



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Education

Classical Civilisation 5021

CIV1 Greek and Roman History and Society

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those specified in the syllabus, is **not** required, but credit is to be given for their use if it aids the clarity and precision of the argument.

Information in round brackets is **not** essential in order to gain the mark.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Unless otherwise indicated, these descriptions and bands of marks are applicable to all questions worth 15 marks.

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of candidates after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course, or two years of study on the Advanced Course, and in the time available in the examination.

Candidates are **not** required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 4, but to cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

Level 5	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge, which is well chosen to support discussion of the central aspects of the question• clear and coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question• ability to sustain a structured argument which effectively links comment to detail, adopts an almost wholly evaluative and/or analytical approach and reaches a reasoned conclusion.	14-15
Level 4	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge to support discussion of the central aspects of the question• clear understanding of many of the central aspects of the question• ability to organise a generally convincing argument which adopts a largely evaluative and/or analytical approach	10-13
Level 3	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge• some understanding of some aspects of the question• some evidence of evaluation and/or analysis.	7-9
Level 2	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge.	3-6
Level 1	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge.	0-2

CIV1 Greek and Roman History and Society

TOPIC 1 *Athenian Democracy*

1 (a) ***Before Solon's reforms, which class had all the political power in Athens?***

nobles / well-born / Eupatridae [1]

(1 mark)

(b) ***What name was given to the highest political offices in Athens at this time?***

(i) archon [1]

(1 mark)

(ii) ***How long did a man serve in this office?***

1 year [1]

(1 mark)

(iii) ***What was the name of the council which he joined after his term of office?***

Areopagos [1]

(1 mark)

(c) ***To what extent do you think Solon was particularly suitable to deal with the crisis in Athens at this time? Explain your answer.***

SIX of e.g. Solon would have seemed a good candidate to be mediator [1] because in poetry [1] Solon championed both sides equally [1] criticising greed of rich [1] but describing poor as 'worthless' [1] not deserving equality with rich / needing to be kept in check [1] who would follow their leaders best if neither too free nor too restrained [1]; said to have iron will / stern determination [1] one of leading men / Eupatridae by birth [1] but moderate in wealth / 'middle class' [1] which said to have got through trade [1] so likely to understand interests of all groups in Athens [1] but cautious / conservative [1] aiming at compromise which would by and large enable nobles to continue to rule [1] with good order / *eunomia* [1] without threat of tyranny [1] unsuitable because quickly became angry / frustrated when neither side approved of his reforms [1] and left Athens [1] etc.

[MAX. TWO] if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. This maximum does not apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (d) ***In his constitutional and judicial reforms, to what extent do you think that Solon was fair to both rich and poor? Give the reasons for your views. Do not write about Solon's economic reforms.***

You might include discussion of

- ***Solon's aims in his constitutional and legal reforms***
- ***what he says about the rich and poor in the other extracts from his poems which Aristotle quotes***
- ***the political significance of his reforms of the classes***
- ***his possible introduction of a second council (boule)***
- ***the changes he made to Draco's lawcode***
- ***his introduction of the right of appeal***
- ***his introduction of third-party redress***
- ***constitutional and legal arrangement which Solon did not change.***

Evaluation of extent to which Solon was fair towards both rich and poor in his constitutional reforms may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Solon's aim to mediate between rich and poor, remove threats of *stasis* and tyranny and establish *eunomia* by giving poor some political and legal rights, but not equal / democratic; references to Solon's poems appropriate to argument
- created system of 4 classes (*pentacosiomedimnoi*, *hippeis*, *zeugitai*, *thetes*) though probably only *pentacosiomedimnoi* entirely new, based on annual produce from land (500, 300, 200, less than 200 *medimnoi*) instead of birth, with political duties / responsibilities distributed according to class: timocracy; *pentacosiomedimnoi* and ? *hippeis* eligible for archonship rather than just nobles and so for Areopagos with its powers of guardianship of the constitution, extensive and largely unaccountable – still very small segment of society with major power; probably little immediate change because Eupatridai also wealthiest and Areopagites served for life, but made theoretically possible gradual social mobility over time and established new, less aristocratic principle for holding political power; if there was a class of dissatisfied traders, unclear whether this did meet their demands; ? top 3 classes eligible for *Boule* if it existed, which may have prepared agenda for *ekklesia*, so ? some of traditional powers of Areopagos spread more widely; *thetes* excluded from all offices but their right to attend *ekklesia* confirmed and so guaranteed some political input / experience
- because of its severity Draco's lawcode abolished apart from homicide law and replaced with laws which were fairer and less arbitrary, where punishment more appropriate to crime and displayed publicly in agora on *axones* / *kurbeis* so all who could read able to access laws themselves
- right of appeal established principle that magistrates not infallible and they could be held to account in front of people in *heliaia* (*ekklesia* sitting as jury court), so poor had some say in legal process and some redress against officials, even if limited; this reform seen as particularly important by Aristotle
- third-party redress enabled a third party to take legal action on behalf of a wronged man and so made justice a community issue rather than a personal matter and gave more protection to the poor and made possible greater access to the judicial process for the poor
- Solon's constitutional and judicial reforms established important principles, but main power still with nobles who probably made up most of *pentacosiomedimnoi*, and did not end *stasis* since underlying problems e.g. power of clans remained untackled and poor felt they had gained too little, while nobles also dissatisfied, etc.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme
(15 marks)

