
AS-LEVEL

Classical Civilisation

CIV2D Athenian Imperialism

Mark scheme

2020

June 2015

Version 1.0 Final Mark Scheme

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 2D Athenian Imperialism

Section 1

Option A

- 01 Why did the allies ask Athens to take over leadership against Persia?
Make three points.**

Three from: The Spartan Pausanias (1) / had behaved in such an arrogant way (1) / that the forces complained (1) / Pausanias was recalled to Sparta (1) and the allies approached Athens (1) to deal with the continuing threat from Persia (1) / the Allies preferred Ionian leadership (To Dorian) (1) / because of Athenian Naval Power (1)

[3 marks]

- 02 Who, in about 469 BC, became the first League member to revolt?**

Naxos (1)

[1 mark]

- 03 Name one city other than Kolophon which attempted to leave the League after 469 BC.**

One from: Khalkis / Erythrai / Miletos /
Megara / Thasos/ Mytilene (1)
Allow any other correct answer

[1 mark]

- 04 To what extent does Passage B give a different impression of relations between Athens and her allies from the views Thucydides expresses in Passage A, and what are the reasons for any differences?**

Discussion might include:

both passages are looking at aspects of the same situation: revolts by allies (and fellow members of the Delian League) against the authority imposed on them by Athens and in particular, the levying of tribute; Thucydides (**Passage A**) is writing a history and looking at things in a general sense from the Athenian point of view; he is not specifically dealing with the situation regarding Kolophon; **Passage B** is believed to be part of an inscription set up following the failure of the Kolophonians to pay their agreed tribute; in **Passage A** it is made clear that tribute could be paid in two ways, by cash or by provision of ships; it is not clear which of these the Kolophonians had failed to do (or whether it was both); it is made clear that the Athenians were non-negotiable over the amount of tribute, and that failure to pay the whole sum was to be treated as harshly as total non-payment; again whether the Kolophonians were resisting wilfully or unable to pay the full amount is not clear; the term 'severest pressure' seems to be a euphemism for 'extreme action amount to violence', while the final section seems to be justifying Athens' behaviour by suggesting that the allies 'don't want to make .. sacrifices' because they are used to having an easy life; Athens here is made to sound like the victim; in **Passage B** it is clear that the Athenians are making an example of the Kolophonians; no mention is made of tribute but the conditions being forced on the Kolophonians are the same as those set out for other known defaulters; crucially it appears that settlers have been 'sent to Kolophon' and that a democracy has been established (the Kolophonians 'will not subvert democracy at Kolophon'); the settlers have presumably been sent to enforce this democracy by weight of numbers; virtually the entire tone is negative and punitive - the public humiliation of having the stele set up is to be funded 'at the expense of the Kolophonians'; the Kolophonians do not only have to obey Athens but to speak as well as they can about them; the only glimmer of light is that 'many good things' may happen if they

obey the oath.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[10 marks]

- 05 To what extent do you agree with Thucydides in Passage A that the allies were to blame for the way Athens treated them in the period between 479 and 454 BC? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Thucydides you have read.**

You might include discussion of

- the original purposes and arrangements of the Delian League
- the allies' relationships with Athens during the early actions of the League
- responsibility for the early rebellions
- the Athenian leaders and how they treated other cities
- how and why the League became an Athenian Empire.

Discussion might include:

- **original purposes and arrangements:**
following Persian defeats at Salamis (sea) and Plataea (land), Persians retreated from Greece leaving great damage and fear; hence lots of 'togetherness' and anti-Persia alliance of cities remained in place with Athens apparently happy to accept Spartan leadership initially; then with other Greek cities Athens accepted Spartan Pausanias as leader until he revealed 'the arrogance of his nature'; key point: other states approached Athens to protect them (so in a sense they got themselves into the position of subservience to Athens quite willingly); Thucydides admits that even at this early stage Athens had a second aim, to neutralise Sparta and so would do whatever 'would best suit their own interests'; other states though, annoyed with Spartan attitude were 'initially glad to see them do so'; it seems that the allies left all decisions on League arrangements (introduction / level of tribute, etc.) to Athens; Athenian treasurers put in charge of assessing / collecting tribute; some suggestion of joint responsibility provided by keeping treasury at Delos while decisions initially reached 'in general congress' at same neutral venue
- **early actions:**
(Eion, Scyros and Carystus): all fitted the general terms of the League with united League force (under Cimon) making slaves of Persians captured at Eion; for Scyros attack, no Persian element but removal of pirates made safer sea trade of all League members; no suggestion of other cities being less than supportive or of Athenian abuse of the League; Carystus: showed beginning of new trend; Greek city (although suspected of pro-Persian tendencies) it refused 'invitation' to join League; League attacked and forced it to join; Thucydides tells us Carystus 'was not supported by the rest of Euboea' suggesting unity (but Athens' motives looking to own interests now? – certainly she provided most of ships and fighting men, so becoming increasingly authoritarian; hence first rebellions?)
- **early rebellions:**
at formation of League states swore oath of permanence so when Naxos tried to withdraw, this was against oath made to all members so may not have been Athens breaking ranks (Thucydides though calls it 'first case when the original constitution of the League was broken'); Persian threat still present (until victories at Eurymedon shortly after Naxos rebellion); credit for examining responsibility for Naxos rebellion and effects of Athens' behaviour there on other allies; Thasos rebellion different: not primarily League matter but dispute between Athens and Thasos over mines; threat of Spartan involvement (Spartan offer to help Thasos) would have frightened Athens and led them to seek to make an example of Thasos (very harsh treatment); credit for discussing how far Thasos (as an ally) and the other allies brought this on themselves and how far Athenian intolerance / greed was to blame; credit for discussion of other rebels from

inscriptions in similar terms

- **Athenian leadership:**
 despite partly serving own interests Athens under Cimon basically pro-League and not so bothered about Sparta (tendency to go relatively easy on allies); also Persia still a threat under Cimon so no fundamental reason for allies to resent Athenian leadership; four years after Thasos Cimon ostracised (political manoeuvring by democrats – at home at least - Ephialtes and Pericles); credit for reference to Pericles's later speech for his attitude ('your empire is now like a tyranny'); Athenian focus moved from Persia to Sparta (series of alliances with Sparta's enemies); credit for discussing the effect all this would have had on the allies
- **move to Empire:**
 under Pericles change in League nature: most tribute limited to cash; harsher terms (as in Kleinias / Coinage decrees) introduced; League funds blatantly used for Long Walls in Athens; also rebuilding of Acropolis temples; Treasury moved from Delos to Athens in 454; clear preparations for war v Sparta; no suggestion League were consulted over this; meetings on Delos abandoned; war with Sparta beyond 454 with League members expected to support Athens unconditionally; effectively the league is over and an Empire is in place; credit for examining all this in line with the title.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[20 marks]

Option B

06 Which city was Hermocrates representing at the Debate?

Syracuse (1)

[1 mark]

07 What actions caused Egesta to request ‘military aid’ (line 7) from Athens? Give two details.

Two from: Egesta had declared war on their neighbour Selinunte (1) / over territory and/or marriage rights (1) / Selinunte called on (their ally) Syracuse for help (1) / Syracuse attacked Egesta (1) / by land and sea (1) Add. Egesta needed help from someone powerful (1)
Allow any other answer.

[2 marks]

08 How did the Camarinians react after hearing the speeches of both delegations? Give two details.

Two from: they liked Athens (1) / but feared Syracuse (1) / so told both sides they would remain neutral (1) while secretly deciding to support Syracuse (1) / without upsetting Athens (at this point) (1)

[2 marks]

09 How effectively do you consider Hermocrates puts across his argument in the passage?

Discussion might include:

starts with apparent throwaway comment (‘plenty of scope for attacking .. Athens’) as reminder of her reputation for harsh dealing with allies, etc;) followed up by ‘misdoings’ to reinforce her potential as an enemy; then cleverly sets his own city side by side with Camarina as fellow Sicilians who have both erred (‘.. blame ourselves’) in not standing up to Athens; reminds them that Athenian allies ‘in the mother country’ have all been ‘enslaved’ because of ‘not supporting each other’ (ie we Sicilians must stand together to avoid such a fate); reminder that the Athenians use clever words (‘the same sophistries’) to lure victims into their net, before comparing their dependent states (‘always slaves’) to the states of Sicily (‘free’ and ‘independent’); warns them that individually they will be easy pickings for a super-power like Athens; also that their tactics are blindingly obvious – divide and rule; finally blames Athens for ‘stirring up’ the trouble between Syracuse and other Sicilians by using ‘flattering language’; (something of the pot calling the kettle black, given the ‘sophistry’ of Hermocrates’ language here?); credit for any points above or other relevant quotation from the passage as long as tied into the ‘effectiveness’ of what he says (rather than the fairness or otherwise).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[10 marks]

10 ‘Athens’ arrogance was the main reason for the failure of the Sicilian Expedition.’

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to Book 6 of Thucydides.

You might include discussion of

- **Athens’ view of her own ambitions and abilities**
- **Athenian leadership before and during the Sicilian Expedition**
- **Athens’ relationships with her allies**
- **Athens’ relationships with other cities including Sparta.**

Discussion might include:

- **own abilities:**
throughout most of the period studied Athens shows great (excessive?) self belief; happy to disregard the views of others (good supporting quotations available from passage and other speeches – eg Athenians tell Melians to ‘behave with deference towards (your) superiors’); yet as time goes on some self-examination might have been wise; strong leadership prevented any self-doubt from interfering with policy (eg Pericles pep talk in 430 when beset by plague etc.); by time of Sicilian Expedition this self-belief / arrogance may well have been masking a degree of self-delusion (see each item below) leading to her overstretching her resources
- **Athenian leadership:**
before: strong leadership up to 420s, followed by period of uncertainty (competitors with differences of opinion); when vote taken in 415 to send help to Egesta / Leontini, Nicias spoke up against (despite being named joint expedition leader); Alcibiades (also prospective joint leader) spoke in support of motion and won the day; Nicias demanded vast numbers of troops; (to his surprise) this was accepted **but** Alcibiades accused of undemocratic behaviour over Hermae) and recalled; he defected to Sparta (below) rather than face trial; **during:** Nicias and Lamachus in charge (half-hearted; lacked Alcibiades’ charisma and skills); arrogance of their approach at Camarina lost support from Sicilian allies; failed to press home initial successes v Syracuse; Nicias’ request for recall would have had negative effect; reinforcements called in too late (Sparta now fully involved – below); disastrous defeat of new force at the Great Harbour (while land-based troops dithered); whole force in disarray culminating in total destruction of expedition forces; leadership major factor in defeat?
- **allies:**
strong link here with idea of ‘arrogance’ as key factor: since Cimon’s time in authority Athens pursued foreign policy (especially against Sparta) expecting blind loyalty from allies; terms of inscriptions show that fear was now the main weapon by which loyalty was kept, but rule by strength needs that strength to continue; after deaths of Pericles and Cleon, the single-mindedness is lacking so allies would be watching Athenian involvement in Sicily hoping she would overstretch herself; little loyalty left to count on if things got tough (or stomach for the fight for allies directly involved?); while allies became bigger problem **after** Sicilian defeat Athens’ earlier arrogant treatment of them was clearly a factor in defeat in Sicily; credit for examining how big a factor

- **others:**

Sicilians: Athens' willingness to assist allies in Sicily (although – or because of? - her mixed motives) was not met with the level of support expected; Leontini failed to produce resources promised; Camarina promised support but sat on the fence; all allowing Syracuse (biggest power on island anyway) fairly free rein to oppose Athens who was not at her strongest (see leadership below); initially things went well with Athenian blockade of Syracuse, but Athenians were unable to strike the decisive blow; meanwhile Syracuse' appeal for Spartan help proved vital in the eventual Athenian defeat; **Sparta:** whole idea of expedition aroused great concern in Sparta (threatened balance of power both in Sicily and in Greece itself); Athens' recall of Alcibiades resulted in potential key to Athens' success falling into Spartan hands and encouraging them to intervene; Spartan reinforcements added to Syracusan naval power provided Athens with biggest challenge to her forces yet; inspired Spartan leadership from Gylippus (compared with half-hearted Athenian leadership) almost guaranteed Syracusan / Spartan victory; another major factor to consider in responding to the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[20 marks]

Section 2

Option C

- 11 'Athenian speakers always portrayed the Athenians more favourably than they deserved at the time.'

Judging from the speeches by Athenians you have read, how far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Thucydides you have read.

You might include discussion of

- the Athenians' speech at the Debate at Sparta in 432 BC
- Pericles' speech in 430 BC
- the Mytilenian Debate in 427 BC
- the Melian Dialogue in 416/5 BC
- the Athenians' speech at the Debate at Camarina in 415/4 BC.

Discussion might include:

(Students will not be expected to deal with all speeches in great detail, but to make judgements that relate the tone of the speeches discussed to the Athenian political / military position at the time)

- **Debate at Sparta:**
at this stage (432 BC) Athens was used to getting its own way; its 'Delian League' is now effectively an Empire and Cimon's support for Sparta is long in the past; the Disputes over Corcyra and Potidaea threatened Corinth, main ally of Sparta and suggested Athens was seeking to increase her Empire: **speech:** Athenian tone (responding to Corinthian allegations) at the Debate: one of superiority (Athenian delegation just happened to be visiting): main points: Debate has no jurisdiction, so no need to answer Corinthian points; we fought the Persians almost single-handed, while making great sacrifices (so element of self-justification); after Persian war Spartans withdrew so other Greeks only had us to look after them ('we did not gain this empire by force'); Sparta later threatened us so we had to hang onto the empire; Sparta would be as harsh to allies as us if they were in the same position (so don't talk about 'right and wrong'); we are, if anything, too fair for our own good (our democratic tendencies); so Sparta should not be hypocritical; don't push us too far or you'll regret it (straight threat at end); fairly realistic speech from a position of strength; does the speaker's self-justification though amount to his being 'over favourable' to Athens?
- **Pericles:**
after several false starts Sparta had declared war and begun her annual invasions of Attica; Pericles' (not too popular) policy for dealing with land invasions was to retreat into Athens and let them take their course; many Athenians suffered loss of land, lack of food, etc.; even worse in 430 plague broke out (30,000 dead – including, eventually, Pericles); **speech:** acknowledges justification for Athenians' anger; stresses need to stick together and support war effort ('as long as the state is secure, individuals have a much greater chance of surviving'); he is the man for the job; nobody wants war – it is our very freedom at stake; I am strong; it's you lot who are weakening; remember your heritage; you can't lose, because you control the sea; but if you give up now, your

heritage will be gone; think of your natural superiority; you can't give up your empire even if you want to; it would be too dangerous; times are bad but we have overcome perils before; don't give in; fight on; (essentially a pep-talk in Athens' darkest hour, so clearly tending to be in a sense 'more favourable' than the situation warranted, but for obvious reasons – and Pericles did not refrain from discussing the current difficulties)

- **Mytilenian Debate:**

following Pericles' death (and relief from Spartan attack as Spartans did not want to catch plague) Athens switched to a more aggressive (Cleon-inspired) approach: started taking war to Sparta; despite this, Spartan invasions of Attica resumed and Athenian allies, sensing weakness, started to revolt, in particular Mytilene, main city of island of Lesbos; unusual in being non-tributary ally, not totally committed to Athens (had oligarchic government); Mytilene saw opportunity in **428** to rebel and seek help from Peloponnesians; Sparta agreed to accept Mytilene as ally; Athenian fleet blockaded Mytilene; Spartans sent fleet but Mytilenians were starved into surrender before they arrived; Debate held over how to treat Mytilenians; clearly important for Athens to send message to other allies looking for signs of weakness; initial decision very draconian (death/slavery for all) but overnight opinion shifted towards mercy **speeches: Cleon** spoke first: don't be weak; you are tyrants; get on with it; subjects will see you as weak otherwise; mustn't step back once decision made; strike quickly is the best policy; you do too much talking; Mytilene has harmed you and joined your enemies; Mytilene will despise you if you show mercy; so will other allies; more rebellions will follow; no time for pity or listening to 'their' views; see it through or risk losing empire (clear enough reflection of situation, from one point of view. **Diodotus** followed: get rid of emotion and take your time to think; Cleon is trying to scare you; yes, they are guilty but will savage punishments help 'us'? Over-harsh deterrence does not work; cities will still rebel and if they know their failure guarantees destruction they will never give up; you should suit the punishment to 'our' interests; just punish the oligarchs or democracies elsewhere may give up; Diodotus' view prevailed – credit for looking at the two views in line with the title: both could be read as showing that the weaker Athens' hold over her allies became, the greater the need to 'talk up' her justification for acting tough; but again there is more than a hint of realism, acknowledging her faults; chance to contrast the two speakers in this light

- **Melian Dialogue:**

Peace of Nicias in 421 BC had brought first phase of war v Sparta to an end; gradually skirmishes began and both sides started jockeying for position; in **416** Athens was trying to subdue Argos (thus weakening Sparta); at the same time a large force was sent to force the Spartan ally Melos to move over to Athens; things going quite well for Athens during these years – hence the tone? **speech:** very factual, unemotional tone, but blunt and to the point: we are not here for a debate; you, the weak, can save yourselves by giving in to us, the strong; join us for your own good; we would rather welcome you than destroy you; neutrality is not an option; forget 'right' and 'wrong'; we need no trouble from you whatever it takes; take your one opportunity; don't count on the gods – we already do that and it seems to work for us; don't count on help from Sparta; forget 'honour'; save yourselves; (result: Melos refused, was defeated, all killed/enslaved, Athenians settled there – Athenian attitude: could be said to have stated it just as it is; in this situation Melos is powerless; the speech hardly exaggerates the favourable position Athens is in, but in a wider sense is she quite as all-powerful as the speaker claims?)

- **Camarina:**

in **415** the truce still technically held but both sides were looking to gain advantages in the knowledge that further war would follow; Sicily was a potential problem for Athens (Syracuse was strongest city and pro-Sparta); appeal from Egesta for support v Syracuse (Egesta to pay!) seemed good opportunity to steal a march on Sparta (and enrich Athens); hence different tone from other speeches by Athens at Camarina; large fleet sailed and had initial success against Syracuse; both sought support from Camarina; **speech:** we (Athenians) only have an empire because others asked us to look after them; we've always done this well; you and we now are under similar threats (you from Syracuse, we from Sparta); we are not here to enslave you but to stop you from being enslaved; with us you will stay independent; you asked us to help; don't give in to cowardice – make use of our strength for your own sakes; (why the lack of threats, attempts at self-justification, etc. here when not seen at Melos etc.?); are the Athenians – with split leadership, far from home, etc. – showing self-doubt? If so, with good cause; Camarina stayed neutral – not offered to Melos – but quietly supported Syracuse; Athenian bubble about to burst in a big way with utter defeat – and eventually loss of Empire.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[30 marks]

Option D

12 'Difficulties in Athens' relations with her allies between 454 BC and 404 BC were largely her own fault.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Thucydides and the extracts from 'The Athenian Empire' you have read. You might include discussion of

- **Athens' situation in 454 BC**
- **Athens relationship with her allies after 454 BC**
- **Athens' relationship with Sparta after 454 BC**
- **the period after the Sicilian Expedition.**

Discussion might include:

- **Athens in 454:**

pretence of a continuing Delian League of 'equals' basically ends in 454 with removal of treasury to Athens and end of joint conferences; as early as 470 when Naxos had rebelled, 'Athens made war on the place'; first sign of difficulty in keeping alliance intact; Thasos dealt with similarly (but here clear desire for self-enrichment in Athenian attitude – virtually a self-seeking 'Empire' by now?); all relatively fine until Egyptian Campaign; first real setback as this lasted years (459-454) and ended in big defeat; hence retrenchment in 454; difficult to claim end of Empire is in sight but at least the "Empire" can be recognized for what it is (causing alarm to allies, Sparta, etc. – below)

- **Athens and allies after 454:**

inscriptions show Naxos and Thasos not alone; some issues with dates but Erythrai appears to have rebelled in about 453; Miletus about 450; Khalkis and Kolophon in about 446; terms set up to indicate growing sense of desperation leading to in harsh terms (difficult for Democracy to rule lands with contrasting governments so tendency for Athens to impose democracy abroad and / or settle Athenians there); council set up in

Erythrai, made to promise not to revolt from ‘Athens and allies’ or join Persians (sign that allies still important and Persia still a problem); also some positives: Athenian law to help Erythrai in case of murder, etc.; **Miletus** seems to have received an (Athenian) garrison; **Khalkis** receives promise not to uproot their citizens (but must promise not to revolt, to pay their full tribute; also no reference by now to ‘allies’, just Athens), while **Kolophon** will promise not to revolt (and to love the Athenian people); kept in check by threats the allies largely stayed in line during war with Sparta, but harsh treatment must have made them look for chances to jump; eg 440 **Samos** rebelled (see below) : 428 **Mytilene** saw chance to approach Sparta; far harsher treatment than earlier rebels from Athens (Cleon would have killed / enslaved all; even the less harsh Diodotus spoke for killing the oligarchs in the government – example of Athens having to deal with an ally of different political persuasion); in Sicilian Expedition Athens reputation for treatment of allies dissuaded Sicilian allies from giving full support (eg **Camarina** though ally of Athens actually helped Syracuse on the quiet in 415; also nearly all coastal states refused to ally themselves with Athens); at same time, allies at home, seeing destruction of Athenian fleet, felt it was time to revolt (eg **Miletus** in 413; **Chios** in 411) but the Spartans were slow to support these **and** the Athenian fleet made a surprise comeback and saved the situation (even beating the Spartan navy in 411); Empire still intact in 411 despite many (partly) ally-inspired troubles; even after final defeat (largely though Spartan naval superiority) in 404 some allies (eg Samos – a democracy) refused to surrender

- **Athens and Sparta:**

in early days of Empire Sparta was largely relieved to stay out of foreign affairs; Thasians had sought Spartan aid when rebelling in **465 BC** but came to nothing (helped that pro-Spartan Cimon was Athenian leader); little evidence that Sparta wanted confrontation; by **459** however by interfering in Spartan territory (provocative alliance with Megara) Athens had forced Sparta into a response: 15 years of war followed won conclusively by Sparta; even then Sparta wanted peace, so in **446** ‘30 Years Peace’ declared; by **440** Samos was rebelling and others looked like following; even so Athens kept provoking Sparta (actions against Corinth, Spartan ally); Debate at Sparta (**432**) saw Sparta and allies considering renewing war: Athens v threatening in her response; provoked Sparta and allies into declaring war which (with plague) started v badly for Athens (Pericles’ speech of **430**); death of Pericles saw rise of Cleon (v pro-war); war continued inconclusively until death of Cleon: allowed Peace of Nicias in **421**; neither side could hold back however and Sicily brought things to a head again; Athens split herself disastrously (with poor leadership thrown in) and Gylippus and Spartan allies were able to destroy Athenian force in Sicily (**413**); still time for Athenian comeback (victory through Spartan inertia in **411** – although in same year democracy temporarily overthrown in Athens); further minor Athenian victories but final battle of **404** saw final end of Empire

- **Sicily and after:**

(see above): credit for weighing up Athenian culpability v Spartan brilliance in Sicily; also for examining events of 411 onwards above (should Athenians have sought to make 411 victory pay? Were they foolish going on with weakened fleet when peace may have been possible? etc.).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[30 marks]

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2D Athenian Imperialism

Section 1

Either
Option A

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	3	-	3
02	1	-	1
03	1	-	1
04	5	5	10
05	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
06	1	-	1
07	2	-	2
08	2	-	2
09	5	5	10
10	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section 2

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
09	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
10	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

OVERALL

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