

---

AS

# Classical Civilisation

CIV2F The Second Punic War  
Mark scheme

---

2020  
June 2016

---

Version: 1.0 Final

---

---

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the student uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

**Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.**

## DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of students after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Students are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

## QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the student's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

---

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS**

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

---

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS**

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

---

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS**

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

**This page has been left intentionally blank**

**Unit CIV2F The Second Punic War****Section 1****Option A**

0	1
---	---

**Which serving consul died at Cannae?**
**[1 mark]**

Paullus (1)

0	2
---	---

**What immediate actions did Fabius suggest following Cannae to keep Rome calm? Make four points.**
**[4 marks]**

**Four from:** to send riders out (1) / to gather information (1) / to keep women indoors (1) / to keep silence (1) / to restrict mourning (1) / to post guards (1) / to stop people leaving (1) / the Senate should act to avoid confusion/chaos (1) / there should be silence throughout the city (1) / people should stay at home (1) / festivals were cancelled (1) / there should be increased military presence throughout city (1) / they buried a vestal virgin (1) / a messenger was sent to Delphi (1) / they consulted the sacred books (1) / they made human sacrifices (1)

0	3
---	---

**To what extent did Marcellus show ‘a spirit of enterprise and daring’ (lines 9–10) in his actions after the battle of Cannae and until his death in 208 BC?**
**[10 marks]**

**Discussion might include:** by the Second Punic War he had built up a reputation as a great military leader (awarded a triumph for victory over the Gauls) but was virtually retired; appointed Praetor in 216 BC aged 52 he was about to go to Sicily but was recalled to help deal with the aftermath of Cannae: he sent his 1500 men to garrison Rome: he then moved to Nola which he defended successfully against Hannibal who was moving south (probably his biggest achievement here as, although not decisive, it was Hannibal's first reverse); credit for seeing this as complementing Fabius' policy of attrition; Marcellus suffered a setback in 215 being removed as consul in favour of Fabius Maximus after some bad omens; appointed proconsul he defended Nola for a second time, again taking some pressure off the Fabian policies; back as consul in 214 he not only defended Nola for a third time, but led the capture of Casilinum; all keeping Hannibal at bay while the effects of time, losses of men and disenchantment at home gradually weakened the Carthaginian position; foreshadowing the much younger Scipio ten years later, Marcellus was sent to tackle the key area of Sicily which was hovering between the opposing sides; he took Leontini in 214, but had to confront a rebellion from Roman rule by Syracuse among others; after a grim 2 year siege Syracuse fell (positive evidence for the title) but he failed to win over Agrigentum, resigning from his post in late 211 BC; for this failure he did not receive a triumph (negative evidence perhaps for addressing the question); consul again in 210 (not totally popular because of brutality and only partial success in Sicily; also approaching 60 years old), he fought Hannibal in Apulia; this went very successfully (eg victory at Salapia and an honourable draw fighting directly against Hannibal at Numistro); he reached a stalemate with Hannibal again in 209 and was reappointed consul yet again for 208, taking the field at Venusia where he was



ambushed and killed; on balance students may conclude that the war came too late in life for Marcellus to truly merit the title 'sword of Rome' (more suitable for Scipio later), but that his aggressive efforts did serve to enhance (and even perhaps make possible) the Fabian delaying tactics that set up the opportunity for Scipio to emerge as saviour.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

0	4
---	---

**'Fabius was as much a hindrance as a help to the Romans in defeating Hannibal.'**

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

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the circumstances in which Fabius was appointed dictator**
- **his dictatorship after Lake Trasimene**
- **his actions after Cannae**
- **the Roman Senate's relationship with Fabius**
- **the middle years of the war**
- **his dealings with Scipio.**