- 2 (a) **Give four details of the civil strife which arose in Athens after Solon's reforms.**

FOUR of e.g. no clear leader because Solon had gone abroad (to Egypt) [1] (in 2 years) no archon appointed [1] one archon (Damasias) held onto power for over 2 years [1] until removed by force [1] Athenians chose 10 archons from 3 classes (5 from Eupatridai, 5 from country, 2 from artisans) [1] discontent because of Solon's cancellation of debt [1] failure to redistribute land [1] constitutional reforms [1] development of 3 groups / factions [1] Shore, Plain, Uplands / Hill / men of the Diakria [1] led by Megacles, Lycurgus, Peisistratus [1] respectively said to be the middle way, oligarchic, the most democratic [1]

(4 marks)

- (b) **How easily did Peisistratus (Pisistratus) establish his rule as tyrant? Explain your answer.**

SIX of e.g. had most democratic reputation [1] leader of Uplands / men of the Diakria [1] and of those impoverished / discontented because of Solon's cancellation of debt [1] and those not of pure Athenian descent [1] popular because had distinguished himself in war with Megara [1] to gain sympathy claimed self-inflicted injury done by enemies [1] persuaded people to vote him bodyguard / club-bearers [1] despite Solon's opposition [1] but exiled twice [1] after first exile 'brought back' to Athens by 'Athena' [1] after agreeing to marry rival's (Megacles') daughter [1] during second exile became very wealthy (in Thrace) [1] hired mercenaries [1] gained support of other states [1] (Thebes, Lygdamis of Naxos, Eretrian *hippeis*) [1] won battle (of Pallene) [1] disarmed Athenian people [1] etc.

[**MAX.TWO** if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. This maximum does not apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (c) **'The tyrants Peisistratus (Pisistratus) and Hippias were more successful in reducing the poverty of the people of Attica than Solon had been.'**
How far do you agree with this judgment? Give the reasons for your views.

You might include discussion of

- **the reasons for poverty in Athens**
- **Solon's reform known as the Shaking-off of Burdens (*seisachtheia*)**
- **Solon's other economic measures**
- **the extent to which Solon solved the underlying economic problems of the poor in Athens**
- **the general conditions which the tyrants Peisistratus (Pisistratus) and Hippias provided**
- **how far specific measures which the tyrants took reduced the poverty of the poor.**

Evaluation of extent to which tyrants successfully reduced poverty in Athens in comparison with Solon may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Athenian people entirely dependant upon agriculture for their survival; before Solon all land under control of nobles; some (*hektemoroi*) had to pay one-sixth / five-sixths of produce to landowner; failure to pay these dues or other debts led to enslavement because all debts on security of person (*epi somati*)
- Solon cancelled existing debts, and so gave everyone a fresh start and made loans on security of person illegal and so removed threat of enslavement for economic hardship; freed those enslaved for debt; abolished system of hectarage and so peasants owned land outright, could keep all produce and stigma of *horoi* removed; but did not redistribute land so failed to tackle underlying cause of debt and abolition of loans on security of person perhaps made them more difficult to secure since peasants had little else as collateral
- banned export of all produce except olive oil so price of grain reduced and economy boosted; legislated that fathers should teach sons a trade; encouraged foreign craftsmen to live in Athens and broaden economic activity; allegedly reformed weights and measures (and ? coinage) to facilitate trade; but by not removing *stasis* did not create the peaceful, stable conditions in which the economy could flourish
- tyrants provided long period of political stability, taxed wealthy and from this revenue and own resources provided poor with loans so that greater olive production could be introduced and sustained; road-building programme provided employment and facilitated trade with Attica; peaceful relations with other states encouraged trade abroad; growth in pottery manufacture (red figure); building programme on Acropolis etc. provided work and boosted morale; debt never appears to have been a major problem subsequently, etc.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)

- 3 (a) **How many citizens served on the Council (Boule) each year?**

500 [1]

(1 mark)

(b) **Give two restrictions on which citizens were eligible to serve on the Council (Boule).**

TWO of e.g. not *thetes* [1] not those under 30 [1] not in successive years [1] not more than twice [1]

(2 marks)

(c) **How were citizens selected to serve on the Council (Boule)?**

lot / 50 per tribe / fixed quota per deme [1]

(1 mark)

(d) **To what extent did the Athenians try to prevent bribery in politics and the lawcourts? Explain your answer.**

SIX of e.g. bribery difficult because *ekklesia* open to all citizens and so meetings attended by large numbers (typically about 6000) [1] juries also very large [1] *Boule* had 500 members [1] though *prytaneis* only 50 [1] juries selected by lot [1] on day of trial [1] from pool of 6000 [1] no guidance from judge [1] secret ballot [1] evidence of *Wasps* [1] most offices selected by lot [1] for a term of one year [1] with no possibility of reappointment [1] generals elected, could serve any number of annual terms, but still had to be re-elected [1] all officials subject to *euthuna* [1] etc.

