

A-LEVEL CLASSICAL CIVILISATION

CIV4D Tiberius and Claudius

Mark scheme

2020
June 2014

Version/Stage: Final V1.0

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.	8-10
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.	5-7
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.	3-4
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 40 MARKS

These essays form the **synoptic assessment**. Therefore, the descriptors below take into account the requirement in the Subject Criteria for Classics and Specification that students should, in a **comparative** analysis, **draw together** their knowledge and skills to demonstrate understanding of the **links** between central elements of study in the context of the cultural, religious, social and political **values** of the classical world.

- Level 5** Demonstrates
- well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources which thoroughly covers the central aspects of the question
 - coherent and perceptive understanding of the links between the central aspects of the question and the values of the classical world
 - ability to sustain an argument which
 - is explicitly comparative,
 - has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,
 - responds to the precise terms of the question,
 - fluently links comment to detail,
 - has a clear and logical structure
 - reaches a reasoned conclusion
 - is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and
 - makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- 37-40**
- Level 4** Demonstrates
- generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources which covers many of the central aspects of the question
 - sound understanding of many of the central aspects of the question, including the values implicit in the material under discussion
 - ability to develop an argument which
 - makes connections and comparisons,
 - 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.
- 27-36**

Level 3	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge from different sources • some understanding of some aspects of the question, including some awareness of classical values • 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. 	17-26
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. 	8-16
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. 	1-7

Unit 4D Tiberius and Claudius

Section 1

Option A

01 What evidence of Tiberius' 'savage' character does Suetonius give elsewhere in his biography? Make five points.

Savage punishments for trivial offences – beating a slave, changing clothes close to a statue of Augustus, etc / his remark “Let them hate me, so long as they fear me.” / treatment of Capri fisherman / crab used for torture / guard executed for stealing an Imperial peacock / flogging the centurion for getting his litter ‘stuck’ in a thicket / his cruelties towards the associates of his family, etc. / encouragement of delation by rewards to informers. Drusus’ death with detail of eating his mattress/Agrippina losing an eye during flogging etc.

(5 marks)

02 Suetonius refers to Tiberius' 'pretence of moderation' (line 5). To what extent do you think this assessment of Tiberius' behaviour in the early part of his reign up to the death of Germanicus is accurate?

Support your answer with evidence from the sources you have read.

Points might include:

- swift murder of Postumus – whether Tiberius' own savagery or on Augustus' orders
- inability to read speech announcing Augustus' death – real modesty or annoyance at the terms of the Will
- initial discretion – acceptance of only a few honours, reluctance to celebrate birthday by means of the Plebeian Games, veto of bills re his divinity, etc.
- hatred of flattery – refusal to let senators approach his litter
- being unperturbed by abuse, etc. – sign of 'dour' character?
- excessive courtesy to Senate
- threw off pretence as he gained confidence – reminding Senate of sanctity of law and attempting to curb extravagance, eg lowering pay of actors
- revival of punishment of married women – dour character?
- his cruel behaviour towards the wife and sons of Germanicus after his death and rumours of Tiberius' involvement via Piso etc.

Students should assess the degree to which Tiberius can be seen as dissimulating to gain favour in the early part of his reign and indicate the point at which the 'pretence' ceased. Many of these points can be used to argue either side.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

03 To what extent did Tiberius' character influence his policies throughout his principate and how far were his policies the result of other factors?

Support your answer with evidence from the sources you have read.

Points might include some but not necessarily all of:

Tacitus

- Tiberius' alleged malevolence towards Libo Drusus
- but diplomacy shown in his behaviour in the case of Urgulania
- and his generosity to certain senators who had fallen on hard times (Hortalus)
- secretiveness shown in trial of Aemilia Lepida
- withdrawal to Campania in 21AD and communication with Senate by letter
- understated reaction to the Gallic revolt in 21AD – character or tactics?
- the emperor's old-fashioned austerity, his letter to the Senate
- modesty – dislike of flattery, eg censuring the golden lettering voted for Drusus by the senate, calling the Senate, 'Men fit to be slaves!'.

Suetonius

- secretive nature leading to his duplicity or suspicion – delay in revealing Augustus' death, saying he was ill to forestall Germanicus' ambition, to do away with Clemens and tricking Libo Drusus at a sacrifice
- initial modesty – not accepting honours, and vetoing bills for setting up temples to him, hatred of flattery – senators not to approach his litter – and seeming lack of concern about slander, etc about him and his family
- exaggerated courtesy when addressing the Senate
- austerity – attempts to curb excess in entertainments, etc, large scale generosity twice only
- his treatment of senators who bent the rules eg moving house too early
- apparent dislike of travelling leading to seclusion on Capri thereby allowing others to much power, eg Sejanus
- solitary nature came to the fore on Capri – allowing his passions full rein
- stinginess became greed – seizing property on meagre evidence – Lentulus, Aemilia Lepida, provincials, etc
- savage enforcing of law under pretext of reforming public morals
- savagery possibly due to lack of confidence – following suppression of Sejanus' conspiracy
- superstition – soothsayers forbidden to be consulted in private and attempted suppression of oracles at Rome except for fear of sacred Lots
- abiding interest in literature and mythology and tendency to correct speech of senators etc.

Other factors may include

- ambitions of other members of his family
- rebellions in Gaul and Africa
- reliance on Sejanus
- ambition and greed amongst the Senate.

Students should assess whether Tiberius' character was proactive or whether he was reacting to events.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B

04 What were the arguments that 'did not impress Claudius' (line 1)? Make five points.

Five from: Italy is not so decayed [1] that it cannot provide enough suitable senators [1] native Roman senators were enough for the people in former times [1] native Roman senators were models of courage and virtue in the past [1] we already have some (Venetian and Insubrian) Gauls [1] there will no careers left for the aristocracy or impoverished senators [1] every post will be absorbed by men who commanded hostile tribes [1] these people were our enemies [1] they can have citizenship but let it stop there [1].

(5 marks)

05 How typical of his principate is Claudius' interest here in tradition and history?

Support your answer with evidence from the sources you have read.

Points made might include:

Tacitus

- Cherusci asking for a King, and Claudius encouraging him with reference to behaviour of previous generations
- debate about enlarging the senate – digression on his own family history, etc. elevation of long-standing and well born senators to patrician rank
- celebration of Secular Games with reference to own involvement as member of the Board of Fifteen
- establishment of a Board of Soothsayers based on ancient tradition.

Suetonius

- in matters of religious ritual, civil customs, military matters and social status of all ranks Claudius revived obsolete customs and invented new ones
- inconsistency – no new senators without proof of five generations of citizenship but ennobled the son of a freedman on condition he was adopted by a knight, but cited an ancestor as precedent
- abolition of Druidism, grant of perpetual exemption from tax to Trojans
- sacrifices according to ancient rites when making treaties with foreigners
- suggestion that all this done according to the whim of wives and freedmen rather than his own judgement.

Students should draw references from the points raised which will either see Claudius' behaviour as shoring up his rule with ancient precedent or as purely antiquarian interest.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

06 How important is this episode for our understanding of the development of Claudius' relationship with the Senate?

Support your answer with reference to the sources you have read.

Points might include:

- desire to integrate Gauls / need to bring in new blood
- need to have more senators owing allegiance to Claudius
- elevation of senators of long-standing to patrician status welcomed as beneficial
- bringing in new senators from the provinces allowed him to get rid of existing senators
- he was keen not to alienate the Senate so he allowed resignations and expulsions to go on the same list to mitigate the humiliation
- suspicion of Senate after it delayed ratifying his accession after Caligula's assassination (Suetonius)
- sitting between Consuls in place kept for Tribunes (Suetonius)
- initially undertaking to create no new senators unless could prove Roman citizenship for five generations (Suetonius).

Students should present some analysis of the possible motives behind his actions. Was Claudius trying to create a broad power base or was he trying to ensure that opposition was minimised?

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section 2

Option C

07 'Claudius was more easily influenced by others than Tiberius was.'

To what extent do you agree? Support your answer with reference to both Tacitus and Suetonius.

To fulfil the synoptic element of this question, students should produce and weigh up the evidence from across the prescribed texts coming to a reasoned conclusion.

Points might include the following:

Claudius

- the affairs of Asiaticus and Poppaea Sabina
- the many assassinations ordered by Messalina
- Callistus, Narcissus and Pallas basking in Claudius' favour
- Narcissus arranges for Claudius to find out about Messalina and for her capture and execution, Narcissus gets an honorary quaestorship
- Suetonius lists Claudius' favourite freedmen ch 28 – Posides – awarded honour of headless spear – Felix – governorship of Judaea, etc.
- Pallas – treasurer – and Narcissus – secretary – most influential. Comments made to him that his freedmen were dipping into the Privy Purse, Claudius seemed their servant rather than their emperor
- possibly endorsing Messalina's marriage contract with Silius
- congratulating Narcissus on his vigilance in the affair of Appius Silanus
- regret at having married Agrippina upon recommendation
- freedmen prevailed upon him to execute Mnester against his inclination
- Agrippina suspected of stopping him advancing Britannicus ahead of Nero
- Agrippina suspected of administering the poison which killed him
- Claudius timid and indulgent by nature and, despite being educated in literature and history, rather gullible

Tiberius

- divorce from Vipsania at Augustus' behest to marry Julia (Suetonius)
- Tiberius' retirements – do they suggest he was keeping away from influences which might try to manipulate him?
- Tiberius' response to his mother who wanted him to enrol a man on the jurors' list
- T's assertion that Livia wanted to be co-ruler, his avoidance of her and dislike of people thinking that he gave her advice serious consideration
- uncertainty over position of Sejanus – Suetonius suggests that Sejanus had held him in check, but that Tiberius manipulated him at the end
- his fear of soothsayers etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(40 marks)

Option D

08 'Both Tacitus and Suetonius are more interested in judging the morality of Tiberius' and Claudius' behaviour than in assessing the effectiveness of their policies.'

To what extent do you agree? Support your answer with reference to both Tacitus and Suetonius.

Students should be expected to weigh up the evidence on both sides. They may well include some discussion of the genre of each author's writing.

Points might include the following:

Tacitus

- tendency to moralise although claims to be writing impartially
- case of Libo Drusus – not entirely impartial on either side, and comment on 'national disgrace' made at the end of the section
- numerous examples tend to support the thesis, eg Tiberius was mainly bad but what has he left out?
- Tiberius' actions ascribed to malice, eg trial of Aemilia Lepida
- Tiberius' appointments put down to undue outside influence eg Blaesus, Sejanus
- Tacitus tends to finish sections with a '*sententia*' which displays his attitude
- tendency to supply intent rather than impartiality, eg Messalina's removal of Poppaea by suicide
- concentration on the fall of Messalina rather than on policies (in the section prescribed)
- we lack sections of Tacitus' work which may have included assessment of Claudius' policies.

Suetonius

- initial history of the Claudians giving fairly equal weight to good and bad elements
- general list of significant events of Tiberius' early childhood
- comment tends to come more obviously when Tiberius has reached maturity – Vipsania
- retirement to Rhodes in 6BC – Suetonius speculates as to his reasons and his delaying on news of Augustus' illness
- comment on his initial reluctance to take on imperial titles, etc.
- following Tiberius' accession there is a greater degree of comment as opposed to narrative until the salacious gossip of life on Capri
- discussion Tiberius' feelings for Drusus and behaviour after his death
- commentary on Augustus' response to death of Drusus, in *Claudius*.
- comment tends to increase in sections where Suetonius is assessing the reign or dealing with character
- Claudius' interest in food and drink, his forgetfulness
- different purpose of Suetonius' writing etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(40 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 4D Tiberius and Claudius

Section 1

Either
Option A

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	5		5
02	4	6	10
03	8	12	20
TOTAL	17	18	35

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
04	5		5
05	4	6	10
06	8	12	20
TOTAL	17	18	35

Section 2

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
07	16	24	40
TOTAL	16	24	40

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
08	16	24	40
TOTAL	16	24	40

OVERALL

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
TOTAL	33	42	75
%	44%	56%	100%