**[20 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **general:** this invites students to look at the two sides of Fabius' leadership: even in the months immediately after Cannae when his policy was most effective there was great concern among the other Italians that Rome was sacrificing them for her own safety; as the war dragged on the need for a change of tactics became increasingly evident, yet Fabius remained totally opposed, nearly keeping Scipio from his successful taking of the war to Africa; students may come down on either side of the question but should weigh up the evidence both ways before reaching their conclusions; the clear successes of his post-Cannae years need to be carefully weighed against his 'peevishness and malice' in working against Scipio's successes in Africa
- **appointment as dictator:** Rome had been let down by a series of at best only adequate leaders (eg Cornelius Scipio), at worst over-confident ones (eg Sempronius at the Trebia); Hannibal had outflanked the Senate by crossing the Alps in winter and advanced fast across northern Italy; Cornelius Scipio put his trust in his larger forces but was wounded and beaten; Flaminius, the leader at Lake Trasimene then apparently ignored adverse omens and rushed into battle with Hannibal's (again much smaller) forces, suffering a major disaster; Fabius had been counselling caution and the Senate responded to this defeat by appointing him Dictator, apparently accepting the wisdom of his tactics; clearly at this point he was the main ray of hope rather than any sort of 'hindrance' to Roman safety
- **after Trasimene:** Fabius advised the introduction of a 'scorched earth' policy denying resources to Hannibal; this also involved refusing to face him with the main army, but using guerilla tactics to strike with small forces; this caused great upset to Rome's Italian allies who were left to fend for themselves; students may wish to argue how helpful or otherwise Fabius' tactics were here; certainly he split the Senate persuading them to appoint the more aggressive-minded Minucius as Chief-of-Horse; despite eventually winning Minucius over (by saving him from a disaster at Gerontium), further opposition arose leading to Varro being given his head at Cannae: he (with the more moderate Paullus whose pro-Fabian views were overruled) led the Romans to a defeat which left their city on the brink of disaster; seen in this context

students may see the Fabius' post-Trasimene attempts to wear Hannibal down vindicated as the better (only?) way forward for Rome at that point

- **after Cannae:** as the passage suggests, Fabius was now seen by all as the man for this situation; students may wish to speculate whether Hannibal could have made the question irrelevant if he had marched on Rome immediately; this apart, Fabius' responses, both socially and militarily inspired (see 02 above), can be argued to have made the best of the situation as it stood; by restoring discipline to the city he prevented internal strife; by maintaining his policy of non-confrontation he encouraged Hannibal to roam around Italy picking off the allies one by one (credit here for referring briefly to Marcellus acting as his foil by attempting to protect the more important allies); by the end of 216 with Hannibal's forces dispersed well away from Rome Fabius seems to have achieved his initial aim of saving the city
- **Roman Senate:** areas for discussion could include the clear existence of pro and anti Fabius factions throughout the period, perhaps best exemplified by the appointment of Minucius (see 'after Trasimene' above); also the arguments much later over the appointment of Scipio to move the war to Africa, etc.
- **middle years:** students may see Fabius' contribution to the years from 216 to the rise of Scipio and invasion of Africa as a more complex area of argument; initially the containment policy was successful as Hannibal's wearying forces became less and less effective in Italy; they remained unbeaten in any major battle however, so the Italians remained unimpressed by the Romans' attitude; Fabius' conquest of Tarentum in 209 represented a rare and short-lived move away from the defensive mindset; there was also stalemate in the other main arena, Spain: students may argue that a change of approach was needed and that the rise (through success in battle rather than containment) of the younger Scipio marked such a change; also that Fabius' lack of trust either in Scipio or his policies shows the beginnings of Fabius as a hindrance
- **relationship with Scipio:** students may cite Plutarch 25/26 as evidence of an increasingly negative effect of Fabius' attitude and tactics: following Scipio's successes in Spain from his appointment there in 211 via his defeat (and the death) of Hasdrubal Barca in 207 to his driving out of the Carthaginian leaders in 206, the thought occurred that the war was there to be won by Rome; students may see Fabius' attempts to 'do his utmost to spread doubts' about Scipio's subsequent appointment to take the war to Africa as being significant in their final judgements; while crediting Fabius with initially using his 'instinctive caution', Plutarch asserts that his opposition became 'violent and extreme' almost causing the Africa mission to be aborted; luckily this apparent attempt at 'hindrance' failed but Fabius continued to plot against Scipio, forcing a restriction on the troops Scipio could take; only Scipio's early successes turned the Senate away from Fabius who died still 'casting gloom over the general celebrations' when the war was almost won.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

