

# A-LEVEL CLASSICAL CIVILISATION

CIV2F The Second Punic War  
Mark scheme

---

2020  
June 2014

---

Version/Stage : 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](http://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

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

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question</li> <li>• coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question</li> <li>• ability to sustain an argument which                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,</li> <li>responds to the precise terms of the question,</li> <li>effectively links comment to detail,</li> <li>has a clear structure</li> <li>reaches a reasoned conclusion</li> <li>is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and</li> <li>makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>19-20</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question</li> <li>• understanding of many of the central aspects of the question</li> <li>• ability to develop an argument which                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus,</li> <li>is broadly appropriate to the question,</li> <li>mainly supports comment with detail and</li> <li>has a discernible structure</li> <li>is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and</li> <li>generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>14-18</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li> <li>• some understanding of some aspects of the question</li> <li>• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question</li> <li>• some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar</li> <li>• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li> </ul>	<b>9-13</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>either</b> a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li> <li>• <b>or</b> some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them</li> <li>• <b>and</b> sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>5-8</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>either</b> some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li> <li>• <b>or</b> an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it</li> <li>• <b>and</b> little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>1-4</b>

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

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

**This page has been left intentionally blank**

## Unit 2F The Second Punic War

### Section 1

#### Option A

- 01 Describe how Flaminius, the Roman commander at Lake Trasimene, was killed. Make two points.**

After three ('long and bloody') hours fighting around him (1) / as he held his ground bravely (1) / an enemy soldier (1) / a Celt (1) called Ducarius (1) / on horseback (1) / recognized Flaminius (1) / galloped up to him (1) / killing Flaminius' armour bearer (1) / then Flaminius with a lance (1).

*(2 marks)*

- 02 What did Fabius Maximus do after the defeat at Lake Trasimene? Make three points.**

**Three from:**

Used his appointment as Dictator (1) / to try to get the gods on board (1) / by ordering reading of (Sybilline) books (1) / leading to putting on great games (1) / and public prayers (1); practical measures included: increased guards on walls (1) / held big debate in senate (1) on rebuilding army (1) / added 2 new legions (1) / moved vulnerable people to fortified towns (1) / organized 'strewing of couches' (1) / ordered destruction of buildings and crops which might help Hannibal (1) / started campaign of 'delaying tactics' (1).

*(3 marks)*

- 03 How successfully in the passage does Livy portray the effect of the battle on the Roman troops?**

**Discussion might include:**

shows (atypical) 'chaos' in Roman army by referring to the 2 key disciplines which were lost (recognizing standard and keeping place in ranks); use of 'bemused' with illustration (again a basic: ability to handle weapons; suggestion that these were 'not a defence but a **fatal** encumbrance); turns to the chaotic sounds of battle (strong words – 'groans', 'thud', 'ring', 'shout', etc.); focuses on two points of the battlefield ('some' ... 'others'), chaos in both places with Romans either getting in each others' ways or being mixed up with runaways; suddenly a simple sentence of summation: 'in every ... failed'; explains more calmly the geographical difficulties ('the mountains .. the lake ..') before returning to the main hazard, the enemy; change of emphasis after 'when, at last ..': away from Roman ideal of teamwork to every man for himself (no man now waited ... each became ... dependent on his own efforts') implying that leadership has now disappeared leaving ordinary soldiers to react for themselves; contrast of 'familiar tactics', 'disposition of forces', 'legion, cohort', etc. all gone, leaving only 'the spirit in each breast' to face the foe.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(10 marks)*



**04 To what extent do you think the Roman leaders in the battles at the River Ticinus, River Trebia, Lake Trasimene and Cannae were responsible for their own defeats?**

**Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy you have read.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **Cornelius Scipio, Sempronius, Flaminius, Paullus and Varro**
- **decisions of the Roman Senate**
- **the Carthaginian leadership and tactics**
- **religion and superstition.**

*Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:*

- *Roman leadership: **Ticinus:** Hannibal had just arrived from crossing the Alps; the Consul Cornelius Scipio had previously arrived too late in France to stop Hannibal leading but moved quickly to return to Northern Italy to cut him off early; unfortunately he had to leave most troops in Spain under his brother to keep province secure; he waited (with 'inexperienced' and 'bewildered' troops) until Hannibal arrived weary from the journey; good rallying speech from Cornelius Scipio before battle; Scipio moved first to bridge river, then set up position close to Hannibal's men; Carthaginians in good heart (promised gifts); Romans subdued (bad omens); Scipio set up men with best troops behind spearmen; inexperienced spearmen broke and ran; equal struggle between cavalries until Romans were attacked from rear; cavalry managed to retreat safely; spearmen routed; Cornelius Scipio wounded but saved by son; Scipio unfortunate with troops; did little wrong but outmanoeuvred; **Trebia:** Cornelius Scipio remained in charge awaiting his fellow consul Sempronius (recalled from Spain); debilitated by wound he took up defensive position; Sempronius arrived in time so full Roman force available for first time; disagreement: Scipio urged caution, Sempronius action; Scipio dismissed offer of Gallic help, but Sempronius sent men to aid them; they were successful in seeing off large number of Carthaginian raiders; Consuls kept arguing but headstrong Sempronius (buoyed by attack on raiders) won the day; set off with all cavalry into trap laid by Hannibal; fell for it, crossed river to be faced by main Carthaginian force; some 38,000 Romans faced about 18,000 Carthaginians (plus some heavier cavalry); tired and frightened by elephants, Romans fought on but were then attacked from rear again; Romans fled to river, chased so far but allowed to escape with considerable losses; main failing here: split leadership; headstrong Sempronius; (**Placentia:** credit for relating this Roman victory to title; brief skirmish where Romans did better; Hannibal was seeking to attack under surprise of night but Sempronius arrived in time and fought open battle from which Carthaginians retreated defeated); **Trasimene:** Consul Flaminius set out for battle in disgrace with Senate; couldn't wait to attack; enticed by Hannibal's display of aggression into marching to Lake Trasimene; walked straight into trap; without reconnaissance entered narrow pass; attacked from all sides; general panic (as per passage); Romans fought bravely around Flaminius until he was killed; total disaster (15,000 dead); **Cannae:** again disunity between Roman leaders (Varro headstrong; all for action now; Paullus more restrained but gave way to Varro); latter fell into another Carthaginian trap (apparently deserted camp); Varro nearly fell for it; followed Hannibal to Cannae where drawn to battle on unsuitable ground; Paullus wounded early on; fell for Hannibal's ruse yet again; pushed forward through centre only for African troops to hit them from both sides; further Carthaginian troops (pretend deserters) came up from behind and battle was lost (nearly 50,000 Roman dead)*

- *Senate*: **Ticinus**: did nothing obvious wrong but were far from action; dependent on their Consul; they had acted quickly to send Cornelius Scipio to France with 60 warships but then had only a watching brief; **Trebia**: quick to recall Sempronius and get him to Trebia in time; unable to influence battle beyond that; failing of the 2 Consul rule rather than the Senate itself?; **Trasimene**: because of system, 2 new consuls in charge before Trasimene (so little continuity); Flaminius set himself above Senate; urged him not to rush into fight (bad omens); recalled him when he refused, but he ignored them; not really their fault but lack of authority contributing factor; **Cannae**: sensibly appointed Fabius Dictator in advance of battle; his delaying tactics slowed Hannibal's progress but quarrels arose and he fell out of favour; joint command with belligerent Minucius was a distraction; new Consul Varro gained popularity by threatening aggression against Hannibal; at odds with his colleague, Paullus; again lack of insight, cohesion and authority from Senate
- *Carthaginians*: **Ticinus**: although Carthaginians tired from journey, Hannibal roused them with great speech and promise of land, freedom, etc.; took advantage of Roman lull (bad omens) and struck first; fortunate that Roman spearmen put up no fight, but fooled Cornelius Scipio by trademark use of crack Numidian cavalry to get behind opposition; even so, no rout here; **Trebia**: Hannibal nearly in trouble as offended Gallic allies who tried to join Rome; caused him some problems and losses; however took advantage of dispute between Roman leaders to provoke an early fight; sent Mago over river to set trap; having lured Romans back over river (freezing conditions) Hannibal's warm and rested main force attacked with success; using Mago's men from rear against the smaller Carthaginian force put Romans to flight; (**Placentia**: open fight lost by Carthaginians when Hannibal wounded - indication of his importance to question as well as Roman shortcomings); **Trasimene**: Hannibal had it easy; just had to provoke headstrong Flaminius by roughing up area round Trasimene, lure him into narrow valley, place men strategically and wait; his plan worked perfectly; **Cannae**: when plan to lure Romans into empty camp failed, Hannibal moved to Cannae; position suitable for cavalry (his strength); set up army so centre would give way, allowing Roman advance which could then be outflanked; totally successful strategy; again won stunning victory although greatly outnumbered; once more utilised disagreement between Roman leaders to his advantage
- *Religion / superstition*: **Ticinus**: regular problem with Roman troops according to Livy; Romans failed to seize advantage after crossing river because of wolf in camp, bees on tree and other apparent omens; **Trebia**: no mention of superstition here; just Roman leadership problem and skill of Hannibal; **Trasimene**: great deal of time between Trebia and Trasimene spent purifying Rome after further negative omens (baby talking, wolves with swords etc.); new Consul Flaminius suspected these would cause delay so absented himself (to public disapproval) as he was spoiling for a fight; lots of evil omens as Flaminius approached battle; **Cannae**: lots of praying, religious games etc in preparation for Cannae (possibly more than proper planning?); more bad omens on eve of battle.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

