
AS

Classical Civilisation

CIV2D Athenian Imperialism
Mark scheme

2020
June 2016

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

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 student 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 students after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Students 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 student'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	Demonstrates <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	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 use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	6-8
Level 2	Demonstrates either <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge or <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them.	3-5
Level 1	Demonstrates either <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge or <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	<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. 	19-20
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 and has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	14-18
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. 	9-13
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 sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	5-8
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. 	1-4

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 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 <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	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 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	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. 	13-19
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 writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	7-12
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. 	1-6

This page has been left intentionally blank

Unit CIV2D Athenian Imperialism

Section 1

Option A

0 1 What was the agreed length of the 446 BC ‘truce’ referred to in lines 7 and 14? [1 mark]

30 years (1)

0 2 What criticisms of Sparta did the Corinthians make in their speech that follows the passage? Make two points. [2 marks]

Two from: they accuse them of not listening to their allies (1) / of being ignorant of foreign affairs (1) / of not trusting their allies (1) / of not acting against Athens in time or slow to take action or too cautious or indecisive (1) / of allowing Athens to build up her strength (1) / of treating her allies as badly as Athens treated hers (1) / of pretending to act but not doing so (1) / of not deserving her reputation for being ‘safe and sure’ (1) etc.

0 3 How did the Athenians respond to the Corinthian accusations that they had committed ‘acts of aggression against the Peloponnese’ (line 14)? Make two points. [2 marks]

Two from: refused to defend themselves (1) / but agreed to speak (1) / called the Corinthian points ‘extraordinary attacks’ on Athens (1) / called their own gains ‘reasonable enough’ (1) / reminded everyone how they had saved Greece from the Persians (1) / accused Sparta and Corinth of being little help (1) / said Athens had not taken its empire ‘by force’ or they had done nothing wrong (1) but couldn’t let it go (because of Spartan/Corinthian ill will) (1) / said ‘the weak are always subject to the strong’ (1) / yet Athens has always behaved moderately (1) / threatened that Athens would win if Sparta / Corinth went to war (1) etc.

/

0	4
---	---

In the passage, to what extent does Thucydides show bias in favour of Athens and against Potidaea, Corinth and Aegina?

[10 marks]

Discussion might include: on the surface he seems to be trying to be even-handed: 'both... had grounds ... against each other'; he gives both points of view: he states Corinth's grievance that Athens was besieging Potidaea (in one short clause reporting it only as Corinth's view with no mention of the fact that there were Corinthians within the besieged city); then states at greater length what Corinth had done in Athens' eyes: here guilt on Corinth's part is suggested (she supported rebels, potentially depriving Athens of lawful tribute; she fought 'openly' despite the truce); he suggests Athens was showing restraint ('in spite of this, the truce was still in force'); he then repeats the Corinthians' areas of grievance without making any judgement; the Corinthians' desire for action is shown to be heated ('immediately urged'; 'violently attacked') suggesting she is an aggressor; he reports the Corinthians' claim that Athens had 'broken the truce' and 'committed acts of aggression'; he does not address this directly but moves on to the Corinthians' suggestion that Aegina did not dare to send an envoy to complain 'out of fear of Athens; credit for discussing whether this suggests criticism of Athens or an indirect compliment to her; Aegina's 'fomenting war' 'behind the scenes' may suggest unreasonable aggression and a sneakiness on her part; credit for any sensible interpretations in line with the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

0 5

To what extent was Athens' alleged breaking of the truce of 446 BC (line 14) the main reason for the Debate at Sparta, and to what extent did other factors contribute?

Give reasons for your answer and refer to Book 1 of Thucydides.

