



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

Classical Civilisation 1021

The Second Punic War

AS Unit 2F

Final

Mark Scheme

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 © 2011 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

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 given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the candidate uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

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 and in the time available in the examination.

Candidates are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the candidate's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS

Level 4	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question • clear understanding of central aspects of the question • ability to put forward an argument which for the most part has an analytical and/or evaluative focus appropriate to the question and uses knowledge to support opinion • ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	9-10
Level 3	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	6-8
Level 2	<p>Demonstrates either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them. 	3-5
Level 1	<p>Demonstrates either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it. 	1-2

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

Level 5	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question• coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question• ability to sustain an argument which• has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,• responds to the precise terms of the question,• effectively links comment to detail,• has a clear structure• reaches a reasoned conclusion• is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and• makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	19-20
Level 4	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question• understanding of many of the central aspects of the question• ability to develop an argument which<ul style="list-style-type: none">has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus,is broadly appropriate to the question,mainly supports comment with detail andhas a discernible structureis generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language andgenerally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	14-18
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 analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question• some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	9-13
Level 2	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge• or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them• and sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	5-8
Level 1	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge• or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it• and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	1-4

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

Level 5	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question • coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question • ability to sustain an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, responds to the precise terms of the question, effectively links comment to detail, has a clear structure reaches a reasoned conclusion is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	27-30
Level 4	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question • understanding of many of the central aspects of the question • ability to develop an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	20-26
Level 3	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	13-19
Level 2	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them • and writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	7-12
Level 1	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge • or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it • and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	1-6

Mark Scheme
Unit 2F The Second Punic War

Section One

Option A

- 01 *Hannibal then led his men down the Alps. What problems did they face during the descent? Give two details.***

Two from: steepness of the descent (1) / narrowness of path (1) / slipperiness of path **or** tendency of men/animals to fall (reference to problems caused by elephants will do here) (1) / animals/elephants exhausted/ill (1) / snow and ice (1) / path blocked by rocks (1) / starvation/lack of food (1)

(2 marks)

- 02 *What happened at the Battle of the Ticinus, Hannibal's first battle in Italy? Give three details.***

Three from: commanders made speeches of encouragement (1) / Romans built/crossed bridge over river (1) / bad omens depressed Romans (1) / two armies approached each other (1) / Roman spearmen broke ranks (1) / the two cavalries fought for some time (1) / Hannibal tricked the Romans (into advancing) (1) / Carthaginian cavalry eventually got behind Romans (1) / young Scipio saved his father, the Roman commander (1) / but the Romans retreated beaten **or** the Carthaginians won (1) / but not decisively (1)

(3 marks)

- 03 *In this passage how effectively does Livy show both Hannibal's strengths and his weaknesses as a leader?***

Discussion might include: his use of elephants was in one way inspired as they were 'a protection to the troops' but a weakness as they 'caused serious delay'; the whole idea of trying to cross 'narrow & precipitous tracks' was risking disaster but his inspiring leadership allowed the army to make it against the odds; he allows his men to reach the point of 'utter exhaustion' but is aware of his men's problems ('seeing their despair'); he takes the lead ('rode ahead'); in charge ('gave the order to halt'); has definite plan / is decisive ('pointed to Italy far below'); addresses them as 'my men'; ignores the present and future danger, but focuses on positives ('all will be easy going'; 'no more hills to climb'); makes it seem as if they've already won ('you are walking over the very walls of Rome'); dismissive of challenges ahead ('after a fight or two ...'); makes victory in the battle for Rome seem inevitable ('you will have the capital .. in the hollow of your hands'); but how realistic is he being – credit for pointing out his apparent lack of awareness/concern for the problems ahead and his later failure to keep up the impetus.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

- 04** *'After a fight or two you will have ... Rome in the hollow of your hands' (lines 11-12). How significant was Hannibal's own misjudgement and how important were other factors in his failure to keep this promise by the end of 216 BC? Give reasons for your answer and refer to Books 21 and 22 of Livy.*