**Option B**

**0 5** Which African city was Scipio besieging at the start of 203 BC? [1 mark]

Utica (1)

**0 6** Who was the Numidian enemy leader who opposed Scipio at this time? [1 mark]

Syphax (1)

**0 7** How did the siege end? Give three details. [3 marks]

**Three from:** Scipio sent Laelius (1) / to set Syphax's camp on fire (1) / then used (Masinissa's ) cavalry (1) to massacre Syphax's panicking men (1) / this panicked the soldiers in the main Carthaginian camp (1) / who ran out and were massacred (1) / although the Carthaginian leaders escaped (1) / the Carthaginians rallied (1) / met the Romans (in the battle of the Great Plains) (1) / Roman cavalry broke through (1) / and routed Carthaginian & Numidian army (1) / no defence now for Utica (1) / so city fell (1)

**0 8** How dramatically in the passage does Livy suggest that this was to be a very important year for Rome? [10 marks]

**Discussion might include:** the fact that 'The Great Games' were to take place was significant as these were only to be held when Rome had turned a corner (presumably big negative change had been feared but the city had managed to 'still survive unchanged'); omens are sent by the gods to indicate that something is afoot: very many seem to have occurred so suggesting this is a very important juncture: the idea of crows (or mice) eating or even gnawing gold is clearly an impossibility: credit to students who attempt to explain this (possibly the Romans will get their 'bite' into an apparently invulnerable enemy – will it be the other way round?); the Capitol was the focal point of Roman religion so this was obviously a very important happening with divine support; again there is possible ambiguity with the locusts: these pernicious insects travel fast across fields devastating crops: does this signify the Romans ravaging Carthaginian lands or vice versa? A five-footed foal is a rare but not unknown phenomenon, but such an animal would be an object of revulsion flying in the face of nature: is this indicating the gods' displeasure over something or simply a neutral sign that the unexpected is soon to happen? Fire often represents war and bloodshed so the happenings at Anagnia could portend death and destruction – but for whom? The signs from Frusino suggest interference with the normal sunlight; only the most dramatic of events could cause this: yet it is not an eclipse (involving darkness) but an extra source of light; credit for students who understand that Livy is writing with hindsight; he knows this will be a great year for Rome in Africa; so the 'subsidence' at Arpinum may represent the collapse of a great power; the liver was the main organ used by seers to prophecy the future; the lack of a regular feature (the 'head') again indicates that something very strange is happening; the short final paragraph suggests that at this time (unlike certain others Livy describes) the Romans were attending to their religious duties very thoroughly (so everything would go well for them?); students may discuss the imagery without getting very deeply into these

issues which are highly subjective; credit will be given for any sensible ideas based on use of language, symbolism etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

0	9
---	---

**How important a part did the Romans' religious practices and beliefs play at key points in the Second Punic War?**

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

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the declaration of war**
- **the battles in Italy up to and including Cannae**
- **Rome under Fabius Maximus**
- **Scipio's actions in Spain and Africa**
- **decisions of the Roman Senate.**

**[20 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **general:** religion is a theme that permeates the events of the war, particularly in Livy's account: students should examine whether at times religion rather than tactical sense on the ground led to questionable decisions and actions; they may suggest that with Livy writing with hindsight he may at times be seeking excuses for simple incompetence when blaming defeats on the failure to observe omens, pray enough etc; credit too for students who point out that Plutarch tends to focus on the human side of the early failings (and later successes, although there may be a shift here in Livy also); they may also discuss whether the need for the senate to accompany every decision with elaborate rituals had any effect on decisions taken at key moments; they should be aware that the modern equating of religion with (western-style) 'morality' was not a feature of ancient Rome; overall this is a wide topic and students will be able to reach high level marks without necessarily dealing with all the bullet points; more will depend on a general empathy with the question
- **declaration of war:** following the Carthaginian threat to lay siege to Saguntum the Romans were nearly panicked into an immediate declaration of war, but a 'period of public prayer' was declared; a delegation including Fabius Maximus was then sent to enquire of the Carthaginian Senate whether they wanted peace or war; the Carthaginians did not ask for peace making them in a sense the main aggressors; had the Romans' religious practices not held them back they may have been technically the aggressors (not perhaps a huge point but important from both moral and propaganda points of view?)
- **up to Cannae:** Livy provides two speeches before **Ticinus**: Cornelius Scipio makes no reference to the gods before joining battle (students may contrast this with the religious fervour displayed at regular points in Hannibal's speech); certain ominous events' made the Romans unhappy about their prospects; Rome lost in a close run battle, leading Sempronius to sail from Sicily with a big army to sort things out with Cornelius Scipio; describing the Roman defeat at **Trebia** Livy again does not mention religion in the build-up or the battle; following this Livy reports a series of strange happenings (similar to the passage – a baby shouting 'victory'; 'shapes .. in the sky' etc); as a result the Romans held many elaborate rituals ('consulting the Sacred Books'; 'a nine-day period of supplication'; gifts to gods etc) perhaps mindful of the failings by the Roman commanders; the consul designate Flaminius kept away from