[**MAX.TWO** if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. This maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (e) ***In this passage the author is arguing that the democratic constitution in Athens was inefficient. To what extent do you agree with this judgement? Give the reasons for your views.***

You might include discussion of

- ***the Assembly (Ekklesia): for example, how often it met, who attended, what business it transacted, what its procedures were***
- ***the Council (Boule): for example, how it was organised, what jobs it had to do***
- ***the lawcourts (dikasteria): for example, how they were organised, what part they played in politics, why trials could not be held every day***
- ***generals (strategoï) and other officials: for example, how they were selected, how long they served, how much influence they had, how they were held to account.***

Evaluation of the extent to which the Athenian democratic constitution was inefficient may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of e.g.

- assembly (*ekklesia*) – where all major decisions had to be passed, met at least 4 times a prytany; routine agenda for each meeting plus all motions had to be prepared by *Boule*; open to all citizens, but those who actually spoke probably more limited; herald maintaining order in speakers, etc.
- the Council (*Boule*) – advantages and disadvantages of selection by lot and lack of continuity; system of *prytaneis*; new chairman (*epistates*) daily; functioned as sub-committee of assembly with range of duties in all areas of administration including setting agenda for assembly and ensuring decisions of assembly carried out – triremes, public buildings, committees, auditors (*logistai*), physically disabled, horses, etc. (see prescribed Aristotle 43-49 and Xenophon the Orator / Old Oligarch 3)
- lawcourts (*dikasteria*) – advantages / disadvantages of large amateur juries, with no judge to guide and no discussion, the use / misuse of rhetoric and emotional appeals; all officials ultimately answerable to juries; no trials on festivals of which Xenophon the Orator / Old Oligarch says there was a large number in Athens
- generals (*strategoï*) – had particularly influence in assembly because of their military / naval experience but their views still subject to popular vote and could be held to account in courts, as well as needing to be re-elected annually, etc.
- particular examples e.g. treatment of Arginousai commanders, Mytilene debates

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)

TOPIC 2 *The Life and Times of Cicero*

- 4 (a) ***Cicero refers to the triumvirs as ‘the powerful’ (line 1). Give the names of the triumvirs.***

Caesar [1] Pompey [1] Crassus [1]

(3 marks)

- (b) ***Which political group in the senate does Cicero call the ‘powerless’ (line 1)?***

optimates / boni / ‘conservative republican oligarchy’ (Grant) / those led by Cato [1]

(1 mark)

- (c) ***How close was the friendship between Cicero and Atticus? Explain your answer.***

SIX of e.g. friendship lifelong / from childhood [1] shared basically similar republican principles [1] but Atticus Epicurean [1] and so favoured quietism / wanted to continue refined lifestyle in peace [1] and not endanger wealth / business interests [1] whereas Cicero actively engaged / took risks in politics [1] Cicero wrote to Atticus regularly to seek advice [1] expressing personal feelings on day-to-day politics [1] and political principles (e.g. p.80) [1] Cicero had initially rejected Atticus’ advice to cooperate with triumvirs [1] because of Cicero’s wish to impress *optimates* [1] desire for *concordia ordinum* [1] Cicero also wrote to Atticus about family / personal matters [1] e.g. Tullia (e.g. p.85 and p.87) [1] Atticus frequently looked after Cicero’s house for him [1] advised him on his writing [1] published his work [1] fitted out Cicero’s libraries [1] carried out other business for Cicero e.g. guaranteeing validity of Cicero’s title to property he was selling (p.72) [1] and settled debt (800,000 sesterces with Oppius) [1] Atticus’ sister (Pomponia) married to Cicero’s brother (Quintus) [1] and Cicero expressed his critical feelings about her openly to Atticus [1] etc.

[MAX.TWO if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. This maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (d) ***To what extent do you think Cicero was ‘an utter fool’ (line 3) in the period 62 B.C. (Pompey’s return from Asia Minor) to 56 B.C. (the conference at Luca)? Give the reasons for your views.***

You might include discussion of

- ***Cicero’s political aims during this period and how far he achieved them***
- ***his attitude towards the triumvirs before and after they formed the triumvirate***
- ***the reasons for his exile***
- ***his actions when he returned from exile and how far he was responsible for the conference at Luca***
- ***the consequences of the conference at Luca for Cicero and the Republic.***