You might include discussion of

- *the condition of Hannibal's army after arriving in Italy*
- *the early battles fought in Italy in 218 and 217 BC*
- *the battle of Cannae in 216 BC*
- *Hannibal's actions in the period immediately following Cannae*
- *Roman responses after Cannae*
- *support Hannibal received from Carthage during this period.*

Points for discussion regarding possible misjudgements by Hannibal might include:

- after Cannae the Romans were so exhausted that an immediate attack would almost certainly have led to a speedy victory. Cannae saw the crushing of Rome's military might (credit for details of battle and poor Roman leadership) but more importantly left her with no effective leadership and dreadful morale at home; she lost 45,500 infantrymen and 2,700 cavalrymen – the heart of her army: Hannibal's failure to understand and act on the moment of critical Roman weakness could be seen as a fatal misjudgement
- conversely Hannibal's army was undefeated, buoyed by their victories, a series of increasingly impressive successes (Ticinus, Trebia and Trasimene each marking a step up in Carthaginian achievement and morale), while the victory at Cannae saw the Carthaginians at their highest point in all respects. It could be seen as a misjudgement to stop at this point
- allowing his men to indulge in their hunger for spoils after Cannae, suggesting that victory was as good as won, allowed them to go off the boil; Hannibal seems to have seen no urgency after Cannae, rejecting Maharbal's advice to strike at once and settling in for a war of attrition; communications in Rome were so bad that the city was wide open for a successful attack without the need for elaborate siege tactics; if Maharbal could see this should Hannibal not have followed his advice in moving on Rome at once?
- by misjudging the Roman character in stopping to demand (but not receiving) the ransom (which would have bought him friends at home and resources for promoting the war with Rome) Hannibal lost support in Carthage; resources from home which might have made the difference in attacking Rome were not forthcoming; also, by the time he received the rejection of his terms Rome was ready to defend herself; it was too late to commit himself to a prolonged siege.

Points for suggesting other factors might include:

- Hannibal had lost many men, animals and equipment in the tough battles fought in 218 and 217; he came to Cannae in a weaker position than the outcome of the battle suggests (victory at Ticinus was mainly due to a strategic Roman withdrawal, Trebia was a victory but accompanied by many losses on the Carthaginian side, Trasimene an even better victory but with 2,500 Carthaginian dead); he needed time to recover - this may appear with hindsight to have been a fatal error but at the time a medium-term victory seemed inevitable
- Hannibal's inexperience in siege warfare (coupled with being far from home in cold and inhospitable territory) was a factor – the risk of losing many men in mounting a full scale siege seemed unnecessary

- once Hannibal had decided not to strike at once, the situation in Rome was quickly restored by Fabius Maximus (credit for detail of Fabius' rallying of the people, actions as Dictator etc.)
- Hannibal on the other hand had no fellow leaders who were his equals (or even good enough to support him properly) for all his great start in Italy
- the distance from Carthage coupled with non-availability of support (moral, financial & strategic) hindered Hannibal's chances of a quick victory; clashes of will in the Carthaginian senate added to this problem; given all this, 'taking Rome' looked more likely if Hannibal was patient, assembled Italian allies and made absolutely sure of victory; this would not have happened by the end of 216, but there was no such deadline; despite his failure to act promptly, Hannibal's tactics still looked likely to deliver Rome; only with hindsight can we see that he was mistaken.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B

05 What tactics did Fabius Maximus use in retaking Tarentum? Give three details.

Three from: A Roman soldier entered the city (1) / pretending to be a deserter (1) / and persuaded the Carthaginian commander (1) / who was in love with the soldier's sister (1) / to betray his garrison (1) / Fabius drew Hannibal away from the city (1) / then besieged the city (1) / with the help of the commander (1) / the Romans scaled the walls (1)

(3 marks)

06 How did Fabius Maximus treat the people of Tarentum and their allies in the days after he had retaken the city? Give two details.