You might include discussion of:

- **the terms of the truce made in 446 BC**
- **Pericles' leadership**
- **Athenian colonisation**
- **Athens' relationships with her allies**
- **Athens' relationships with Corinth and Megara**
- **Sparta between 454 and 432 BC.**

[20 marks]

Discussion might include:

- **background to truce:** with Cimon long ostracised the pro-Spartan faction in Athens seemed to have had its day; by 457 Athens and her allies (willing and unwilling) had turned their eyes towards Sparta with the two coming come to blows at Tanagra (over Megara, an ally of Corinth); despite defeat at Tanagra Athens embarked on a series of aggressive policies in the following two years including actions against Spartan allies (mainly in the gulf of Corinth); these were more successful, leaving the Spartans and Corinthians isolated; by 454, with the move of the treasury to Athens and the ending of allied councils the Delian League had effectively become an Empire; a short recall for Cimon saw relationships improve and a return to Athenian anti-Persian activities in Cyprus, but Cimon's death there in 450 left Pericles virtually in uncontested command
- **Pericles' leadership:** much of the aggression above stemmed from Pericles' imperialistic ambitions; with Cimon finally gone he embarked on further expansion of the new 'Empire' as well as withdrawing citizenship from all but those with two Athenian-born parents, and instituting the big rebuilding programme on the Acropolis and elsewhere in the city (using league funds); in 447 he started his colonisation programme (below); in 446 came the need to crack down on unhappy allies (Euboea and Megara in particular) who were rebelling (below); realising the stress on Athenian resources he then sought peace with Sparta; hence the 30 years peace accord is signed (returning Megara to Sparta - making likely further conflict later); Pericles spent the next few years fighting off opposition at home; in 440 further confrontation with Sparta arose over Samos, but the Spartan allies backed down from war allowing Pericles to install a democratic government in Samos; by 436 his Athenian colonisation programme is threatening Potidaea; this issue lead to the Debate at Sparta; students will need to assess how far the actions above constitute 'aggression' and 'breaking the truce' and how far the rival cities (in particular Corinth and Sparta) had their own agendas
- **colonisation:** although not 'aggressive' in the sense of direct attacks on other cities, students may feel that the imposition of cleruchies from 447 BC was a threat to the other (mainly oligarchic) cities in the areas where these were sent; Amphipolis in particular (founded 436 BC) was very close to Potidaea, an ally of Corinth; the existence of a bastion of democracy near one of Corinth's non-democratic allies was a major concern leading in part to the Corinthian demands to Sparta in 432 BC

- **relations with allies:** although initially an internal matter, the loss of previously allied cities could change the balance of power in Greece; hence dramatic interventions by Athens to prevent them from leaving; this had occurred from the early League days (Naxos, Thasos) but seems to have reached a crisis point in the 440s; credit for students who introduce here the inscriptions giving the terms imposed on Erythrai, Khalkis, Miletus etc; points of relevance here may be the perceived threat to Sparta and Corinth of the establishment of democratic councils, sometimes quite near them; also the effect on the balance of power as cities willing to move into alliance with Sparta were kept 'loyal' to Athens; also the financial effect: allies equalled resources (financial or military)
- **Megara / Corinth:** (see also above): there was constant stress throughout the period between Athens and Corinth over the status of Megara; its situation by the isthmus separating Athens from Corinth and its status as one of the strongest allies in the wars against Persia made it a strategic target for both Athens and Sparta; Megara's defection from the Spartan alliance to the Delian League in 460 led to war, through Corinth's fear of the threat posed to it by a pro-Athenian Megara; in 446 Megara (among others) rebelled against Athens; although the rebellion was put down by Pericles, the return of Megara to the Spartan alliance was accepted reluctantly by Athens in the terms of the peace of 446 (above); things settled for a number of years, but in 434 Pericles introduced the Megarian Decree: for 'violation of sacred land' Megarian traders were banned from trading within the Athenian Empire; this choked the Megarian economy; clearly this upset Corinth, the close ally of Megara, especially as in the previous year Potidaea, another (oligarchic) ally of Corinth, had been threatened by the new (democratic) colony (Amphipolis) set up by Pericles (above); students need to assess to what extent the behaviour of Athens towards Corinthian interests constituted 'aggression' and to what extent it was simply a response to threats to her own democratic ideals
- **Sparta:** (see also above): Sparta is a recurring thread throughout the above; the First Peloponnesian War (460-446) pitted her directly against Athens: the Second Peloponnesian War followed in 431: students may want to assess to what degree this was caused by 'Athenian aggression' and how much by Spartan aggression in fear following the weakening of its own alliances; the peace terms of 446 seemed to reflect an anxiety by Athens to avoid unnecessary conflict; however Pericles' continuing placing of cleruchies (some as an apparent challenge to the oligarchic powers allied to Sparta) may be seen as positive evidence that the essay quotation is at least to a degree, a fair one; the military defeat of Corinth over Potidaea was clearly a key event to the calling of the Debate at Sparta; Sparta's reluctance to declare war here even after the pleas from Corinth and others might be taken as evidence that it was Athens' belligerence that left Sparta with little alternative but to fight.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