the rituals, resulting in the Senate accusing him of being at war not only with them 'but with the gods'; a list of his religious transgressions follows; the Senate recalled him but too late; he led his men at **Trasimene** with disastrous results; students may see this as a 'key point' for discussion; similarly the build-up to **Cannae** features a Livy set-piece in the Senate: the popular party candidate Varro had been elected consul, with the patricians setting up their man Paullus as his colleague; as they set off for Cannae Fabius addressed Paullus asking that he keep the reckless Varro in check: no mention is made of religion; once the scale of the disaster at Cannae was known however, another set of religious failings (eg 'sexual incontinence of two Vestal Virgins'); were identified and drastic measures (including human sacrifice and the sending of envoys to the oracle at Delphi) were taken; the fiercely religious Fabius was now the unquestioned setter of policy for the next few years

- **Fabius:** when he was appointed Dictator after Trasimene (above) he instituted immediate changes ('beginning with a reference to religious matters' he blamed the defeats on 'neglect of the traditional ceremonies'); his initial actions included consulting the Sibylline Books which revealed errors in the recent rituals, holding public prayers etc; this religious changes went hand in hand with his decision to tackle Hannibal by delaying tactics etc; his religion-backed stubbornness allowed him to see off the challenge from Minucius, but he could not convince the Senate to oppose Varro's aggressive approach at Cannae (above); after Fabius' religious post-Cannae efforts Livy reports that 'the gods being now .. adequately appeased', life could move on; Fabius and Marcellus now gained relative success in the former's delaying tactics and the latter's more aggressive measures in support of Nola and other Italian allies; Fabius' successes culminated in his victory at Tarentum where Plutarch tells us 'Fabius killed the people but spared their gods'; students may speculate on how much religion drove Fabius' later hostility to Scipio's attempts to change the direction of the war; Plutarch's full account blames this on character defects of the now old Senator, and makes no mention of religion, but some may feel that these defects, in part at least, sprung from his inflexible religious beliefs
- **Scipio:** we first hear him addressing the Cannae survivors promising 'I shall never desert our country' adding 'if I willfully break my oath .. may Jupiter .. bring me a shameful death', an oath he made the other survivors swear; this sets the scene for his later actions: little is said of this initially in the later books however where Scipio is shown as a man of action rather than a contemplator of religion: the religious focus is more on the Senate (below); religion played a part in hampering his progress: following Pleminius' abuse of his position at Locri, 'rites of expiation' were performed (at Fabius' suggestion) and it was suggested that Scipio be arrested; while he fought this (religiously inspired?) attack, it held up and even threatened his Africa campaign; his successes there
- **Senate:** as well as the position of the Senate as ensuring that all religious ceremonies were properly conducted (including their apparent failures to do this under 'early battles' above), there are occasions, usually critical moments such as post-Cannae above, where the Senate took it upon itself to be proactive: in Book XXXI Livy reports 'a wave of superstition' sweeping over Rome: the Senate again consulted the Sibylline Books and found that if they brought a statue of Cybele back to Rome, any foreign invader could be defeated; this was done and the war soon turned decisively in Rome's favour (Livy and hindsight here?); the events in the passage were part of the same build-up: the fewer general references to religion in Books XXIX and XXX however possibly results from Rome being generally successful in these years, so there is no need to find excuses (or turn events round) by reference to religious action; the Roman misbehaviour at Locri (above) was an exception.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