Evaluation of extent to which Cicero had acted foolishly between 62-56 B.C. may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Cicero aiming for *concordia ordinum* following his experience in crushing Catilinarian revolt – but how relevant in new context? – and so trying to ingratiate himself with *optimates*
- had previously had *amicitia* with Pompey, but angered him by joining with *optimates* in opposing his reasonable demands for land for veterans and ratification of eastern *acta* and boasting of his success in defeating Catiline, apparently arrogantly wanting to play Laelius to Pompey's Scipio Aemilianus, and so contributed to Pompey joining with Caesar and Crassus to achieve his aims and bringing land bill before the People, thus bypassing the senate
- disliked Crassus and regarded his proposal on behalf of *equites* for adjustment to tax collection contract as wrong but eventually supported it to prevent further split between senate and *equites*
- unable to thwart Caesar's ambitions of becoming consul in 59 and very distressed by formation of first triumvirate but unable to prevent it
- Caesar wanted either to secure Cicero's support because of his oratory, prestige as ex-consul and support in Italian towns or to remove him, but Cicero rejected offers to join his staff or go on state mission and so Caesar supported Clodius' plebeian adoption to enable him to become tribune (Pompey also acquiesced in this) and pass law re-enacting punishment by exile / execution for anyone who condemned Roman citizens to death without trial, as Cicero had done during Catilinarian crisis
- despite Clodius' support during the Catilinarian crisis, Cicero destroyed his alibi at *Bona Dea* trial in order to side with *optimates*, but Clodius acquitted through bribery and wanted personal revenge; despite Cicero's appeals, Caesar and Pompey did nothing to prevent Clodius securing Cicero's exile
- Pompey advocated Cicero's recall from exile since continually under attack from Clodius' gangs and suspicious of Crassus whom he openly accused in the senate of plotting against him because Crassus attempted to compete with Pompey over commission to restore Ptolemy Auletes to Egypt
- Cicero hoped to exploit this rift in triumvirate; successfully proposed Pompey take control of corn supply in gratitude for his recall
- Cicero then attacked Caesar by proposing Campanian land law should be discussed and with a view to it being superseded (*pro Sestio*); Caesar summoned Crassus and Pompey to conference at Luca – to satisfy each of their individual needs it was agreed Caesar's command in Gaul to be extended for 5 years, Pompey and Crassus to be consuls 55, then Pompey to govern Spain *in absentia*, Crassus to govern Syria – Cicero's plan had strengthened rather than weakened triumvirate; Cicero forced to recant in letter to Pompey and ? Caesar, to praise Caesar in senate in *de provinciis consularibus* and support claim to continue in Gaul, and to defend enemies Vatinius and Gabinius 54 – Cicero and senate unable to control ambitions of those with military might and wealth who could act in own interests outside senate, etc.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)

5 (a) What were the reasons for the outbreak of the Civil War in 49 B.C.? Make four points.

FOUR of e.g. Caesar illegally crossed Rubicon / led troops into Italy [1] because while in Gaul [1] wanted to stand for consulship *in absentia* [1] contrary to *mos maiorum* [1] but legitimised by bill of 10 tribunes [1] to avoid prosecution for illegal acts during consulship 59 [1] and wanted Gallic command extended to end 49 [1] so no gap between Gallic command and consulship [1] and because Pompey had secured continuation of command (in Spain for 5 years) [1] contrary to Luca agreement that should work in each other's interests [1] Caesar's request rejected by senate [1] on initiative of consul (M. Marcellus) [1] because of fears / stubbornness / jealousy of *optimates* / Pompey [1] Marcellus proposed Caesar be replaced because Gallic war finished [1] questioned legality of bill of 10 tribunes [1] insulted Caesar by flogging senator from Novum Comum [1] Pompey further angered Caesar by proposing to send to Parthia legion he had lent Caesar [1] (Curio's) motion that both Caesar and Pompey should disarm passed with large majority but vetoed on initiative of *optimates* [1] consul (Marcellus) asked Pompey to take command of all forces in Italy / save republic [1] Caesar attempted to continue negotiations through Antony [1] Metellus Scipio proposed Caesar should be declared public enemy unless laid down arms [1] etc.

(4 marks)

(b) To what extent is Cicero justified in criticising Pompey for evacuating Rome, going south to Apulia and then sailing to Greece without telling him? Explain your answer.

SIX of e.g. Cicero himself hesitated on which side to join [1] and had no real military experience / expertise / understanding [1] Pompey had backing of senate to be in charge of all forces in Italy [1] and had control of the sea [1] whereas Caesar had only one legion [1] but it would have been foolish for Pompey to attack Caesar directly [1] because his only 2 legions in Italy had been taken from Caesar [1] and so loyalty in question [1] so reasonable to move south to build up forces [1] and to sail for Greece [1] in easy reach of eastern regions where Pompey had much support [1] and wealth [1] although it did enable Caesar to take control of Rome [1] and treasury [1] Pompey cannot be blamed for Domitius' disobedience to his orders to withdraw (at Corfinium) [1] although it showed a threat to Pompey's authority [1] demonstrated Caesar's instant success when Domitius forced to surrender [1] and clemency when Caesar released distinguished prisoners [1] and so increased Caesar's support [1] and increased his forces which now outnumbered Pompey's [1]

[MAX. TWO if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. The maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument]

(6 marks)

- (c) ***'What a disgrace!' (line 1). How far do you think that Cicero himself acted disgracefully in the period from the outbreak of the Civil War in 49 B.C. to Caesar's murder in 44 B.C.? Give reasons for your views.***

You might include discussion of

- ***Cicero's political principles and the problems he faced in achieving them***
- ***Cicero's behaviour in the build-up to the Civil War and when it broke out***
- ***his meeting with Caesar at Formiae and his response to letters from Caesar and Pompey***
- ***what Cicero did during the Civil War before and after the battle of Pharsalus***
- ***Cicero's attitude towards Caesar's constitutional position, reforms and treatment of his enemies and his dinner with Caesar***
- ***Cicero's attitude towards Caesar's murder.***