---

**Option B**

**05 What actions had Scipio taken against the Locrians before he left Pleminius in charge? Make two points.**

**Two from:**

sailed to Locri from Messana (1) / severely reprimanded the Locrians for their defection (1) / executed the leaders (of the revolt) (1) / took their property away (1) / gave it to the opposition (1) / ordered the Locrians to send an embassy (1) / to the Roman Senate (1) / to decide their fate (1).

*(2 marks)*

**06 What did Scipio and Pleminius subsequently do to the tribunes? Make three points.**

**One or two from:**

Scipio judged them guilty (1) / and had them arrested (1) **and one or two from:** / Pleminius became furious (1) / had the tribunes dragged to him (1) / tortured (1) / killed (1) / and left unburied (1).

*(3 marks)*

**07 In the passage, how successfully does Livy build up the drama?**

**Discussion might include:**

straight description of the incident to start with, followed by gradual crescendo of response (3 points: tribunes' reaction (controlled) leading to 'loud and angry abuse' (verbal confrontation), then 'pitched battle' (physical); detail of how the incident continued to grow ('the crowd in the street ...or the other'); strong images of the damage suffered ('howling ...'; 'ran to show ... bleeding wounds'; 'horrible insults hurled ...'; 'rushed .. in a flaming rage') leading to action by Pleminius ('called for .. ordered ...' with suggestion this was instinctive rather than considered ('flaming rage'); contrast of mood between tribunes ('resisted' ... 'begged') and soldiers ('flushed with victory' .. 'running up'); also grim contrast between soldiers' standard behaviour ('as if in answer to a call against an enemy') and what they did here ('in mad and uncontrollable rage' attacked the lictors 'in a shameful manner" and without 'ordinary decency' attacked 'their commanding officer); clearly Livy is not concerned with the rights and wrongs of Pleminius' behaviour, only with the non-soldierly behaviour of the men; finishes with graphic account of Pleminius' wounds ('slashed ... about the body'; 'left ... half dead'; 'nose and ears mutilated').

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(10 marks)*

**08 How important a factor in Rome's victory over Carthage were changes in the Senate's attitude towards Publius Cornelius Scipio?**

Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy and Plutarch you have read.

You might include discussion of:

- the Senate's attitude to Scipio up to his attaining the consulship in 205 BC
- debates in the Senate concerning the expedition to Sicily and Africa
- Scipio's actions in Sicily and Africa
- the Carthaginian response to Scipio's actions.

*Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:*

- *up to 205 BC:* (had gained early fame for saving father at Ticinus); successes in Spain (taking over army in 211 after death of father / brother) turned him into national hero (although had not faced Hannibal there); elected Consul in 205 despite age (31) on return home; early support clear from under-age election as Consul but at this point the Fabian delaying tactics were still the prime tactic in Italy; credit for discussing these in line with title
- *proposals for Sicily / Africa:* Scipio came up with idea of pouring troops into Africa to move the scene of the war away from Italy **but** problems with Fabius and supporters in Senate. Fabius' policy of containment had been generally successful for last 10 years; credit for detail from Plutarch re the quarrels in 205: initially Fabius made speeches arguing against African campaign; critical of Scipio as 'hot-headed young man'; Senate voted with Fabius; they also agreed not to award Scipio funds for raising army but sent him to Sicily instead; he appealed to supporters within and outside Senate to support African plan; raised 30 warships / 7000 soldiers, causing Fabius to step up opposition; he persuaded Senate not to let young Romans join army (apart from the 300 Scipio paid for); Scipio got on with creating formidable army in Sicily, key issue re Senate followed; they sent enquiry team to check out his army; he passed with flying colours and requested Senate to let him move to Africa; again Fabius and supporters stood against; Senate agreed to let him go **but** no money or extra men; after Scipio's initial successes in Africa Fabius' last stand was to demand his recall: Senate this time supported Scipio; Fabius died soon after; Scipio returned from Africa briefly in 203 re possible peace terms; given ringing endorsement by Senate; despite occasional squabbles (Consul Caepio sought credit for Scipio's work in 203; Consuls in 202 tried to persuade Senate they should take over in Africa, etc.) Senate supportive up to Zama; arguments then in Senate re peace terms: eventually voted for Scipio to impose whatever he decided
- *Scipio's actions:* **Sicily:** turned island into training camp (policy of sending failed soldiers – e.g. from Cannae – there as punishment to Rome's advantage); also had Marcellus' soldiers available; gained cavalry by allowing Sicilian nobles either to fight or buy horse; then requested permission to sail to Africa; granted (but with strings – above); **Africa:** sailed 204 landing at Utica; came up against former Roman ally Syphax who Carthage had won over; took until 203 to see Syphax off (by 'brilliant' stealth attack on his camp – up to 40,000 Numidians killed and Syphax eventually captured); Masinissa now vital local ally; well handled by Scipio; Carthage tried suing for peace; Scipio (not Senate) offered reasonable terms, but Hannibal returned to Africa for last fling; Scipio used his own pincer tactics to defeat him at Zama (202); conflict between Scipio and some in Roman Senate re peace terms; Scipio won the argument (possibly setting seeds for 3<sup>rd</sup> Punic War by being soft); sorted it all out then returned to Rome in triumph

- *Carthage*: during Scipio's ascendancy Carthage was shadow of former self; Scipio's work in Spain had seen to this, as well as Fabius' gradual wearing down of Hannibal and his army in Italy; despite early resistance to Scipio from Syphax, by time of recall of Hannibal Carthage seemed resigned to defeat; Zama was really a foregone conclusion (at least with hindsight); rather like early years in reverse; Scipio did great things (as Hannibal earlier) but weaknesses in the opposition helped significantly.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

## Section 2

### Option C

#### 09 To what extent does Livy portray Hannibal as a role model for Romans?

Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy you have read.

You might include discussion of:

- **Livy's reasons for writing his history**
- **his description of Hannibal's early career**
- **his description of the journey to Italy and early battles there**
- **the struggle between Hannibal and Fabius Maximus**
- **the meeting between Hannibal and Scipio Africanus and the battle that followed.**