Two from: the Bruttians were put to the sword (1) / many Tarentinians were killed (1) / (30,000) were sold into slavery (1) / the city was sacked (1) / goods (and money) were removed to Rome (1) / (giant) statue of Hercules taken to Rome (1)

(2 marks)

07 In the passage how effectively does Plutarch emphasise that the recapture of Tarentum was a turning-point in the Second Punic War?

Discussion might include: irony of Hannibal's remark 'it seems that..we took it' suggests a continuing degree of self-confidence/arrogance (as seen in Livy's earlier books); his private reservations ('difficult for them to conquer Italy') show a more negative side (although not admitted to his men), while he 'now believed it was impossible' is a attitude of defeatism not seen before but which will become more prevalent (in Livy's later books); tactics of Fabius, treating Hannibal 'like an experienced wrestler' marks a change of view as the Fabian tactics had come in for criticism earlier when Hannibal held the initiative; point that Hannibal's 'grips .. had lost their original force' marks turning point and vindication of Fabius' approach; the fact that the troops had become 'enervated by luxury & plunder' suggests Hannibal's leadership skills in decline; the 'blunting' of his forces 'by incessant campaigning' emphasises his failings and again the success of the Roman long-term strategy; the Tarentum incident could be seen as marking a turning point from defence to attack by Fabius & the Romans.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

08 To what extent does Hannibal’s reference to Fabius Maximus as ‘another Hannibal’ (line 3) seem a fair one? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy and Plutarch which you have read.

You might include discussion of

- **the characters of both men**
- **their leadership qualities**
- **what each actually achieved**
- **the support each received from his country**
- **Hannibal’s possible motives in making this comment.**

Points for discussion **in favour of** seeing Fabius Maximus as ‘another Hannibal’ might include:

- support from Hannibal’s quotation in the passage, implying Fabius was a character as capable as he was in planning and carrying out of the recapture of Tarentum; both men were self-confident (at least in public) and had an absolute conviction that they were right (e.g. Hannibal leading his men over the Alps; Fabius in taking a grip on the shattered city after Cannae); neither was happy to be anything but ‘top dog’ (Hannibal’s reliance on his own views over those of his officers; Fabius’ jealousy of the young Scipio later in the war)
- both men displayed real leadership skills: Hannibal in winning victories over apparently superior enemies (e.g at Cannae), Fabius in taking a strategic view which layed the ground for eventual victory (e.g. his use of delaying tactics after Cannae); both led by personal example, despite each doing so in a quite different way (Hannibal on the battlefield, Fabius in laying out strategy); again leadership similarities supported by Hannibal’s quotation in the passage
- although initially Hannibal may have seemed to be the greater achiever (with more spectacular military successes against the odds) yet Fabius’s achievements were the greater in the sense that his ‘delaying tactics’ (after Cannae) worked, while Hannibal’s similar efforts at this point failed; also in the longer term thanks to Fabius’ initial efforts Rome won the war, Carthage lost
- achieving despite mixed support at home was common to both: Hannibal did not receive supplies/reinforcements at times when they could have been crucial (e.g. after Cannae); inadequacies in his fellow leaders caused many problems (e.g. Hasdrubal: credit for details); likewise divisions in the Senate caused Fabius problems (e.g. support for Minucius), while other leaders challenged his tactics (e.g. Varro at Cannae)
- Hannibal was sufficiently impressed by Fabius that he believed he truly was ‘another Hannibal’.