Evaluation of extent to which Cicero acted disgracefully from outbreak of Civil War to Caesar's murder may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Cicero's pro-republican ideals, supporting senatorial government working in cooperation with *equites*, limiting power of individuals for the common good, but inability to control ambitions of men with powerful military backing and problems of rival factions within senate
- Cicero's indecisiveness at start of Civil War and inability to influence events through negotiation – met Caesar at Formiae, but refused to go to Rome despite conciliatory letter from Caesar referring to his 'influence'; Caesar asked him to think it over, but subsequent letter (p.83) threatening and urging Cicero to stay out of conflict; Cicero's belief that Caesar aiming at autocracy whereas slight hope that Pompey would uphold republic, though fear that would not; distress at Caesar's successes
- letter (pp.81-82) shows Cicero's continued desire for reconciliation, but also his desire to satisfy obligations to Pompey
- despite Caesar's threatening letter, Cicero eventually joined Pompey in Greece – reasons – but constantly grumbled at bloodthirstiness and stayed in camp day of Pharsalus (unwell? (Plutarch) unwarlike? lukewarm?)
- refused offer of command after Pompey's murder and ? to Brundisium for 11 months – no part in fighting / politics; Caesar sent 'fairly generous' letter and met; Cicero outwardly reconciled to dictatorship
- after Thapsus Cicero spoke in praise of Cato, arch-republican opponent of Caesar, but also on behalf of Marcellus and Ligarius, both pardoned by Caesar, praising his generosity / clemency and urging him as dictator to undertake social reform
- Cicero's dinner with Caesar (p.89) – avoided political discussion
- chose quietism rather than active opposition; literary activities
- joke in letter to Atticus about desirability of Caesar's death but no part in conspiracy; initial delight at Caesar's murder (e.g. p.91) but criticism of conspirators.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)

- 6 (a) ***For what reason is Cicero criticising Trebonius at the beginning of the passage?***

spared Antony / did not involve Cicero in conspiracy [1]

(1 mark)

- (b) ***'Antony's thoroughly discreditable withdrawal' (line 3). What two actions of Antony is Cicero referring to here?***

Antony had gone north / to Cisalpine Gaul [1] after making himself governor [1]

(2 marks)

- (c) ***Give one reason why Antony had taken these actions.***

two of his legions had deserted to Octavian [1]

(1 mark)

- (d) ***How far do you think the conspirators were to blame for failing to bring back 'free conditions' (lines 2-3) after Caesar's murder? Explain your answer.***

SIX of e.g. failed to understand threat from Antony [1] who as Caesar's right-hand man hoped to inherit [1] but killing a consul could well have lost the conspirators further support [1] conspirators had no plan how to follow up murder [1] believed order would be restored simply through Caesar's removal [1] Brutus and Cassius failed to win over crowd when addressed people (in Forum 15 March evening) [1] had taken refuge on Capitol [1] had failed to win over senate [1] which met without them (in temple of Tellus 17 March) Brutus' speech to people 17 March again failed [1] too academic / not fiery enough according to Cicero (p.92) [1] allowed Antony to seize initiative [1] secure support of Lepidus [1] bring troops into Rome [1] speak at Caesar's funeral [1] inflame crowd against conspirators [12] so conspirators had to flee Rome [1]

[MAX. TWO if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. The maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument]

(6 marks)

- (e) ***'Between the death of Caesar in 44 B.C. and Cicero's own death in 43 B.C., his leadership of the Senate was as energetic as it had been in his consulship in 63 B.C.'***

To what extent do you agree with this statement? Give the reasons for your views.

You might include discussion of

- ***the problems facing Cicero after Caesar's death and the reasons why Cicero acted as he did***
- ***Cicero's actions between Caesar's death and August 44 B.C.***
- ***his actions in the senate from September 44 B.C.***
- ***his attitudes towards Antony and Octavian and his reaction to the forming of the second triumvirate***
- ***the problems Cicero had faced during his consulship in 63 B.C.***
- ***his actions as consul and the reasons why he acted as he did.***