Option B**0 6**

What reasons did the Melians give for their refusal to accept the Athenian demand that they should give in? Make three points

[3 marks]

Three from: they won't give up their liberty (1) / which has never been taken from them (1) / throughout their 700 year history (1) / they trust in help from their gods (1) / and their Spartan allies (1) / but repeat their offer of a treaty (1) / of neutrality (1) / to be agreed by both sides (1)

0 7

What was the immediate Athenian response to this refusal by the Melians? Make two points.

[2 marks]

Two from: they show surprise at the Melians' self-confidence (1) / say they are 'deluded' to rely on Sparta (1) / built a wall round the city (1)

0 8

How effectively does Thucydides create an atmosphere of threat towards the Melians in the passage?

[10 marks]

Discussion might include: the Athenians make it clear that Melian attempts to frighten them will not work – they won't be 'despondent' even if their empire should end; they mention Sparta (allies of the Melians) only to dismiss them as unworthy of consideration ('not that we are concerned ..'); Athens may feel under threat from her own allies but the Melians can 'leave us to face the risks ..'; then they state the situation as they see it: the Athenians have come to Melos 'for the good of our own empire'; the Melians need to worry about 'the preservation of your city' (a direct threat); they take it for granted that Melos will be brought 'into our empire' and warn them 'we do not want any trouble'; 'we want to you to be spared' makes it clear this will be Athens' choice, not Melos'; they talk of the good of both parties, suggesting perhaps that it will be a nuisance if Athens has to waste resources destroying Melos; when the Melians fight back indignantly asking how being enslaved would be good for Melians, the Athenian reply is grimly understated (black humour): it is the only way for Melos to avoid 'disaster' (and it would give Athens a nice profit); the Melians still persist in demanding the opportunity to remain neutral, but they are failing to fully understand that the Athenians are not in the mood for any two-way dialogue.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

0 9

‘The Athenians were harsher in both words and deeds to the Melians than to the Mytilenians.’

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Thucydides you have read.

You might include discussion of:

- **the political background to the incidents involving Melos and Mytilene**
- **Cleon’s speech at the Mytilenian Debate**
- **Diodotus’ speech at the Mytilenian Debate**
- **the rest of the Melian Dialogue**
- **the Athenian actions after these two events.**

[20 marks]

Discussion might include:

- **general:** the best responses to this question will link the ‘political background’ with the tone adopted by each speech; then the tone of the speech will be set against the actions taken against the other party; simple retellings of the speeches will not gain higher level marks; credit for querying whether these are genuine verbatim reports of speeches if discussed with relevance to the question and / or taking an historiographical slant to the question
- **Cleon: background:** the earlier of the extracts from 427 BC; Mytilene was a long-standing ally of Athens but there were tensions: ruled by an oligarchy (as opposed to Athens’ democracy) she had sought to move into alliance with Sparta before the Peloponnesian War; also she was a non-tribute-paying ally; Sparta refused this not wanting to upset Athens; then three years into the war, with things going badly for Athens (partly due to plague) Mytilene saw its chance to approach Sparta again, offering to join an invasion of Attica; Sparta agreed to these overtures forcing Athens to ‘defend itself’ by subduing Mytilene; prisoners were sent to Athens where the people were angry in particular that a non-tribute-paying ally had rebelled (and worried about the example this would set), so sent orders to the Athenian General (Paches) on the island to execute all Mytilenian males and enslave the women and children. Some felt this too harsh and a meeting was summoned the next day at which Cleon put his views to a wavering home audience: **speech:** could be seen as very harsh indeed; he represents the views espoused on the previous day and refers to all Mytilenians as ‘the guilty party’; he says (at length) that the Athenians have become ‘regular speech-goers’ whose inaction will cost them dear if they dither; ‘no single city’ has damaged Athens as much as Mytilene has; they were treated ‘with the greatest consideration’, but then acted with ‘calculated aggression’; Athens had tolerated their arrogance for too long; now let them all suffer ‘the punishment their crime deserves’; he concedes that some of the ‘ordinary people’ ‘might have come over to us’, but points out that they preferred to join ‘the aristocracy’ in their revolt; he is lecturing his fellow Athenians to this point, then warns them: if such arrogance goes unpunished, all the other allies ‘will revolt .. upon the slightest pretext’; he claims that ‘to feel pity ..’ is ‘entirely against the interests of an imperial power’; if you show weakness here you may as well ‘surrender your empire’; the original decision should stand. Students may see some similarities in tone to the Melian Dialogue and discuss: how much of Cleon’s anger is aimed at his own people? How much of his ‘harshness’ towards the Mytilenians is in the actions he proposes and how much in the actual words he uses to condemn them?

- **Diodotus: background:** as above; **speech:** as Diodotus is on the other side of the argument, students may instinctively feel his words are less harsh; he speaks of the original decision as being taken in 'haste'; he criticises (again at some length) Cleon's criticism of 'too much talk' – as long as there is 'fair argument' on both sides; their 'emotional attachment' to the previous day's heated talk has led them 'into disaster'; he is less interested in whether the Mytilenians are 'the most guilty people in the world' than in whether the decision is right for Athens; he agrees deterrence is the key, but urges them not to be swayed by 'angry feelings' but by 'how Mytilene can be most useful to Athens'; laws are broken despite the existence of the death penalty; given peoples' natural 'hopes and desires' they will still rebel; if they see annihilation as the likely result they will fight to the end; that is where Cleon is leading you; on the other hand if you 'take tremendous care' of other peoples, they may not rebel; if they still do so, 'hold as few as possible .. responsible'; he finishes with a plea not to punish democrats who are potential allies in a hostile world; credit students who examine these and similar sentiments in line with the title (possibly seeing Diodotus as supporting the quotation while Cleon tends to disprove it); **actions:** despite the harshness of Cleon's words, Diodotus' more measured views won the day: the message to 'kill all' was rescinded (by a tiny majority); the rebellion's 1000 plus ringleaders (who had been sent to Athens) were executed; the rest were spared; their fortifications were destroyed; their navy was confiscated; Athenians were settled on the land; the Mytilenians lost their independence becoming subjects of Athens
- **Melian Dialogue: background:** this takes place fifteen years into the Peloponnesian War in 416 BC; things had now come to a head between Athens and Sparta; following the peace from 422-420, war has restarted; the protracted stalemate was making Athens' allies restless and they looked with envious eyes at the few 'free' island states such as Melos (actually a long-standing Spartan ally but desperately trying to stay neutral in the war); students may see Athens' remorseless refusal to listen to the Melian pleas in this light: they are eager to keep their allies in line at any cost to 'innocent' neutrals. **speech:** is the tone 'harsh' (in the way that, say, Cleon's is)? Or is one of the grim things about it, the impersonal, rather matter-of-fact way in which the harshest of possible outcomes are put forward? Speaking only to the Melian governing body who started by saying they did not believe the Athenians would listen to them, the Athenians at once made it clear they weren't there for a discussion, just to name terms; don't bother telling us 'you have never done us any harm'; we advise you to accept our terms as 'the strong do what they have the power to do' (all said very calmly, but with underlying menace?); warned by the Melians that the Athenian Empire may one day fall, they reply 'leave it to us to face that'; 'we don't want any trouble from you'; 'by giving in you would save yourselves from disaster' (again talking calmly as if adults talking to children); in reply to a Melian plea to be allowed to stay neutral, the Athenians give a simple 'no', then explain that their allies would see this as a sign of weakness; to the Melian complaint that that is unfair, they bluntly admit that strength is the key, not fairness; to the Melians trying to argue that cruelty to one neutral state will turn others against Athens, the Athenians simply reply that they can wait their turn; they then warn the Melians that there will be no 'fair fight' if they resist and tell them to be sensible (there is no detectable change in tone; again, just calm statements of fact); advised against 'hope, that comforter in danger'; to the Melians claiming their trust in their gods (and Spartan allies) will keep them safe, the Athenians warn that this is folly; after a further Melian insistence that the Spartans will save them, the Athenians admit 'it is a possibility' but insist they are offering 'reasonable terms' and urge them 'think it over' leaving the decision to the Melians (employing the same unemotional approach even at the very end); **actions:**

in contrast to the measured words the actions were brutal; once the Melians tried and failed to break the Athenian blockade, the Athenians killed all adult males, enslaved all women and children and repopulated the city with Athenians.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

Section 2

Option C

1 0

Pericles said of the Athenian Empire, 'It may have been wrong to take it.'

To what extent do Athenian actions between 479 and 454 BC support Pericles' comment?

Give reasons for your answer and refer to Book 1 of Thucydides.

You might include discussion of:

- the reasons for setting up the Delian League
- the choice of Athens as leader of the League
- the original terms of the Delian League
- Eion, Scyros and Carystus
- Athens' response to allies' attempts to leave the League
- Eurymedon
- relationships with Sparta
- the Egyptian campaign and its aftermath.

[30 marks]

Discussion might include:

- **general:** credit for students who address the meaning of 'wrong': does Pericles mean 'morally wrong'? Does he believe the Athenians miscalculated? etc.
- **reasons for / terms of the League:** there is no suggestion that the cities who came together to form the Delian League thought they were joining an Athenian Empire; it is not so clear concerning Athenian ambitions: the battle of Plataea in 479 BC saw the Persians forced to retreat from mainland Greece, but not necessarily on a permanent basis; the Persian defeat had only been achieved by the Greek states acting as a unit, with the Athenian navy and Spartan army as key components; the cities therefore looked to Athens and Sparta for their future defence in forming the Delian League; at first Athens, whose city was in ruins, was happy to see Spartan leadership of the League, while she rebuilt her city; the Spartans accepted leadership; they and the other allies however were alarmed by the rapid growth of Athens and sent ambassadors to ask her to desist; they were sent packing; the League continued under the Spartan general Pausanias
- **Athens as leader:** despite the allies' fears of Athenian ambition (above), when Pausanias treated them arrogantly (especially those who were natural allies of Athens), they had him removed; students may see the fact that the allies then approached Athens to become leader as important in assessing whether this was the beginning of Athens actions and intentions being 'wrong' (as in the title); clearly there was internal friction within the League (Thucydides tells us all agreed 'except for the soldiers from the Peloponnese'); Athens must have been aware of the friction with Sparta when accepting the offer to become leader
- **early actions:** Eion was retaken from the Persians by the League under Cimon in about 476, enslaving the inhabitants; there seems nothing here to suggest imperial motivation on Athens part; similarly the League attack on **Scyros**, despite there being no Persian involvement, was necessary as Dolopian 'pirates' based there were threatening the trade of all allies; the island of **Carystos** had sided with Persia: the League attacked it (in the 470s?) and forced it to join – the first example of this happening, so worthy of consideration from both angles of the question; do the three actions represent a gradual change in Athenian intentions?