*Points to consider might include the following:*

- *Livy*: a Roman citizen of the late 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC writing about two centuries after the events he is describing; is a supporter of Augustus' programme to instill national pride in a nation shaken by continuous civil war; his job is to combine examples of this pride from the past with warnings of where lack of such pride, religious observance and patriotism can lead; his attitude to Hannibal needs to be seen in this light as well as that of Livy's possible admiration for any qualities Hannibal may have possessed
- *early career*: focus on Hannibal rather than any Roman during his intro to Book XXI; gives his lineage, then stresses his popularity leading to his appointment as a very young leader (possible cross-reference to Scipio later); pen picture of young man with positive attributes ('vigour and courage'; 'superb tactical ability', etc.), possibly to make him worthy foe and / or excuse early Roman failings (?) but adds typical barbarian faults ('cruelty', lack of religion', etc.); so not an unbalanced early picture; from then through early (pre-Alps) career he does to focus on the positive (siege of Saguntum strong on H's tactical awareness, leadership skills, etc.); support for him in Carthaginian Senate v Roman request to surrender him stressed (and contrasted with initial indecision in Roman Senate);
- *journey and early battles*: sees journey over Alps through Hannibal's eyes (not Romans); suggests here giving him genuine credit which he does deserve: speeches from 218 reported in full (eg pep talk to men full of fear: quells the fear; attacks Roman savagery; assures them they **can** cross the Alps, etc.), and military awareness / decisiveness reported as if he, not Rome, was Livy's focus; short speech at top of Alps confirms all this; Romans out of view at this point; *battles*: although focus shifts back to Rome, stress is on religious and military failings of the Romans; contrast between Cornelius Scipio's (rather stilted, rather negative) speech before Ticinus and Hannibal's rousing call to battle; battle described objectively but chance seized to set up young Scipio as future Roman hero (see below); Hannibal given full credit but no corresponding criticism of Cornelius Scipio; difference at Trebia / Trasimene / Cannae: focus before battles on faults of Roman commanders; Hannibal simply brought in as inevitable consequence (and example of opposite) of their lack of piety, unity and military ability; (eg Hannibal's fastidious preparations contrasted to lack of these by Flaminius; Hannibal's single-mindedness as object lesson against lack of cohesion between Varro and Paullus); Livy's portrayal of Hannibal's decent treatment of captured Romans seems to conflict with earlier reference to cruelty etc. similarly stress on religious failings of Roman leaders seems to be contrasted with Hannibal's positive

attitude to gods in speech before Ticinus (again contrast with criticism of Hannibal for being irreligious earlier); is Livy at this point torn between genuine admiration for Hannibal and the need for him as a marker for Roman inadequacies? He certainly to this point describes the battles largely through the eyes of the winner – Hannibal

- *Hannibal / Fabius*: change of tone once Fabius on scene (?); Rome now has a hero with the qualities Livy wants to boost (religious devotion; steadfastness, etc.) so the ‘baddies’ become those Romans not supporting Fabius; Hannibal drops further from sight following his failure to march on Rome (Maharbal used to imply criticism of Hannibal – first really seen?); next few books (not set) put focus firmly on Roman response – has Hannibal served purpose as role model for Romans now they have their own?
- *Hannibal / Scipio*: even more so when Scipio comes on scene; focus on events in Sicily Africa while Hannibal is left wandering to little purpose round Italy; meanwhile Scipio is portrayed as showing the qualities Hannibal did earlier; Hannibal reappears when summoned back to Africa; Livy reports long speeches between the two; respectful tone to Hannibal from Livy; he almost has him anointing Scipio as his successor; Hannibal lists Scipio’s achievements; certain pathos here; finishes with largely positive report of Hannibal’s marshalling of forces at Zama, then he is allowed to leave gracefully; credit for looking at all these points in line with title.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

## Option D

- 10 'Plutarch shows a greater understanding of Fabius Maximus's character and motives than Livy does.'

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

You might include discussion of:

- the nature of the sources
- information about Fabius' early life
- his career before Cannae
- his career after Cannae
- his attitude to Publius Cornelius Scipio.

Points to consider might include the following:

- *sources*: **Livy** was a Roman citizen, an historian of the late 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC; he was writing a 142 book **history** of Rome from its foundation up to to his own times so Fabius Maximus is a very small cog; these were the times when Augustus was attempting to renew Rome after the Civil War; Livy saw it as his duty to 'put on record the story of the greatest nation in the world' (intro to Book I) and examine how Rome in his own day was 'beginning to work its own ruin'; he was more interested in using the Punic Wars to show positive qualities which saw the Romans to victory then and which Romans of his day would need to rediscover (and of course the negatives which nearly cost them dear); **Plutarch** was a Greek of the late 1<sup>st</sup> C AD, so not a Roman propagandist as Livy was, but was fascinated by the qualities of men and statehood that saw Greece (Athens) fall while Rome rose to rule the world; he wrote a series of **biographies** of famous men - in matching pairs of Greeks and Romans; he paired Fabius with the cautious Athenian general Pericles to investigate this character-type; Livy was one of his chief sources for the section on Fabius'; his whole life is covered in 27 chapters; credit for bringing out these differences where relevant to the question
- *early life*: in **Plutarch** we are given a brief (one chapter) family background and childhood account of Fabius: credit for discussion as to whether this creates a more balanced picture than that of **Livy** (no mention of this) or explains / contradicts later acts and behaviour of Fabius as reported by Livy; points for consideration here could include: obviously mythological ancestry is to emphasise importance of family; emphasis on calm ('grave and gentle nature' etc.) points to his approach post-Cannae; lots of such hints (eg 'freedom from over-mastering passions', etc.)
- *pre-Cannae*: **Livy** gives detail of Fabius' approach to the Carthaginian Senate; not mentioned in **Plutarch**; Livy describes early battles in Rome up to Trasimene; here his focus is on folly of Flaminius; **Plutarch** has strong focus on a clash between Fabius and Flaminius in the lead up to Trasimene (not mentioned in Livy); Fabius 'impressed by reports of the small size of Hannibal' forces' ..urged 'patience' and to allow 'Hannibal's strength ... to waste away ...'; Flaminius refused to listen; suggests Fabius proposing his policy before Trasimene; after Trasimene both sources agree Fabius was appointed Dictator: **Livy** stresses Fabius' joint appointment (as acting dictator) with Minucius; **Plutarch** says Fabius appointed Minucius; then gives long list of Fabius' qualities which made him 'the only man' for the job ('spirit, dignity ...age at which ... boldness is tempered with discretion') – not in Livy; then goes on to stress Fabius' immediate attention to religious practice; persuaded the people this was the problem, not military



weakness (by contrast seems to come straight from Livy): **Livy** then focuses on Fabius' military actions and start of 'delaying' campaign; much tactical detail; **Plutarch** gives long account of battle at Volturnus (v similar to Livy) but then homes in almost exclusively on the details and outcome of Fabius' problems with Minucius (from totally pro-Fabius angle – reveals a lot of Fabius' presumed inner thoughts); this is also in Livy but spread among other details of battles, etc.; both then stress growing dissatisfaction with Fabius' tactics and use Minucius' defeat as metaphor for bad leadership; **Livy** features big speech of apology from Minucius, also in Plutarch; both then have him stepping down as dictator before focusing on Varro, Paullus and Cannae; again much in common: **Livy** stresses general following of Fabian tactics at this point; **Plutarch** portrays Fabius' support for Paullus; both quote long speech from Fabius to Paullus

- *post-Cannae*: (In **Livy** just before dying Paullus asks that Fabius be told he died following his advice; **Plutarch** has this in his version but adds criticism of Varro); **Livy** gives report of Rome post battle with Senate listening to and following advice of Fabius; attention then turns to others; **Plutarch** on the other hand makes it sound as though Fabius did everything personally; he then gives due credit to Marcellus but pointedly notes that Hannibal got Marcellus but never Fabius; Livy focuses on discussions in the Senate between other key senators; then Book 22 ends; credit for detail here
- *Scipio*: **Livy** discusses the growing animosity between Fabius and Scipio in detail outside the selection set so no chance for comparison here but credit for discussing how Fabius' attempts to thwart Scipio (eg "violent and extreme" attitude towards him) help balance his account; also for references to Scipio / Fabius relationship from Books XXIX and XXX of Livy: (Book XXIX – Fabius' criticisms of Scipio re Locri; Book XXX – his warnings re fighting Hannibal in Africa recalled after his death).

*Note: it is not expected that students will make reference to Livy Books XXIII – XXVIII when comparing the two accounts, but students should be credited for using Plutarch points on issues outside the Livy selection.*

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**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	2	-	2
<b>02</b>	3	-	3
<b>03</b>	5	5	10
<b>04</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Or**  
**Option B**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>05</b>	2	-	2
<b>06</b>	3	-	3
<b>07</b>	5	5	10
<b>08</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Section 2**

**Either**  
**Option C**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>09</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**Or**  
**Option D**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>10</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**OVERALL**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>100%</b>