**Section 2****Option C**

1 0

**‘Hannibal’s qualities as a leader were so brilliant that he deserved to win the Second Punic War.’**

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

**You might include discussion of:**

- **Hannibal’s performance up to 216 BC**
- **his performance after 216 BC**
- **his dealings with other Carthaginian leaders**
- **his dealings with the Carthaginian Senate**
- **his Roman opponents.**

**[30 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **general:** this essay offers students a chance to focus on the various aspects of Hannibal’s character and leadership to assess how ‘brilliant’ he was, hopefully at various points in the war; then to look further at whether his performance was the crucial factor in Carthage’s defeat; while many students may choose to support the quotation, there is no ‘right answer’ and there are many shades of grey to be debated here
- **Hannibal to 216:** introduced to us by Livy in Book XXI in a remarkably positive way: he made himself ‘beloved and obeyed’ by his men; he had ‘superb tactical ability’; he was ‘unequaled as a fighting man’ etc (although he does add the barbarian stereotypes of cruelty, lying, impiety etc); he always left the Romans two steps behind him in Spain by his quick-thinking, and students may see his crossing of the Alps as demonstrating ‘brilliance’ both of planning, leadership and personal endurance (although the losses he suffered en route may be used to argue against this); regarding the early battles in Italy it would be interesting to consider how far his (undoubted at least initially) tactical brilliance won the day and how far the Roman defeats were self-inflicted; at **Ticinus** C Scipio had matched Hannibal’s thinking with both arriving at the river at much the same time; Scipio made the first move, across the river; Hannibal plied his troops with promises; the Romans were beset by bad omens; tactically Scipio let his spearmen impede his cavalry; the well-organised Numidian opposition cut through them and the battle was lost; at **Trebia** Hannibal was faced by a much bigger and more battle-hardened Roman army supplemented by Sempronius’ force returned from success in Sicily; disagreement between the two Roman commanders (Sempronius and the still-wounded C Scipio) led to tactical errors; Hannibal saw ‘luck was with him’, seized the opportunity and provoked a instant response from Sempronius; he drew the Romans across the icy river, which weakened them considerably; Hannibal kept his troops warm, posted his cavalry on each wing with infantry between them and elephants as the surprise tactic outside the cavalry; his baliaries then attacked from the front while Mago and the Numidians hit the unsuspecting Romans from behind; this was Hannibal’s first use of this tactic in Italy and crushed the ‘superior’ Roman forces; students may well praise the ‘brilliance’ here – but wonder why the Romans later kept falling for the same trick; **Trasimene** saw a virtual repeat with another reckless Roman commander, Flaminius, falling into

a similar trap (lured into a dangerous position hemmed in by mountains, then attacked from all sides while completely unprepared); **Cannae** combined the ‘two non-communicating Roman commanders’ problem of Trebia (reported to Hannibal through his excellent spy system) with trickery on Hannibal’s part leaving a ‘deserted camp’ to lure the Romans; this did not work however so he had to rethink quickly; he took up a position with the wind behind him; the Roman commanders with 86,000 troops (to Hannibal’s c 45,000) argued over whether to attack, allowing Hannibal to pick off some of their fringe groups; faced with his first open battle Hannibal put all his strength into his cavalry (the Romans’ weaker area); as his cavalry won the day Hannibal withdrew his infantry in the centre, luring the Romans into pushing forward; now they were surrounded as the victorious Carthaginian cavalry hit them from the rear; result: victory for Hannibal against the odds – by his ‘brilliance’, Roman disunity or both? It seemed Rome was ready for the taking, but Hannibal rejected Maharbal’s advice to be told ‘you know how to win a fight; you do not know how to use your victory’; students may well use this as a crucial part of their argument

