
AS-LEVEL

Classical Civilisation

CIV2F The Second Punic War

Mark scheme

2020

June 2015

Version 1: 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 2F The Second Punic War

Section 1

Option A

01 Name Hannibal's father and give their family name.

Hamilcar (1) and Barca (1) (allow 'Hamilcar Barca' for 2)

[2 marks]

02 Give three of Hannibal's negative qualities which Livy mentions in the section which immediately follows the passage.

Three from: (inhuman) cruelty (1) / perfidy (1) / (total) disregard of truth (1) / disregard of honour (1) / disregard of religion (1) / disregard of sanctity of an oath (1) / disregard of anything sacred (1) (allow synonyms or illustrations of any of above);

[3 marks]

03 How vividly in the passage does Livy emphasise the positive sides of Hannibal's character?

Discussion might include:

the comparison to his father: positive terms ('vigour' and 'fire' – suggesting very strong in body and character); 'beloved and obeyed' are hard things for a leader to achieve both of; Hannibal did this ('beloved' particularly strong – not just 'loved'); in case the popularity may be thought to be based on father, simple statement that this is not case ('his own .. sufficient'); two more opposites follow – to 'command' and to 'obey' – his combination of these abilities is 'perfectly united'; reinforces this by emphasising value of these qualities both to men above and those below him (including views of his commander – 'vigour and courage' beyond all **and** his men – 'dash and confidence' gained from him); 'reckless' can be negative (but is it here?) but his 'superb tactical ability' renders this almost irrelevant; 'indefatigable' totally positive; 'physically and mentally' doubles the compliment; more opposites he can cope with ('heat' and 'cold'), before his restraint of the appetite (enough but not too much to eat and drink); throughout, pairs of qualities being used to show breadth of his abilities; on to waking and sleeping; moderation here too; can sleep when necessary, but not when things to do; no need for luxury (no 'soft bed' for him, but 'bare ground'); finally he is 'one of the boys' when appropriate ('amongst the common soldiers').

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[10 marks]

04 How important were Hannibal's positive qualities for the journey to Italy and the early Carthaginian successes there?

You might include discussion of

- **Hannibal's actions after capturing Saguntum**
- **the journey to the Alps**
- **crossing the Alps**
- **the battles before Cannae**
- **other factors which were important during this period.**

Discussion might include:

- **after Saguntum:**
gained support (rare!) from Carthaginian Senate (who refused to hand him to Rome) for major offensive and moved quickly to New Carthage (SE Spain); informed men about plans for invasion (keeping them in picture and gaining trust); gave them leave (popular) then fortified Sicily (to prevent Roman attack from that direction); also sent significant forces to Africa to protect Carthage; then left Hasdrubal Barca and men to defend Spain (all very organized); moved quickly to River Ebro with his forces to beat any likely Roman counter-move; now ready to move over Pyrenees; before going he dismissed any unhappy troops (7,000) and set off fast over Ebro and onward
- **journey to Alps:**
first problems from Gauls (worried about his intentions): Hannibal called them to conference and gave gifts and reassurances; they backed off; at same time other Gauls rose up against Rome, taking Roman eyes off Hannibal for a time; as he reached Rhone, Cornelius Scipio sent to intercept him; Scipio used Gallic allies to attack Hannibal's men, but his tactics (using Hanno as surprise weapon) crushed the Gauls; P Scipio's attempt to face Carthaginians failed as Hannibal had marched on before Romans arrived (Livy gives good pep talk from Hannibal – going to reach 'walls of Rome'); keeping away from coast Hannibal reached Allobroges' land; Hannibal sorted out a dispute amongst locals (re king) and got them on board; no more Roman opposition before arrival in Italy (Romans had retreated to await his arrival)
- **Alps:**
'impossible' journey but he did it; Livy nice picture of hazards ('parched with cold'; 'stiff with frost' etc.); positive leadership as faced (other) Allobroges attackers; used information from his new allies and clever ruse of lighting campfires, Hannibal outwitted barbarians (but not without significant losses in the ensuing battle); Hannibal was nearly fooled by next set of would-be attackers; offered to guide him but led into trap; more losses (especially baggage animals) but came through; no more opposition on journey; now October: gave rest to (demoralized) troops in valley near top of Alps; famous speech to rouse them ('after a fight or two .. you will have .. the citadel of Rome in your hands'); much easier on march down (clever effort to get round landslide); reached pastures on downside and gave further rest (all shattered); then (after clearing path for elephants) took 3 days to reach Po valley (crossing took 5 months)
- **early battles – his leadership:**
knowing Hannibal's troops would be exhausted Cornelius Scipio hurried to the Po but Hannibal had already moved on; Hannibal reached **River Ticinus** to be faced by Scipio's army: despite weariness and Romans making first moves, Hannibal made effective speech telling them what they are up against but that the worst is over; praises men, tells them battle means death or victory; they 'will' win; just before battle, backed it up with promise of gifts; Hannibal showed no great tactical skills (Romans disintegrated), but had his troops in good order to complete victory with sudden attack from behind and sides by

his cavalry; Hannibal moved on to **Trebia**: much larger Roman force opposing him here; started badly as surprise attack by Sempronius' men killed large number of Carthaginians; regrouping, Hannibal hid cavalry force to set trap; then sent main force to lure Romans into a charge; even battle (but elephants spread panic among Romans); key factor was Mago's hidden group attacking Romans from rear; broke lines and eventually fled beaten; at **Trasimene** Hannibal again faced divided Roman commanders: Hannibal lured Romans to attack with deliberate act of aggression: set up men on all sides of narrow pass; as Flaminius' men incautiously entered the pass, Carthaginians attacked from all sides; no contest; Flaminius killed; 15,000 Romans dead; Hannibal all set for **Cannae**; Romans in disarray

- **early battles - opposition:**

Ticinus: speech by Scipio lacked conviction; but he had moved fast to be ready for battle; crossed river and took up position; Romans upset by bad omens; as soon as battle joined Roman spearmen panicked and ran; they got in way of cavalry; chaos ensued; leader badly wounded; **Trebia**: Roman commanders (Scipio – still wounded - and Sempronius) disagreed over tactics; allowed Hannibal to 'divide and rule'; basically outmanoeuvred by Hannibal's tactics of coming up behind (basically repeat tactic from Ticinus); **Trasimene**: same old story for Rome: two commanders, one sensible and ignored; one (Flaminius) headstrong and easily lured into trap; big difference was focus of Carthaginians (and leadership of Hannibal?). Credit for relevant reference to Cannae.

(credit for raising 'other factors' as indicated earlier to give balance to argument)

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[20 marks]

Option B**05 Name the ‘daughter of Hasdrubal’ referred to in line 8.**

Sophonisba (accept any reasonable spelling) (1)

[1 mark]**06 Name Syphax’s main rival for the kingdom of Numidia**

Masinissa (accept any reasonable spelling) (1)

[1 mark]**07 What preparations for taking the war to Africa did Scipio make in Sicily? Give three details.**

Three from: training his troops (1) / a volunteer force (1) / of (30) warships (1) / (and) 7000 men (1) / plus the existing Sicilian garrison (1) / who were mainly in disgrace because of earlier failings (1) / preparing them to invade Africa (1) / without further military support (1) / without financial support (1) / raid on North African Coast (1)

[3 marks]**08 To what extent did the Roman Senate and its individual members support Scipio in his plan to take the war to Africa?****Discussion might include:**

given his excellent track record (early career; victories in Spain etc), might have expected total support but not the case: in 206 his victory at Gades confirmed Roman occupation of Spain; Scipio returned to Rome to general acclaim and was elected Consul (almost unheard of age of 31); this led factions in Senate (especially those around Fabius Maximus) to query whether he was becoming too powerful; Scipio claimed that the ‘containment’ policy had had its day and it was time to move promotion of war to Africa; Fabius ‘spread misgivings of every kind’ (Plautus); no good would come from this ‘hot-headed young man’; Senate went along with Fabius (although people as whole angry); Fabius then tried to persuade Crassus (Scipio’s co-Consul) to veto Scipio’s leadership of army (failed in this) **and** not to vote any funds for an African campaign (succeeded here); Scipio therefore had to proceed by paying all expenses himself (and did so); Fabius then spoke out in Senate against Scipio using ‘the whole reserve of Italy’s manpower’ and leaving Rome unguarded; this led Senate to restrict number of men Scipio could take to 300 (plus troops already in Sicily, the proposed stopping-off point); all changed once news of Scipio’s successes in Africa began to be reported; at this Fabius (still holding title of ‘princeps’) demanded Scipio’s recall; did not happen, but Senate remained split; Scipio continued to meet little but success and death of Fabius prevented further problems before victory was won and terms established (with Scipio unanimously put in charge of this).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[10 marks]

09 How important to the Roman victory in the Second Punic War were the events involving the Numidian leaders? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy you have read.

You might include discussion of

- why Numidia was important both to Rome and to Carthage
- the characters and activities of the Numidian leaders
- the outcome of the Carthaginian marriage plan
- Numidian support for Rome at Zama
- other factors that were important for the Roman victory.

Discussion might include:

- **importance of Numidia:**
Numidia was vital area for both sides (war was now moving from Spain/Sicily/Italy to Africa); each side had stake in leadership of Numidia: of the two rivals, traditionally Masinissa had been Carthaginian choice (brought up in Carthage and fought for them with as cavalry commander distinction in Spain); after defeated by Scipio however he changed sides and joined the Romans; to restore the balance Carthage needed to bring over Masinissa's rival claimant Syphax, (allied to Rome since 213 BC); hence the marriage plan
- **Numidian leaders:**
longstanding rivalry between them; when his uncle, king of a Numidian tribe (Massylii) died in 206 BC, Masinissa made play for kingdom (with Moorish help); Syphax was technically Roman ally at this time but spending much time with Hasdrubal Gisco; Hasdrubal fearing Masinissa's intentions (growing pro-Roman sympathies), persuaded Syphax to attack Masinissa; Masinissa barely escaped with his life (men wiped out); Masinissa returned and gathered large army; met Syphax in battle again and again soundly beaten; retreated and licked wounds until arrival of Scipio in Africa; Syphax therefore seen by Carthaginians as likelier to achieve great things for them against Romans; hence again the marriage plan
- **marriage plan results:**
marriage of Carthaginian princess to Syphax aimed to guarantee this change of loyalty on part of Syphax; potentially good move on their part as at this time Syphax seemed stronger in Numidia than Masinissa ; at first it worked for Carthage; marriage took place and Syphax joined Hasdrubal Gisco in attacking Romans at Utica; initially success for Carthage as Scipio withdrew; then went wrong as Scipio sent Masinissa against Syphax while Scipio himself led attack on Hasdrubal Gisco at Bagbrades (203 BC); great Roman victory; meanwhile Masinissa (aided by Laelius) met Syphax in battle at Cirta; Syphax led forces bravely but captured; sent to Scipio in chains; eventually moved to Italy in 202 where died; credit for relating that Sophonisba, after capture of Syphax, almost turned Masinissa back to Carthage's side ('his heart melted into pity'); only Scipio's quick, decisive (and in modern terms cruel) treatment of the situation prevented this – Sophonisba forced to commit suicide; Masinissa kept on board by Rome.
- **Zama:**
crucial aid from Masinissa (now undisputed Numidian chief), commanding Roman allied cavalry on right wing; Scipio beat Hannibal at Zama; much due to skill of Masinissa, who, having effectively driven back the Carthaginian cavalry, came upon rear of Carthaginian lines; war now effectively over; Masinissa rewarded by confirmation of kingship in 'perpetual alliance' with Rome

- **other factors:** mainly suggested above, but credit for weighing up importance of what Masinissa and Syphax actually 'did' in comparison to the importance of the judgements made by the Carthaginian and Roman leaders in their attempts to turn the situation in Numidia to their own advantage.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[20 marks]

Section 2

Option C

- 10 'In the period down to 205 BC, Quintus Fabius Maximus made a more effective contribution to the Roman war-effort than Publius Scipio Africanus did.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to the books of Livy and Plutarch you have read. Do not discuss Scipio's campaign in Africa.

You might include discussion of

- the different circumstances down to 205 BC in which Fabius and Scipio made their contributions
- the actions each took and their results
- support from the Senate and individual Roman leaders
- the opposition each faced from his own side and from the enemy
- the relationship between Fabius and Scipio.

Discussion might include:

- **situation when each made major contribution:**
Fabius: appointed at a low point of Roman history; cumulative effect of Hannibal's victories (up to and including Cannae) made defeat look likely, if not certain; Fabius had been appointed Dictator after Trasimene, but met opposition (below) and laid down his dictatorship before Cannae; after the disaster there he was put in charge again and remained so for more than a decade; **Scipio:** some input as very young man early in war (saving father, etc.) but came to fore in Spain; at this time war still hung in balance; Scipio volunteered to lead the campaign in Spain (210 BC) and over the next five years consolidated the country for Rome; his second spell of authority came in proposing and leading the expedition to Africa, at a time when the balance of the war was swinging towards Rome (partly because of success in Spain)
- **what each did:**
Fabius: after Trasimene he had right ideas but Senate chose Minucius as Master of the Horse; Fabius argued lack of moral fibre was the problem; organised sacrifices, then started policy of 'delaying tactics'; not popular with all as costing allied cities (left to Hannibal) and seen as inaction; rash Minucius decided to attack and walked into Hannibal's trap: Fabius rescued him, but withdrew from dictatorship soon afterwards; Varro took over and his rashness led to Cannae and even worse crisis; Fabius stepped back in (with less opposition this time); basically took over – sought accurate news of Cannae, imposed curfew to stop panic, posted guards, etc.; fortunately Hannibal didn't follow up with attack on Rome so (after urging refusal of chance to ransom hostages) Fabius renewed his delaying policy; his only major aggressive act was the capture of Tarentum in 209 BC; in all his policy held good for a decade; credit for querying what would have happened had Scipio not changed tack and moved the war to Africa;
Scipio: small but important (?) contributions as young man (possibly saving father after Ticinus; also rallying troops after Cannae); first major contribution in charge in Spain from 210 onwards; war at a stalemate? Defeated Hasdrubal Barca at Baecula in 208 (use of Hannibal-like tactics – dividing army and getting behind enemy); did not chase Hasdrubal Barca as he headed to Italy (good tactic); major battle at Ilipa in 206 (and subsequent occupation of harbour town of Gades) gave Rome control of Spain; next led

mission to take on Carthaginians in Africa; trained men (despite problems below), crossed, gained useful allies (especially Masinissa); leant heavily on (and lucky to have – compare early colleagues of Fabius) good fellow generals (eg Laelius); forced recall of Hannibal to Africa; peace terms left to Scipio (was he too merciful? 3rd Punic war still to come!); credit for assessing whether Scipio was just finishing off the job started by Fabius, or whether Fabius' tactics had outstayed their welcome and Scipio effectively rescued Rome

- **support received:**

both achieved at times despite, rather than because of 'help' at home; **Fabius:** had to stand by and watch as Flaminius and Varro recklessly undermined his efforts by joining all out battle (and losing); Minucius in lesser way not much help – kept arguments going in Senate, splitting the men and nearly causing a disaster; Senate finally showed support and by the time of Scipio's rise Fabius held enough sway in Senate to nearly prevent his invasion of Africa; indirectly Scipio's work in Spain was Fabius' greatest help, whether or not he appreciated it; **Scipio:** by contrast surrounded himself with good generals (Marcellus / Laelius, etc.); on the other hand, like Fabius, it took him a long time to gain full support from the Senate (see below); he also had knack of knowing how to treat allies which led to easier victories than would otherwise have been the case

- **opposition:**

see above (and below) for opposition from within; **Fabius** was up against Hannibal in his prime; Hannibal had just won staggering victories and Cannae could have settled war; credit for assessing how much the survival of Rome was due to Fabius' judgements and how much to Hannibal's indecision; later Fabius only really had Hannibal to face (at Tarentum Fabius' tactics led Hannibal to call him 'another Hannibal'); **Scipio** had Hasdrubal Barca as his main opponent in Spain; good use of tactics to beat him (but evidence suggests Hasdrubal was no Hannibal); Scipio only had to face Hannibal as a weary and disillusioned character (worn down at last by Fabius?)

- **relationship between them:**

not actually much cross-over until 205: while Fabius was tracking Hannibal round Italy, Scipio was making his way as a young soldier; Scipio's achievements in Spain were well away from Fabius (although both won battles there); the relationship came to a head over whether to adopt a change of tactics; desperate struggle between the two; Fabius restricted Scipio but could not stop him; is it fair to judge Fabius on his actions as an old man, given that he saw his achievements in jeopardy? What if Scipio had lost? (but he didn't!).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[30 marks]

Option D

- 11 'To find out about the character of Quintus Fabius Maximus, read Plutarch. To find out about his skills as a leader in times of war, read Livy.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and support your answer with discussion of specific passages from the books of Plutarch and Livy you have read.

You might include discussion of:

- each author's background and chosen literary form
- the areas on which each author chooses to focus
- the degree of detail each applies to his chosen areas.

Discussion might include:

- **backgrounds / lit forms:**

as long as linked to the comparison required by the title, candidates may point out that we have two different authors from different eras and of different nationalities (although neither writing at any time near the events described); both writing from a common source (Polybius) so it is pertinent to discuss which sections each chooses to use / emphasise (see below); **Livy** was writing in the early Empire (late 1st Century BC) under patronage of Augustus (Second Punic War some 200 years earlier); Livy's Fabius' is a small part of a huge **history of Rome** from creation to 'present day' (part of Augustus' programme to restore Rome's sense of pride and self-confidence); **Plutarch** was wealthy Greek born about 45 AD; took up Roman citizenship (under patronage of wealthy Roman of consular family and later friend of Emperor Hadrian) but remained in Greece for most of life; interested in philosophy so keen to look at past figures to see what made them tick; main work to create **biographies** of pairs of similar characters (1 Greek, 1 Roman - Fabius was paired with the Greek Pericles for these political biographies)

- **areas of focus / detail:**

general: **Livy** as Roman historian was looking primarily at the war as a whole; his interest in Fabius is confined to the part he played here; any other details are mentioned in passing (his death, etc.) or not at all (his youth and early character) if not directly relevant to the war; **Plutarch's** interest is in Fabius the man; his fighting abilities are only dealt with when it illustrates an aspect of Fabius' character or in which he made a major contribution; areas of Fabius' life not connected with war are given equal coverage (helping understand Fabius the war leader better than Livy?)

Some likely specific areas for discussion might include:

character: 'Fabius' childhood: **Plutarch** sees this as important; **Livy** doesn't mention it (as might be expected given bullet points 2 and 3 below); believed to have been taken from Polybius who stressed negatives (slow learning, docile behavior, appearance as 'dull and stupid', etc.), Plutarch's account elegantly makes counter-argument ('greatness of spirit'; 'unshakeable resolution', etc.); all helps to provide explanation of the strengths and weaknesses of the older Fabius (and so may be seen to support the quotation?); **before and after Cannae:** **Plutarch** spends a lot of time sketching the characters of Flaminius (at Trasimene) and Varro (at Cannae); in between comes a long section on Minucius - all to contrast their rash 'qualities' with those of Fabius (shown in the section which follows reinforcing the strength of Fabius' character by detailing his response to Cannae); while **Livy**; on the other hand covers this ground (hence suggesting the quote is not the whole story?), the contrast between Fabius and the other leaders is less

prominent) – relevant when discussing ‘focus’ and ‘detail’ below? **the Fabius / Scipio dispute:** students will not have met the arguments in the Senate re Scipio’s Africa proposals in **Livy**, so full credit if they see **Plutarch’s** account of this (with good psychological profile of the older Fabius) as important in ‘character study’;
skills as a leader: credit on the other hand for attempts to look at how the two authors portray Fabius’ leadership skills: **Livy’s** efforts are easy to find (passim) but **Plutarch’s** descriptions of Fabius’ contribution in battle call into question the accuracy of the quotation (his descriptions of Fabius’ saving of Minucius and the later Battle for Tarentum for example where tactics are discussed, not to mention the leadership aspects of his post-Cannae actions as Dictator); lots of possible examples from both authors to use here

- **conclusion:**
the essential ingredient of any successful answer will involve direct comparison between the two authors (possibly, but not necessarily exclusively, along the lines of these bullet points); a key element of any higher level answer will be the use of incidents and passages from both authors to support the basic argument.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

[30 marks]

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2F The Second Punic War

Section 1

Either
Option A

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

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
05	1	-	1
06	1	-	1
07	3	-	3
08	5	5	10
09	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section 2

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
10	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
11	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

OVERALL

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