- **early rebellions:** can a difference be drawn between Naxos and Thasos? Naxos tried to leave the League between 469-467 while the Persian threat level remained high; the league (mainly Athens) forced **Naxos** into submission: possibly allowing members to withdraw at this point would have increased the likelihood of a Persian return; or is this the beginning of Empire (it may be worth considering Pericles' judgement on the Empire in his follow-up to the quotation in the title that it would be 'dangerous to let it go')? Or does Thasos in 465 fit this better (as Eurymedon came between the two revolts – see below)? Students might discuss whether the Thasian issue was really a League matter – the Persians were a much lesser threat and the main reason for Athenian aggression against **Thasos** was over mining rights; Thasos was one of the largest League contributors and it took a three year siege to bring her to heel; Athens took over the mine and Thasos restarted their tribute; the 'solidarity of the League' argument may still hold, but is the balance changing (Thucydides comments after the events up to Naxos that 'it was the allies themselves who were to blame' for any issues; he does not repeat this after Thasos)? Does the near-involvement of Sparta at this point also mark a change in Athenian intentions?
- **Eurymedon:** this may be seen as particularly important in the context of this question (see paragraph above) for marking the end (for a significant period) of the Persian threat to Greek territory; victory for the League (under the pro-League and pro-Spartan Cimon before his overthrow) effectively cleared the coast of Asia Minor from the Persian threat; the real evidence of growing Athenian ambition here was the use of the spoils for rebuilding and strengthening Athens rather than for League purposes; taken with Thasos this may reflect at least a hardening of the Athenian position
- **Sparta:** ever since the recall of Pausanias (above) Sparta had retreated into itself; it only failed to support Thasos because of internal problems; while Cimon was prominent, Sparta did not fear Athens (even asking the Athenians for help in Ithome), but their perceptions after Thasos (and fear of the strength shown by Athens at Ithome which led to them sending the Athenian forces home) caused a dispute; the move of Megara from alliance with Sparta to join the Delian League led to great concern in Corinth and other Spartan allies; the two great powers now saw each other as a real threat; students may argue that with Athens building their long walls at this point, the League has effectively become an Empire (for good or ill)
- **Egyptian Campaign:** on the surface, Athens could justify the League's continuing existence because of the Persian elements here; however, did the poor League performance here (defeated on land and forced to retreat at sea) give Athens an excuse for finally pulling the plug on the League? Did Persian requests for Spartan help (although eventually turned down) further fuel Athens' desire to hold on to her Empire, knowing a conflict was close? Students may support such an argument by reference to the Athens' speedy dismantling of the League meetings etc after Egypt; the moving of the treasury to Athens may be seen as the final evidence that Athens has taken an Empire by stealth; students will need to assess how right or wrong they were to do so.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

Option D

1	1
---	---

‘The inscriptions in ‘The Athenian Empire’ show Athens struggling to retain her empire while attempting to be fair to her allies.’

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the extracts from ‘The Athenian Empire’ you have read.

You might include discussion of:

- **arrangements for Khalkis**
- **the Kleinias Decree**
- **the Coinage Decree**
- **Erythrai**
- **Miletos**
- **Kolophon.**

[30 marks]

Discussion might include:

- **general:** this offers students an opportunity to look at the inscriptions both from the Athenian point of view and from that of the allies; the best essays will try to strike a balance between the two; credit too for those showing a general appreciation of events of the period, even though some of the dates here are conjectural
- **Khalkis:** thought to date from 446 BC: Khalkis was chief town of the island of Euboea; traditionally hostile to Athens (Athens expelled her ruling aristocracy in the 6th century BC) she had been forced into the Delian League; after the move of the treasury (454) and other imperialistic moves by Athens, Khalkis was a likely potential rebel; the Athenian democratic system was still under threat in the 440s; hence a perceived need on her part to put down rebellions in a strong enough way not just to keep the rebel city quiet but to encourage others not to rebel; seen in that light this decree might seem a reasonably two-sided settlement: for the Khalkians Athens won't: 'uproot their city'; 'expel Khalkidians'; 'deprive (them) of civil rights' plus a further list; on the other hand the Khalkidians must swear: 'not to revolt from the people of Athens' (no mention of the allies); not to 'obey anyone who revolts'; 'to be the best and fairest ally' etc; only failing to keep to the oath would lead to more drastic consequences; it also guaranteed that foreigners living in Khalkis should pay taxes to Khalkis; finally the oath was to be displayed publicly in both cities – although both paid for by Khalkis; plenty of material here to discuss in line with the title
- **Kleinias Decree:** this apparently dates from about the same time as Khalkis above (possibly 447 BC?); following the end of the Persian conflict (the ostensible reason for the Delian League) against that background it would perhaps not be surprising if the allies were questioning the need to continue paying tribute; the need for such a Decree suggests that Athens was having difficulties in collecting it; she passed the Decree to tighten up the whole process: to help the allies, it provided a system of detailed receipts when they paid their tribute; the tribute would be sealed with identification tokens before dispatch so there could be no or underhand business en route or at the Athenian end; a 1000 drachma fine for defaulters would make it likelier that the funds needed to keep the alliance in operation would forthcoming (fair to all); Athens was to act as 'policeman' by appointing four men to chase any offenders, with a guaranteed 'right of appeal' for alleged offenders; on the other hand the decree was imposed without consultation and it seems likely that much of the income was by now being used by Athens for her own purposes

