal shows; beast hunts; gladiatorial combats; trials and punishments of criminals and very occasionally naval battles. The fact that such a sophisticated and educated society regarded the slaughter of beasts and of humans as entertainment is an endless source of interest and astonishment to modern students. As well as this, the evidence of such an impressive scale of engineering and construction tells us a great deal about the Romans. Even the degree of organisation required to administer the events in these arenas is amazing. The segregated seating in the *cavea* is evidence of the class structure in ancient Roman society.

Two points. (8, 7.)

(15 marks)

(iii)

(a) The first photograph shows a floor mosaic from a triclinium on the Aventine hill, known as "The Unswept Room". It is possibly by the mosaicist Sosus. The other photograph shows a still life painting from the House of Julia Felix in Pompeii. The mosaic is so mundane that it is almost ridiculous. It shows an unswept floor after a big dinner. It is extraordinary to see the skilled artistry which has been used to show such everyday items as a nutshell, a chicken claw and cherry stones. It tells us that even debris could be lovingly shown as art in the Roman world. Even the shadows of the rubbish are beautifully rendered, as well as a little mouse feasting on the waste. The subject matter could not be further from the heroic. The other photograph shows a painting of a glass fruit bowl, an amphora and a pot. Again, these are not majestic items, or in any way grand. They are ordinary, everyday household things, a glass bowl full of fruit spilling out over the top and an amphora leaning against another pot. Even the casual strewn fruit shows that it is a simple, spontaneous scene, not a formal painting. The beautiful colours of the apples and grapes and the delicate effect of the glass raise this routine image to one of great beauty.

Two developed points. (13, 12.)

(25 marks)

(b) Candidates might choose the first style - painting walls to look like marble blocks, second style – illusions of fanciful architecture and landscapes, third style – very sophisticated, dainty patterns with small landscaped panels or fourth style - theatrical scenes and elaborate decoration. Also acceptable would be the choice of a particular theme depicted in Roman painting (gardens, mythological scenes, scenes from the amphitheatre or landscape vistas). Candidates should be able to describe at least one example of the type they choose.

Three points. (5, 5, 5.)

(15 marks)

(c) Obviously, this is a very subjective question. Candidates should show a personal engagement and familiarity with their chosen piece.

Two reasons. (5, 5.)

(10 marks)

(iv)

(a) The event commemorated here is the triumph of the emperor Titus after his conquest of Judaea in 71 AD.

One point. (10.)

(10 marks)

(b) Relief sculpture is sculpture which is raised from its background, but still attached to it. In other words, it is not free-standing.

One point of explanation. (10.)

(10 marks)

(c) In terms of composition, the panel in Photograph J is a more interesting and varied composition. The figures are in a wide variety of poses and facing in different directions. There is a sense of movement and the drapery swirls. There are several strong angles above the figures leading the eye around the composition. The triumphal processions is shown in a slight curve, swinging around through the arch. The composition in the other panel is, in contrast, very static and domination by vertical and horizontal lines. The horses are in a rather monotonous row and the figures are all frontal, along the same line, dominated by the figure of the emperor. It is a repetitive composition. Again, in terms of perspective, the first panel is superior in rendering a sense of 3D or depth. Because of the variety of both high and shallow relief, there is a sense of figures receding into the background, while others with their drapery deeply carved are out in the front. The 3D effect is emphasised by the standards and the angle of the triumphal arch. The perspective of the other panel is very flat indeed. There is an attempt to show depth with the horses receding at an angle, but the figures are in a neat row and way below the dominant figure of the emperor. The horses are not at the right angle to the chariot in order to draw it. It seems that the sculptor is showing the scene from the front and the side simultaneously which does not fully work. In terms of subject matter, the first panel is dominated by the menorah, or Jewish candlestick, which immediately sets the time and place of the moving procession underneath. The fact that it is heading through a triumphal arch completes the story. The subject matter of the second panel is all about the greatness of

the emperor, here his dominant figure is crowned by a, (not quite as tall), figure of Victory. The greatness of the Emperor Titus is the story here.

Three points of comparison. (10, 10, 10.)

(30 marks)

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	Marks out of 35
Engagement	40%	20	16	14
Development	40%	20	16	14
Overall Evaluation	20%	10	8	7

Blank Page

Blank Page