- **Hannibal after 216 BC:** the advent of Fabius’ scorched earth, containment policy prevented any further mass battles; Hannibal too pursued his own war of attrition trying to discourage Rome by picking off her allies in Italy one at a time; while to a degree successful opposition from Marcellus kept Nola and Casilinum amongst other safe causing Hannibal to run out of ideas; away from home, starved of resources and reinforcements, Hannibal restricted himself to minor skirmishes while his fellow-leaders in Spain began to lose ground to new (and better) Roman leaders; his ‘brilliance’ may be argued as remaining as he kept his troops loyal and remained personally unbeaten, but students may argue that he gradually lost control of the war; when he eventually returned to Africa the contrast between his age and battle-worn demeanour and the still youthful Scipio is clear; Zama, the decisive battle of 202 BC ironically sees Hannibal’s tactical ‘brilliance’ turned on him by Scipio’s adoption of similar tactics to those used by Hannibal above; again students may consider this important in answering the question
- **other Carthaginian leaders:** although some of his fellow leaders provided effective support (eg his brothers Mago at the early battles and Hasdrubal early on his Spain) their overall careers suggest that they were no match for their Roman equivalents (Hasdrubal was defeated and killed by Scipio’s forces; Mago took over as commander in Spain but failed to hold off the Roman advance); students may consider that for Carthage to have won the war it would have required more ‘brilliance’ from at least one of the others; also some of Hannibal’s subordinates had good ideas: Maharbal was a tactically sound cavalry leader but students may see as more important here his advice quoted above and the way it reflected on Hannibal’s brilliance; the switching around of the Numidian leaders did not help Carthage: their capable ally Masinissa deserted in favour of Rome, while Syphax, persuaded to join the Carthaginian cause by Hasdrubal Gisco, quickly perished
- **dealings with Carthaginian Senate:** while the Roman Senate may deserve some criticism, its Carthaginian counterpart was riven with rivalries which students may argue hampered Hannibal’s progress in the war; despite giving initial support to Hannibal (refusal to give him up to Rome at the outbreak of war) his support in the Senate remained at best lukewarm as Hanno, Hannibal’s late father’s great rival generally controlled things there; even when supplies and reinforcements were voted through, the Roman naval superiority often prevented these from arriving;
- **Roman opponents:** while Hannibal triumphed over a range of Roman generals, students may argue that once Fabius took over (and later with P Scipio) Hannibal had no more major victories; Fabius in particular may have lacked ‘brilliance’ but he wore Hannibal down, while Scipio as mentioned above beat him at his own game at Zama;



in addition, despite errors along the way (eg the early battles; their initial support for Fabius' motion against Scipio's African move), at crucial points in the war the Roman Senate came good; credit for students using the initial appointment of Fabius, support for Scipio in Spain etc as evidence of their superiority over the Carthaginian Senate.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

### Option D

1	1
---	---

**'Livy is more concerned to present Scipio Africanus as a perfect Roman than to present a balanced account of Scipio's achievements and failings in the Second Punic War.'**

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

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the qualities expected in a Roman leader**
- **Livy's reasons for writing his history**
- **his portrayal of Scipio's actions at the Ticinus and immediately after Cannae**
- **his portrayal of Scipio's campaigns in Spain**
- **his account of Scipio in Sicily**
- **his description of Scipio's behaviour at and after the Locri incident**
- **his account of Scipio's contribution to the African campaign.**

**[30 marks]**

**Discussion might include:**

- **general / Livy's reasons:** students should show awareness of Livy's background and stated reasons for writing his history: he was born some 150 years after the events he describes (themselves a small section of a giant work), so has had no access to no eyewitnesses of the events, and relied on secondary sources (eg Polybius); his own life was lived at a troubled period in Rome's life when many felt that the moral qualities of the past had been lost; to an extent Livy seeks to justify early victories and defeats in terms of the moral character (or lack of it) shown at the times they took place, and so offer a lesson to his own times; students may bear this in mind when assessing the quotation; simply relating the main contributions of Scipio will not reach the higher level marks; the suggestions below are only a selection of possible material; students reaching high level marks need not discuss all of them but may use many other suitable examples
- **Ticinus / Cannae:** Livy reports different views on whether it was P Scipio who saved his father after he was wounded commanding the Roman forces at the Ticinus, but states 'I myself prefer to believe' that he did; students may see this as being in support of the quotation (filial duty being a prerequisite of a true Roman since the story of Aeneas); the young Scipio next appears rallying the survivors after Cannae; students should be aware that speeches quoted verbatim are unlikely to have survived; this gives Livy the opportunity to put words into his characters' mouths and students may find the (very few) words quoted here worth considering: he comes straight to the point: 'come with me ... if you wish to save our country'; he then swears never to desert 'our country'; students may find the mix of total decisiveness and

patriotism here significant; having introduced Scipio (as ‘the man who was destined to command ..’) Livy puts the one man aside until the potential hero is fully developed

- **Spain:** Scipio was appointed in 210 at the age of 25 to oversee the whole campaign in Spain: he immediately restored the troops’ morale, secured vital alliances and captured the key port of New Carthage; his troops in total were fewer than the armies of either Mago or Hasdrubal Gisco; he then destroyed Hasdrubal Barca’s forces at Baecula (in 207 BC) before following up in 206 with a comprehensive defeat of the (much bigger) joint forces of Mago and Hasdrubal Gisco; by the end of 206 he had basically quelled the Carthaginians in Spain; it would be impossible to invent (and pointless to exaggerate?) such achievements
- **Sicily:** the island had been effectively used as a camp for wounded Roman soldiers for years; Scipio clearly addressed this by restoring morale to these men and turning them again into a disciplined fighting force; Sicily became a training camp for the African invasion; despite the Locri incident (below) this was a major achievement as shown by the later successes in Africa; he mixed discipline with humanity in training the men (if Livy’s story of the young man allowed to leave (‘I am perfectly willing to listen ...’ etc) is to be taken at face value
- **Locri:** students who up to this point are finding in favour of the accuracy of the quotation may see the story of Pleminius and Scipio as redressing the balance to a degree; Livy describes this (unsavoury) incident in great detail; while Pleminius is clearly ‘the villain’, Livy does not hold back in criticising Scipio: Scipio came to the aid of Pleminius, ensuring a Roman victory over the Carthaginian invaders who held the city; following internal squabbles Scipio found in favour of Pleminius who went on a rampage against Locrians and Romans alike; in the enquiry that followed Scipio was implicated but talked his way out of it; Livy cites at some length criticisms made of Scipio: ‘his dress and bearing were un-Roman’; ‘discipline .. had gone to the dogs’ etc; he concludes that ‘some of these accusations were true’; students may see this contradicting the quotation, at least in part
- **In Africa:** students may be credited for brief reference to Plutarch’s account in establishing that Scipio was a strong enough character to fight off the attempts by Fabius (and a number of Senators) to prevent his appointment; students may note the support he clearly enjoyed in enlisting his own men for the mission; also his unanimous appointment as Consul at the age of 31; they may go on to judge Livy’s description of Scipio’s dealings with the Numidian chiefs (Masinissa and Syphax) to be quite convincing even if the verbatim speeches might again be seen as rather suspect; Scipio’s siege and conquest of Utica (see 07 above) showed both strength and initiative, although the Carthaginian death toll of some 40 000 was reported by Polybius as showing excessive cruelty (not repeated by Livy); the set- piece meeting with Hannibal may again be treated with some care; students may feel some suspicion that the handing of the torch from Hannibal to Scipio (‘I rejoice .. that destiny has given me you’ etc) looks like Livy stressing a moral point rather than reporting a factual event; the tactics used by Scipio at Zama however have a ring of authenticity; credit for details of ‘the Roman Cannae’; also for reflection on the part Scipio played in the ensuing peace negotiations (was he too generous to the loser? – the 3rd Punic War followed).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

**Assessment Objectives Grid****Unit CIV2F The Second Punic War****Section 1****Either  
Option A**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	1	0	1
<b>02</b>	4	0	4
<b>03</b>	5	5	10
<b>04</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**or  
Option B**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>05</b>	1	0	1
<b>06</b>	1	0	1
<b>07</b>	3	0	3
<b>08</b>	5	5	10
<b>09</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Section 2****Either  
Option C**

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

**or  
Option D**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>11</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**Overall**

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