- **Coinage Decree:** again there are doubts over dating but the general consensus puts this at about the same time as the other two decrees above; trade must have been difficult given the number of cities in the alliance, each with its own currency (the values of which could have varied considerably through political and other problems); lack of a standard system of weights and measures would also have been a problem; seen in this light the Athenian decision to make all allied partners adopt the Athenian silver coinage system, and Athenian weights and measures, looks fair to all; an exchange system was set up to ensure equal treatment for all; details were to be publicly displayed in all cities and heralds were sent to brief each member; again all would be protected from cheating by comprehensive records of all transactions; however refusal to cooperate would lead to large fines and, as above, there was no debate, simply an imposed system; according to Hadji and Contes, 'the decree is not a product of secure Athenian imperialism but rather an indication of the uncertain political and financial circumstances of the Athenian state
- **Erythrai:** this was a distant (and relatively small) ally based in Asia Minor; it is believed to have rebelled in 453 BC (about seven years before Khalkis) and the inscription is probably from that time; students may find significance in the way a rebel was treated in 453 as opposed to one seven years later; certainly any apparent 'fairness' to Khalkis is not mirrored here: to 'help' them become democratic a council overseen by an Athenian garrison was imposed; the usual oath of loyalty was demanded: similar promises to Kolophon: 'I will not revolt ... from... Athens, nor from the allies (not mentioned at Khalkis)'; 'I will not receive any of the exiles' etc); here severe punishments are promised to oath-breakers ('destruction on themselves .. and on their children'); possibly relevant to the harshness of the threats is Erythrai's geographical proximity to Persia; if this is an earlier revolt the Athenians may have been more scared of the Persians than by 446; only the Erythrai Decree of these inscriptions refers directly to Persia forbidding Erythraians from having anything to do with 'those who flee to the Persians'
- **Miletus:** this possibly dates from 450 BC; if so it is halfway between Khalkis and Erythrai; despite its fragmentary nature it is clear again that an Athenian garrison had to be set up; no tribute was recorded as being paid in 450 so it may be conjectured that Athens is trying to lessen its own democratic isolation by forcing a democratic council here (as at Erythrai); presumably after a rebellion that required force to put it down
- **Kolophon:** could be any time 450-446 BC when records show tribute was not paid (and only half as much thereafter); rather a mix of the others in tone: 'may I be destroyed, myself and my family ...' (as at Erythrai); 'I will not revolt from the Athenian people' (no mention of allies); 'I will love the Athenian people' goes a shade further than the others, but in general Kolophon is more likely to be used to corroborate points made earlier, rather than provide any fresh lines of argument.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

Assessment Objectives Grid**Unit CIV2D Athenian Imperialism****Section 1****Either
Option A**

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	1	0	1
02	2	0	2
03	2	0	2
04	5	5	10
05	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

**or
Option B**

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
06	3	0	3
07	2	0	2
08	5	5	10
09	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section 2**Either
Option C**

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
10	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

**or
Option D**

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
11	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Overall

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