Points for discussion **against** seeing Fabius Maximus as ‘another Hannibal’ might include:

- their characters were totally different: Hannibal was an aggressor, a taker of risks, a charismatic centre of attention; Fabius was cautious by nature, stern and far from charismatic, often unpopular with his people; a deep thinker rather than a ‘doer’; possibility of heavy irony in Hannibal’s quotation in the passage
- their leadership styles were total opposites: Hannibal led from the front by personal example; without him the army would not have succeeded in battle; he carried his men along on a surge of emotion; a risk taker, his successes were in this mode; Fabius was a thinker, not a fighter; his leadership style was calculating, never impulsive; risks were avoided; his successes came from unemotional long-term planning; he fought (wrongly?) against Scipio’s appointment because he seemed to see Scipio as too Hannibal-like in his approach

- his achievements could not stand up against Hannibal's: Hannibal led an army over impossible terrain, beat superior forces and was never beaten by Fabius; Fabius held Hannibal up by his delaying tactics but, had Scipio not fought off Fabius' resentment and pushed his negative approach aside, Hannibal may well have won the war for Carthage
- Hannibal had general support from home (despite certain problems above) and was acknowledged for better or worse as the top Carthaginian throughout the war; win or lose it was his responsibility. Fabius was supported by some factions at least but only to the point where he came into contention with Scipio; it was Scipio who 'out-Hannibaled' Hannibal and was responsible for his eventual defeat
- Knowing Fabius' stolid reputation (and his out of character behaviour at Tarentum) it was with irony that Hannibal christened him 'another Hannibal'. If there was a Roman Hannibal it was Scipio Africanus.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section Two

Option C

- 09** *How great a contribution to the defeat of Hannibal did Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus make? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy you have read.*

You might include discussion of

- *Scipio's role in Books 21 and 22 of Livy*
- *reasons for Scipio's rise to power from 212 BC*
- *his response to tensions within the Senate*
- *his words and actions in Sicily and Africa in the final years of the war*
- *other factors that contributed to Hannibal's defeat.*

Discussion might include:

Character:

- he saved his father at Ticinus (introduced proudly by Livy); not mentioned at Cannae but praised for character in the aftermath: speech in front of Metellus 'I shall never desert our country ... or permit any other... to leave her in the lurch'; moral e.g. of what was wrong with other leaders in Livy's eyes
- appointed to office young in 212, then following year at age of 24 given command in Spain; great praise of his character by Livy; emphasis on his regard for religious conventions (criticism by Livy of other commanders in this respect); religious observance stressed again (correct sacrifices etc.) after battle of New Carthage; kindness to Numidian hostage after Baecula in 209 stressed good character; modesty emphasized after ejection of Carthaginians from Spain (206); also his balanced view that the war was far from over; elected Consul 205 because of achievements (still very young)
- as consul in 205 he tried to appoint himself commander of Spain and threatened to go outside the Senate for support if necessary (awkward for Livy given character message he is trying to portray, but shows decisive nature); attack by Fabius Maximus demanding he remain and fight Hannibal in Italy; Fabius accused him of arrogance; Scipio made firm speech denying arrogance and promising success; not well received (Senate worried about him getting power through people); eventually won the day by cunning (raising troops as volunteers after being refused more men and using appointment in Sicily as stepping stone to Africa)

- clever in getting Romans substituted for Sicilian cavalry on arrival in Sicily in 205; also in using cunning to get Masinissa on board with Rome; Scipio, accused then of abusing his authority at Locri, fought off Fabius asking for his removal; accused of slackness Scipio responded by proving excellence of his military discipline; persuaded Senate to support imminent invasion of Africa; stress on his religious observances on journey to Africa; sensible enough to heap praises on Masinissa for early successes there; foresaw problems with Syphax after Utica (203) and dealt with firmly (sent to Rome as prisoner); ditto problems over Sophonisba (delicate handling of Masinissa); meeting with Hannibal before Zama (202); speech of Scipio emphasizing qualities of Roman character (and his own), then dismissed Hannibal.