Evaluation and comparison of how energetic Cicero's leadership of the senate was in 44-43 B.C. and 63 B.C. may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Cicero's fear of reprisals from Antony's supporters because met conspirators on Capitol even though no part in actual conspiracy; demoralised by difficulties in restoring 'free government' of republic in which theoretically authority of senate, working with *equites*, provided checks on ambitions of individuals by means of annually elected officials
- in aftermath of murder, Cicero kept out of Rome so lost immediate opportunity to exert influence on politics; enrolled on Dolabella's staff in Syria for 5 years to have legitimate reason for absence from Rome and opportunity to see son in Athens, but driven back by contrary winds
- request by Brutus and Cassius that all senior senators attend senate 1 September after their departure for Macedonia and Syria; 2 September Cicero delivered moderate attack on Antony in senate (*1st Philippic*); October Cicero in country circulated vitriolic / defamatory pamphlet against Antony (*2nd Philippic*); 20 December speech in senate (*3rd Philippic*) rallied senate as in passage – believed Antony aiming at dictatorship
- Octavian illegally raised large army using Caesar's name, but nevertheless Cicero proposed that despite illegality of this and his youth he should be made senator and propraetor to support consuls (Hirtius and Pansa) against Antony; expressed his plans for temporary use of Octavian in later part of this letter; plan backfired because underestimated Octavian's ambitions – Antony defeated at Mutina but both consuls died so Octavian in control of both consular armies, demanded consulship, snubbed by senate, marched on Rome
- Second Triumvirate: November 43 alliance between Octavian, Antony and Lepidus for 5 years with power to make laws and nominate officials and so dominate senate – effectively 3 dictators – division of provinces; proscriptions
- comparison with Cicero's consulship: threat from Catiline serious because proposed cancellation of debt; Cicero took over full responsibility for episode himself; successfully prevented Catiline from gaining consulship of 62 by appearing at elections wearing breast plate / bodyguard, but in response Catiline planned uprisings throughout Italy; acting on intelligence Cicero got SCU passed despite difficulty of persuading senate of danger and posted troops throughout Italy; after further intelligence Cicero avoided assassination and denounced Catiline to face in senate, thus forcing Catiline to flee Rome, and persuaded senate to declare Catiline and Manlius public enemies; Cicero persuaded Allobroges to trick conspirators into signing treasonable documents; Cicero arrested 5 ringleaders in Rome, consulted senate about what to do with them; after Cato's speech senate favoured death penalty despite Caesar's opposition, uncertainties over legality – senate not court of law and citizens entitled to trial unless classed as enemies of the state; Catiline's forces soon defeated in battle, though not by Cicero himself; discussion of Cicero's justification and effectiveness in these events, etc.
- other events of Cicero's consulship e.g. *in Rullum*, *de rege Alexandrino*

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)

TOPIC 3 Women in Athens and Rome

- 7 (a) ***In what circumstances had Neaera come with her children to Stephanus' house in Athens? Give three details.***

THREE of e.g. Stephanus met Neaera in brothel in Megara [1] where Neaera had fled to escape brutality of Phrynion [1] because could not return to Corinth because of agreement when freed (by Eucrates and Timanoridas) [1] but business bad because war on [1] and Megarians stingy [1] so Stephanus promised to take Neaera back to Athens and protect her from Phrynion [1] and introduce sons to phratry / make them citizens [1] etc.

(3 marks)

- (b) ***What was the penalty for giving a foreign woman in marriage to an Athenian citizen?***

atimia / loss of citizenship / property [1]

(1 mark)

- (c) ***Explain why the dowry was so important in an Athenian marriage.***

SIX of e.g. Athenian marriage was business arrangement [1] between girl's father and her husband [1] to produce legitimate children [1] and run *oikos* [1] handing over of dowry was witnessed [1] which provided the evidence that the couple living together was a proper marriage / legally binding contract [1] size of dowry demonstrated status of a girl's family [1] and was intended to make her attractive to marry [1] since the dowry was intended to provide enough income for the husband so that he could maintain his wife at no cost to himself [1] if the wife returned to her original family either because of divorce or because her husband died the dowry went with her [1] so that whoever was the girl's *kurios* had the means to support her [1] this also gave the wife some protection because divorce had a serious consequence for the husband [1] anyone who failed to pay back the dowry was required by law to pay interest at 18% [1] and the size of the dowry also gave wife some status in her new family [1] in effect, dowry was girl's share of her father's inheritance which, unlike males, she received while her father still alive [1] etc.

(6 marks)

- (d) ***Judging from the evidence you have studied, to what extent do you think Athenian men took into account the feelings and opinions of their wives and daughters and to what extent were they concerned only with their own interests? Give reasons for your views.***

You might include discussions of

- ***the purposes of Athenian marriages and how they were arranged***
- ***the different kinds of evidence you have studied***
- ***Apollodorus' description of the way Stephanus, Phrastor and Theogenes treated Phano***
- ***Apollodorus' definition of marriage and what he says will happen if Neaera is acquitted***
- ***Euphiletus' account of the way he treated his wife***
- ***Ischomachus' conversation with Socrates.***

Evaluation of extent to which Athenian men considered the feelings and opinions of the wives and daughters may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Athenian marriages were business arrangements between girl's father and husband to provide husband with essential services of management of *oikos* and procreation of legitimate children; because of emphasis on legitimacy demonstrable chastity essential and so couple would not have met alone before marriage, etc.
- evidence needs careful interpretation because either from court speeches in which speaker has a case to prove or from Ischomachus' idealised version of his marriage as told to Socrates; all evidence by males giving male perspective
- Stephanus allegedly arranged marriages for Phano as part of his own agenda to honour pledge to Neaera and to further his own social ambitions
- Phano and Phrastor allegedly an unsuitable match because of their clash of personalities / lifestyles and Phano's alleged unwillingness to be trained as Phrastor wanted her; discovery that she was not who Stephanus claimed she was presented as sufficient reason for his divorce of her and refusal to hand back dowry; fact that Phano pregnant added to urgency of divorce from Phrastor's point of view because of fear of illegitimate heir; circumstances of his subsequent failed attempt to adopt Phano's son as his heir shows the importance of having an heir and necessity of being able to prove legitimacy to phratry rather than any concern for Phano's feelings
- Theogenes allegedly married Phano as part of a deal with Stephanus to have financial support while *archon basileus*, but divorced her as soon as legitimacy in question
- Apollodorus attempts to distinguish wives solely for the procreation of legitimate children and management of *oikos* from courtesans for personal pleasure – all women seen as satisfying male needs; but way in which he threatens jury with wrath of wives if they acquit Neaera implies more dialogue between husbands and wives than other evidence
- Euphiletus, putting himself forward as a good husband, says he initially kept an eye on his wife as is proper but was not too oppressive; birth of son turning point in their relationship; says handing over his property to her was sign of affection; apparently showed some consideration in reversing sleeping arrangements in house, but ? to give him freer hand with maid; claims not to have suspected her affair despite her strange behaviour; showed no consideration in his entrapment of Eratosthenes *in flagrante*, which he presents as quite reasonable
- Ischomachus emphasises difference in age, wife's sheltered upbringing, arrangement he had made with her parents and his success in training her; attempts to give impression that he treated her fairly and equally and explained everything carefully, but clearly always dominant; analogy of leader bee and emphasis on importance of her role within *oikos*; shows some consideration when she cannot find what he has asked for, but totally opposed to her wearing make-up, which he explains laboriously from his point of view.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme
(15 marks)

- 8 (a) **Give four examples of the monstrous behaviour of women which Juvenal criticises in Satire 6.**

FOUR of e.g. sex-mad [1] e.g. (Eppia) went off to Egypt / abroad with gladiator [1] further detail [1] refusal of women to sail for legitimate reasons [1] Messalina / emperor's (Claudius') wife spent every night in brothel [1] further detail [1] mothers-in-law encourage daughters in deceit / adultery [1] women are litigious [1] participate in athletics [1] intellectual women who quote poetry [1] make themselves sterile / abort [1] etc.

(4 marks)

- (b) **In the part of Satire 6 which you have read, how far do you think Juvenal has something serious to say about Roman women and how far do you think he is just trying to make his audience laugh? Explain your answer and support it with details from Satire 6.**

SIX of e.g. claims to be giving serious advice to man about to marry [1] but list of criticisms based on traditional male fears [1] and stock jokes [1] e.g. women's deceit / untrustworthiness [1] and attempts to mimic / be superior to men [1] and general view that values in decline [1] Juvenal's exaggeration [1] and use of sharp, vivid images to emphasise point [1] with examples piled up in quick succession [1] as if to imply there is no limit to their vices [1] complete lack of balance / anything positive [1] black and white contrast between present and past [1] and simplistic explanation of reason for alleged decline [1] etc. + 1 mark for each relevant detail.

[**MAX. TWO** if candidate gives only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. The is maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (c) **In the extracts from Livy which you have read, to what extent does he support the view that in earlier times women had only good qualities? Give reasons for your views.**

You might include discussion of

- **Livy's motives in writing**
- **the Sabine women**
- **Lucretia**
- **Cloelia**
- **women's attitudes towards the Oppian Law and the debate between Cato and Valerius about its repeal.**

Evaluation of extent to which Livy supports Juvenal's assertion that Roman women in earlier times had only good qualities may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Livy, writing during principate of Augustus, had moral agenda in providing examples to follow / avoid
- despite use of trickery and force Sabine women acquiesce in their capture, intervene to prevent war between Romans and Sabines and become dutiful wives

- Lucretia won contest for her industriousness (other wives banqueting); showed hospitality to Tarquinius, chastity, courage and honour when refused his advances until he threatened dishonour, initiative, good sense and honesty in summoning father and husband with witnesses and ensuring they took revenge, courage (though also disobedience) in committing suicide; concern that she should not be negative example to other women
- Cloelia's escape impetuous and potentially risky, but her courage admired and her good sense in choosing boys, so became an agent for peace and honoured exceptionally with equestrian statue prominent on Via Sacra
- women happy with restrictions of Oppian Law while Hannibal a threat but publicly campaigned for its repeal 20 years later; Livy's debate reveals two opposing views on women's actions; Cato outraged in accordance with his traditional values, which are ultimately rejected; but Valerius pointed out how women had secured Rome's best interests in previous crises – Sabines, Coriolanus, Gauls, Idaeian Mother, Hannibal – and presented their demonstration as reasonable; confident that women can shun luxury by self-control rather than requiring legislation; sees women as accepting their subservience to men, hating freedom created by widowhood and preferring their appearance to be subject to husband's approval rather than laws; outcome justified women's demonstrations, etc.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme
(15 marks)

- 9 (a) ***In what circumstances is Cicero giving the speech from which this passage is taken? Give two details.***

TWO of: lawcourt [1] defence of Caelius / Clodia's former lover / Cicero's protégé [1] accused under law against riot [1] for stealing gold from Clodia [1] and then procuring poison to kill her [1] Cicero entertaining jury by acting parts because trial being held on holiday [1]

(2 marks)

- (b) ***What relationship does Cicero imply Clodia had with her brother?***

incest [1]

(1 mark)

- (c) ***Give one other accusation against Clodia which Cicero makes.***

malicious prosecution of former lover (Caelius) / lack of chastity / adultery / orgies / parading with other women's husbands on Via Appia / trips to Baiae / spying on young men bathing / not living up to standards of family [1]

(1 mark)

- (d) **To what extent did the Vestal Virgins have greater privileges and status than other Roman women? Explain your answer.**

SIX of: chosen at young age (6-10) [1] Vestal Virgins taken out of control of father [1] under control of *Pontifex Maximus* [1] only 6 at any one time [1] so small elite group [1] lived in community / in *atrium Vestae* close to forum / in centre of Rome [1] had duty of ensuring Vesta's fire never went out [1] important because believed Rome's safety depended on this [1] and attended all other major religious ceremonies [1] whereas other women had relatively little participation in religion [1] sat with emperor / at bottom level in theatre / amphitheatre [1] allowed to drive through Rome in carriage [1] always preceded by lictors / bodyguards [1] like male officials / magistrates [1] special regulations e.g. if accidentally met criminal on way to execution, he was pardoned [1] any man who fell under Vestals' carriage executed [1] had right to make will [1] and conduct other business without guardian [1] could not be bound by oath [1] but sworn to chastity [1] buried alive if unchaste [1] flogged if fire went out [1] served for 30 years [1] tended not to marry even after this period [1] because (according to Plutarch) prone to depression [1] etc.

[**MAX. TWO** if candidate give only factual details relevant to just one side of the argument. This maximum does **not** apply when candidate

- gives factual details relevant to both sides of the argument since in this case evaluation is taken to be implied even if not explicitly stated
- attempts evaluation even if it is linked to only one side of the argument.]

(6 marks)

- (e) **To what extent were Roman women in the 1st century B.C. and 1st century A.D. expected to show qualities usually associated with men as well as domestic virtues? Give the reasons for your views.**

You might include discussion of

- *Sallust's account of Sempronia*
- *the funeral eulogies for*
Turia
Murdia
- *Pliny's letters about*
Arria
her grand-daughter Fannia
his own wife Calpurnia
the young girl Minicia Marcella.

Evaluation of extent to which Roman women in 1st centuries B.C. and A.D. were expected to show the qualities of their male ancestors as well as domestic virtues may include discussion of a balanced range (but **not** necessarily all) of **e.g.**

- Sempronia used by Sallust as an example of Rome's moral decline since despite her potential she failed to live up to traditional expectations and showed neither domestic qualities nor those of the males in her family, being out of husband's control, having no frugality because extravagant and in debt and no chastity because debauched, having too a criminal record and being enlisted by Catiline to further revolution by inciting slaves, burning city, winning over / killing husbands, etc.

- Turia's husband in eulogy passed over her domestic virtues very briefly claiming she had these in common with all other good women and wanting to emphasise her special qualities in exceptional political circumstances, her ability to demonstrate male qualities in the absence of male members of her family, e.g. her initiative, courage, tenacity, physical endurance, independence, ingenuity, effective involvement in politics in interests of husband etc. (with details e.g. avenged murdered parents, successfully contested challenge to father's will, sent jewellery to husband in exile, suggested hiding place, fought off Milo's gang, appealed to Octavian for husband's life, personally confronted Lepidus despite beating and publicly showed up his brutality in contrast to Octavian's clemency, etc.) – all doubtless exaggerated because eulogy also designed to flatter / appease Augustus
- Murdia in surviving part of eulogy briefly praised for domestic virtues but more emphasis on her dutifulness to family in her bequests
- Arria praised by Pliny for her extreme Stoic values, equalling if not surpassing those of the males in her family and sometimes carried out in defiance of their wishes – fortitude / emotional control when hid son's death from sick husband, courage / determination when begged to be allowed to accompany husband on ship after arrest in Scribonianus' revolt and pursuit in fishing boat, outspokenness in criticising Scribonianus' wife, loyalty shown by determination to die with husband and example to him, etc.
- Fannia specifically praised for living up to standards of male members of family and her Stoicism – physical / mental endurance in fatal illness, chastity / devotion to family / selflessness in caring for sick Vestal though contagious, bravery in taking sole responsibility for commissioning of illegal biography of husband, devotion in accompanying him into exile twice, etc.
- Calpurnia, because of context e.g. young, letter to aunt, etc., praised more for her domestic virtues e.g. chastity and frugality, but particularly for her education which she used to show devotion to Pliny, in interest she showed in his legal career and literary pursuits; specifically praised for living up to values of family and in letter to her grandfather for her worthiness as a bearer of an appropriate heir, etc.
- Minicia Marcella praised for her devotion to her father and her similarity to him; her virginal modesty, but also the qualities she would have been expected to show as *matrona* – sedate, studious, respectful, cheerful, enduring, etc.

Apply descriptions of Levels of Response as at beginning of Mark Scheme

(15 marks)