Leadership skills:

- his potential was demonstrated by Livy in speech after Cannae ('come with me instantly ...'); everyone obeyed his command to swear oath of loyalty; Livy carefully introducing both sides of his character ready for the later books
- his early appointments were more through potential than achievement until he took over his command in Spain in 211; battle of New Carthage 210 a turning point for Rome – credit due to Scipio's leadership; sensitive handling of troops in aftermath of battle; good tactics in defeating Hasdrubal at Baecula (one of many great speeches of exhortation to men quoted by Livy); decisive defeat of Hasdrubal in 206 led to expulsion of Carthaginians from Spain (use of extended wings threw enemy forces into disarray)
- by 205 he had brought Syphax on board recognizing need for support in Africa; showed leadership skills in defying Senate over Africa appointment (good speech and clever back down when it appeared he would be defeated); used Sicily appointment as stepping stone
- showed decisive leadership skill when diverting from Sicily to sort out Locri situation; sorted situation out (although caused resentment by upholding Locrian complaints); impressed Senate with display of military excellence at Syracuse; then prepared and led massive invasion force, seizing initiative from Carthage; once there moved quickly, using Masinissa in initial skirmishes; 203 besieged Utica, pretending to agree with Syphax's plan to sue for peace; made truce, then made all-out attack; great Roman victory; occupied Tunis as base for assault on Carthage (fierce sea attack); forced Hannibal to leave Italy to defend his city; tactical success of Scipio at Zama basically settled war; shortly afterwards Carthaginian envoys on order of Roman Senate surrendered to Scipio.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Option D

- 10 How useful are both Livy and Plutarch as sources for the Second Punic War? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy and Plutarch you have read.**

You might include discussion of

- **the date and background of each author**
- **the sources available to each author**
- **the different aims and points of focus of each author**
- **the breadth of coverage by each author.**

Discussion might include:

- neither author was living at a time near the events described: Livy was a Roman writing at the beginning of the Empire in the late 1st C BC, nearly two centuries after the events described; Plutarch was a Greek writing nearly a century later than Livy in a new Rome more detached from the events of the Republic and relatively secure in its Empire
- Livy's section on the Punic Wars was part of a much bigger history of Rome; writing in the time of Augustus he was doing his bit alongside other authors to rebuild Roman self-confidence after a century of civil war; there is no evidence that he had access to contemporary sources but almost certainly used material from Polybius who lived within memory of the events; Plutarch was a philosopher writing biographies of parallel Greek & Roman lives to illustrate qualities of human character; he unashamedly leant heavily on Livy for his source material
- Livy chose to push an essentially pro-Roman agenda; hence the Roman failings tend to focus on their own moral/character defects rather than the superiority of the enemy at that point (although he seems genuinely attracted to the character of Hannibal); as a historian he was at least trying to look at the 'wider picture'; as a biographer Plutarch (without the need for the pro-Roman line) to some extent took an alternative viewpoint focusing on the individual rather than national characteristics; credit throughout for specific examples
- Plutarch's focus is on one character, Fabius Maximus; this creates difficulties in using him as source material for the whole war, in particular the later periods in which Fabius was less central; at the same time we get more detail on Fabius (e.g. his early life) which could be seen as enhancing Livy's more historical overview but how reliable is the source material? Much of the additional information is in the form of anecdotes which fit conveniently into the picture the biographer is seeking to create; we might expect a potential lessening of credit for others who played major parts at this time; credit for examples from the text either arguing for or against these points; Livy, in his use of history as a 'moral lesson' for the nation, was looking at a wider scope but again we must question his likely accuracy given the need to produce a clear message; credit for examples to illustrate either Livy's message or personal characteristics Plutarch is seeking to evoke
- credit throughout for quoting specific examples where Livy differs from Plutarch in fact, emphasis or interpretation; L4/5 credit where candidates offer sensible explanations for such differences or use them as evidence to answer the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2F The Second Punic War

Section 1

Either
Option A

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	2	0	2
02	3	0	3
00	5	5	10
04	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
05	3	0	3
06	2	0	2
07	5	5	10
08	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section Two

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
09	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
010	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

OVERALL

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
TOTAL	30	35	65
%	46%	54%	100%

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion