



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2004

Classical Studies

National Statistics

Assessment Report

Assessment Schedule

Classical Studies, Scholarship, 2004

National Statistics

Number of Results	Percentage		
	Not Achieved	Scholarship	Outstanding
263	61.6%	32.3%	6.1%

Assessment Report

Successful candidates understood that the key words in the Classical Studies scholarship standard are 'evaluate' and 'critically'. They identified points of importance to the questions they had chosen to answer and analysed material to make well-informed judgements. They looked carefully at what each question asked, made sure of the relevance of major points, and achieved a synthesis of these points. Their essays included the necessary mass of relevant detail in support of their argument, as well as reference to a range of ancient and, where appropriate, secondary sources.

Candidates who failed to meet the standard did not examine the requirements of the questions critically. Some candidates appeared to have memorised notes, without relevance to the questions in the examination. At this level, candidates should provide evidence of analytical insight and the ability to appreciate subtext. In some instances, candidates also failed to provide adequate supporting evidence, including reference to source materials. This omission detracted from several otherwise very good answers, particularly in the Alexander the Great and Augustus topics.

The scholarship standard calls for students to communicate their ideas clearly and coherently and to demonstrate ability in developing a cogent, well-supported argument and successful candidates were able to do this. Their essays were well-structured and showed evidence of sensible and intelligent planning. Unsuccessful candidates were prone to make sweeping and generalised statements without adequate support or, in some cases, with no support whatever.

Outstanding candidates showed a real depth of perception and the ability to think 'outside the circle'. They had the skill to make telling and significant points, often with an element of originality. They gave evidence of wide reading from a range of sources. The quality of their essay writing was first class and they maintained this level of excellence right across the examination.

Essays of scholarship standard were produced on all questions, except for Greek Science. No candidate answered on this topic.

Assessment Schedule

Scholarship Classical Studies (93404)

Evidence Statement

TOPIC ONE: ALEXANDER THE GREAT

Question One

Heredity and environment. What effect did these two factors have on Alexander's character and career? What other influences may have been at work?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should describe the differing characters of Philip and Olympias, and cite occasions in Alexander's life when he displayed similar characteristics. They should also examine the largely military environment in which he grew up, as well as the nature of Macedonian kingship, the cultural environment of Macedonia, and perhaps the emphasis on consumption of alcohol. Examples must be provided of these influences at work.

Other factors of importance might include the teachings of Leonidas and Aristotle, the example of traditional heroes, such as Herakles and Achilles, the sudden pressures or opportunities resulting from Philip's murder, preoccupation with deification, and the life-style of the Persian royalty whose world he made his own.

There should be some reference to primary sources such as Arrian, Plutarch or Quintus Curtius Rufus, as well as an acquaintance with secondary sources, such as Hamilton or Bosworth.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might suggest a possible time when Alexander's personal ambition became more significant than the influence of heredity.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates could also show awareness of the more exotic and wilder aspects of Olympias' character, and consider whether these characteristics were particularly predominant in Alexander's actions. They might also consider and evaluate additional influences, such as the attitudes of the Greek states, the sheer geographic and administrative immensity of the new empire, and the loneliness of the man at the top.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

To what extent was Alexander a genuine military genius? Was he, perhaps, just a lucky commander?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

This question calls for a balanced presentation, with both aspects given full consideration, and also a summary that presents the main points logically and draws a fair conclusion from them.

On the one hand, candidates should look, with examples, at Alexander's tactical skill, his speed of movement, his readiness to be innovative, and his personal charisma.

On the other hand, they should point to the superb military machine he inherited, ready-made, from Philip; the skill and loyalty of his commanders; his assumption, virtually *ex officio*, of the position of *hegemon* of the Corinthian League; and the frequent rashness from which he was rescued by the fighting qualities of his soldiers, or by sheer good luck.

There should be some reference to primary sources such as Arrian, Plutarch or Quintus Curtius Rufus, as well as an acquaintance with secondary sources, such as Hamilton or Bosworth.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might analyse Alexander's brilliant tactics against Porus, or the difficulties he got himself into, both before and during the battle of Issus.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates must analyse Alexander's military career in detail, examining a wide range of military factors. They should provide evidence of some insight into Alexander on the battlefield: his ability to act bravely and decisively, but also, at times, rashly, amid the dust and confusion of the fighting.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Using your own knowledge and the resource material below, discuss Alexander's destruction of Thebes in the light of:

- *his character and subsequent actions; and*
- *its effect on his relationship with the other Greek states.*

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must be able to place this action within the context of Alexander's life, both chronologically and in terms of its short- and long-term impact on the political situation. They should consider factors such as Philip's recent death and the possibility that other Greek states besides Thebes might well be expected to try and escape from the domination of Macedonia.

Candidates should notice the speed with which Alexander acted and the way that he always seemed to appear on the scene before anyone expected. Mention might also be made of the immediacy of his action, when older heads advised caution. Comparison could be made with the crossing of the Granicus.

Candidates should also note that Alexander was at first prepared to extend some lenience – as he did to Athens – although this was not always the case later on in Asia, when even the mere suggestion of resistance was sufficient to unleash destruction and terror.

They must also examine the effect of the destruction of Thebes on the other Greek states, especially Athens, their subsequent reluctance to risk rebellion (with the exception of Sparta), as well as the residue of mistrust and resentment.

There should be detailed and specific reference to each of the documents provided.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might analyse the motivation behind the destruction of Thebes, concluding that the razing of the city was a calculated act of terror intended to act as a warning to the other Greek states.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider Alexander's concern about the northern tribes, his need to establish himself as *hegemon* of the Corinthian League, and Demosthenes' influence at Athens.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC TWO: AUGUSTUS

Question One

To what extent did Augustus use women as pawns in a political and dynastic game?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should know who the women in question were: principally Scribonia, Livia, Octavia, and Julia, but mention might also be made of Clodia, Fulvia, and Cleopatra.

They should give an account of Augustus' involvement with each, showing the extent he did or did not make use of them, eg:

- Scribonia, who was much older, connected with the Sextus Pompeii, and soon divorced, having produced one daughter, Julia
- Octavia, whom he really loved, but after Marcellus' death was blatantly married to Antony to confirm the Treaty of Brindisium
- Julia, his daughter, who was married off to Marcellus, then Agrippa (much older), then Tiberius, and who 'went off the rails' after being used for breeding purposes
- Clodia, Antony's step-daughter, to whom the young Octavian was briefly betrothed in order to reinforce the alliance that led to the Triumvirate.

From these accounts, candidates must extrapolate the extent to which Augustus used women as pawns for political or dynastic purposes. References to primary and secondary sources, such as Suetonius or Syme, should be included.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, reference could be made to the enforced divorce of Tiberius and Vipsania that allowed the former to become Julia's third husband.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates should demonstrate a more subtle awareness of Augustus' relationships with these women. For example, they might consider Augustus' relationship with Livia. Was there an ongoing clash between the Julian and Claudian families? Could Livia be regarded as a pawn?

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Discuss the ways by which Augustus endeavoured to keep his policies and actions within the framework of the Republican constitution. To what extent might this have been just a façade?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must display a sound knowledge of the political and administrative structure of Imperial Rome. They should discuss any differences in that structure under Augustus, showing that they were mainly differences of emphasis and terminology, but with subtle variations to concentrate real power at the top.

They should observe, with examples, that the *ordo equester* was given a greater share of administrative responsibility, but that much real power had been lost by the Senate, and that many significant republican offices were concentrated in the hands of one man – Augustus – and generally on a longer-term basis than just one year (which was the usual republican time limit).

They should nonetheless acknowledge that, while the final say generally resided in the person of Augustus, both the senatorial and equestrian orders still had big and important parts to play in running the empire.

This information should come from standard histories, such as Scullard, but reference could also be made to primary sources, such as Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and the *Res Gestae*.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might ask: how true is it to say the clock could not be put back, and that a total reversion to the former type of government would probably have resulted in further civil war?

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might ask: firstly, how likely is it, regardless of the clamour in the Senate in 27 BC, that many saw Augustus as their only hope of security; secondly, might Octavian have felt during the 20s BC, as a result of fatigue and ill health, that he would happily have relinquished the reins of office?

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare the following descriptions of Augustus' rise to power, one by Augustus himself and one by Tacitus (the 2nd century historian), and discuss their historical validity.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must analyse each passage in detail. Both are full of half-truths, vital omissions and deliberate misstatements. Both also contain an element of truth.

In the *Res Gestae*, the most significant omission, both in the passages quoted and the whole document, is the actual name of Mark Antony. Many statements can be justified up to a point by reference to the facts, but they stop short of telling the whole story.

The second passage, although not wholly claimed as Tacitus' personal opinion, does not scruple to use emotive language and even deliberate and unproven allegations of crime, such as the poisoning of one of the consuls.

Candidates should refer to other historians such as Suetonius and Cassius Dio, to other passages by Tacitus, and to secondary sources, such as Scullard and possibly Syme, in order to provide a balanced viewpoint.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might analyse the implications of Augustus' reference to "universal consent" and Tacitus' use of the words "lust for power".

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might examine the authorial bias evident in both of these passages and comment on the choice of vocabulary by both authors: for example, Augustus' use of the first person and the derogatory terms employed by Tacitus.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC THREE: GREEK VASE PAINTING

Question One

Discuss the emotive elements in Greek vase painting. How are these depicted and with what success? You must refer to a wide range of vases in your answer.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must first choose vases with relevant subject matter. An obvious example might be the Kleophrades Painter's *hydria*, with its depiction of the Trojan War.

However they should not confine their commentary to grief and mourning, nor to the set vases. A range of emotions should be considered, including happiness, celebration, ecstasy, or even orgiastic fulfilment, and these emotive elements should be analysed in examples of black-figure, red-figure and possibly white-ground vases.

Candidates should discuss the degree of emotion portrayed and give examples of how emotion is presented. They might, for example, comment on the use of gesture for the rejoicing Athenians on the François Vase, or on the narrative focus of the children on the Kleophrades Painter's *hydria*.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might note the pathos of the portrayal of the victims of Troy's final hour, as painted by the Kleophrades Painter.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates should look in greater detail at the questions of technique and style, and consider on the one hand whether the limitations of the black-figure technique inhibited the display of emotion and, on the other, whether the mannerist style largely dispensed with it.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

In what ways, as their technique developed, did Greek vase painters contrive to give an illusion of depth? Discuss the extent to which individual painters were successful in this regard.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should begin by describing the various techniques employed, such as overlapping, foreshortening, and three-quarter viewpoints.

They might then review these techniques chronologically, from the earliest flat patterns of the black-figure period to the later developments of red figure, such as multiple ground lines.

The next and most important step must be to cite examples of these techniques by individual painters, placing them in their chronological context and evaluating their degree of success. One such example might be from the Lydos column *krater*. On this vase the satyr behind the donkey has a full-frontal face and profile body – a failed attempt, because of technical limitations, to show a three-quarter pose and hence to indicate depth.

Candidates should show detailed knowledge of several of the prescribed Level 3 vases and some acquaintance with other relevant works.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might note the significance of the introduction of the red-figure technique in facilitating the depiction of an illusion of depth, or the impact of other media, such as wall-painting.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might show an appreciation of the overall degree of realism that individual artists were trying to achieve, or alternatively consider the problem of vase shapes and the limitations the decorative surface imposed on painters.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare and contrast the two vase paintings in Reproductions A and B of the Resource Booklet, one by the Amasis Painter and the other by the Meidias Painter.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should present a careful description of each vase, considering its shape, approximate date, figural and non-figural decoration, and general style.

They should move from there to specific comparisons, such as treatment of figures, depiction of drapery, spatial effects, variation of ground line and, of course, the restrictions imposed or the opportunities offered by the differing techniques.

Candidates might also consider each vase in relation to their knowledge of other works by the same artists and of the historical period in which they worked.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, the influence of the mannerist style on the work of the Meidias Painter might be noted, as might this painter's increased awareness of the female form.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might discuss the subject matter of each vase in greater detail. For example, they might explain the religious background of the Dionysiac vase, or the idyllic, or even possibly decadent atmosphere of the Meidias Painter's vase.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC FOUR: ART OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Question One

Comment on Wheeler's description of triumphal arches as "monstrous toys, idle contrivances of grand but nonsensical irrelevance". Discuss this description in terms of architectural quality and political purpose. Can Wheeler's casual dismissal be justified?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should cite the arches prescribed for Level 3, and any others they have studied, noting the time they were erected, the emperors who were responsible, and the men, events, or successes that they commemorated.

They should choose at least two arches, preferably contrasting ones, and discuss in detail their design, sculptural reliefs, and inscriptions. They should know that arches had multiple purposes and that, in Rome at least, they were convenient vehicles for relief sculpture and part of a tradition that includes the *Ara Pacis*, Trajan's column, etc. They might also consider the motives that lay behind the building of these arches: for example, did they attempt to glorify Rome, to impress provincials, or indulge an imperial ego?

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might discuss the importance of the dedications on the Arch of Titus and Arch of Constantine.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider the propagandist elements associated with the construction of specific arches. For example: was Domitian seeking reflected glory from Titus' achievements, or even possibly trying to allay suspicions about his complicity in Titus' death?

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Roman architecture has been variously described as: genuinely creative; mere imitation of Greek models; and a progressive adaptation of Greek models for Roman use. Discuss.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should begin by describing and discussing the main features of Greek architecture that appeared on Roman structures. For example, they might describe the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian orders, noting that the Romans favoured the Corinthian. They should then analyse a range of specific Roman structures that show Greek influence, and discuss the extent of that influence.

They should also consider Greek influence from a chronological viewpoint, discussing whether, as time went on, the Romans developed a more specifically Roman style. They might mention that, in the case of Hadrian's Villa, Greek models were used precisely because they were Greek and had not become Romanised.

Their summary should look at each point specified in the question itself, and reach some sort of conclusion as to which aspect seems to predominate – Greek or Roman.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might discuss the combination of Greek and Etrusco-Italian features in the Maison Carrée.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider to what extent Roman architecture, exposed to Greek or eastern influence as the empire expanded, reflected the essential pragmatism of the Roman character.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare and contrast the two mosaics in Reproductions C and D of your Resource Booklet, one showing a theatrical scene with musicians and the other a boat trip on the Nile.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should examine the two mosaics in detail, analysing techniques that are common to both, as well as areas of difference. They should refer to composition, the use of colour, lighting, perspective and the degree of pictorial realism attained.

They should compare the subject matter of the mosaics, looking at the amount of action portrayed in both, but also noting differences. Whereas the first has a few figures which give a vivid impression of character and vitality, the second has a greater amount of narrative detail.

In the second picture they should observe the interest in landscape, even to the man with the donkey in the background, the exotic hippopotamus and crocodile in the foreground and the Nile river plants.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates may note the colour variation of the *tesserae* used for the river water and comment on how the effect of movement is achieved.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might emphasise the more subtle detail of the two mosaics. For example, they may point out the influence of wall-painting in the careful attention to the musculature of the male figures propelling the vessel. Alternatively, they might discuss the popularity of Egyptian motifs in Roman art during the Empire.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC FIVE: ARISTOPHANES

Question One

Discuss the agon of The Frogs as an exercise in literary criticism. How has Aristophanes managed to make such criticism function as part of a comedy?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should say what they understand by literary criticism, and discuss in general terms the extent to which the *agon* of *The Frogs* conforms to their definition.

They should also examine in detail, with relevant quotations, the criticisms made by Aeschylus and Euripides of each other's works, and consider how far these strictures involve literary quality *per se*, and how far they are simply a reflection of Aristophanes' views on contemporary drama, on the 'new ideas', and on the responsibility of the poet as a teacher of the people.

Candidates should also ask whether the examples each tragic poet gives of his own work and of his rival's are just parodies to amuse the audience, or serious literary criticism – or both.

Finally, the candidates must look at the *agon* as a piece of theatre, and consider how far, in terms not only of its word-play, but also of slapstick comedy, music, dance, and the whole visual impact of the play, it has genuine audience appeal.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates may consider the issue of social corruption – Aeschylus' comment about not having "loose women" in his plays, and Euripides' response.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might reflect on whether literary criticism has a place in the theatre. Some might refer to modern playwrights, or even the cinema.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

The essence of drama is conflict. How does this apply to the comedies of Aristophanes?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should first of all discuss the meaning of the statement, expanding upon their understanding of conflict and how it applies to drama.

They must then apply these ideas to the Aristophanic comedies that they have studied. It is essential that they look beyond the obvious conflict of the *agon* to the wider themes of the plays, such as the conflict of the generations in *The Wasps*. They might also consider elements in the comedies that do not involve conflict.

They must refer specifically to at least two plays, and, where appropriate, to modern commentators such as Professor Dover.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates may consider the implications of Procleon's flooring of his son, with a right to the jaw, shortly before the *exodos* of *The Wasps*. Did the debate on jury service actually indicate the ultimate victor of the play's central conflict? Has Procleon at last proved himself the better man of the two?

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might observe that all conflicts, from the battle to keep Procleon out of court in *The Wasps* to the great literary *agon* of *The Frogs* are subordinate to the main business of Aristophanic comedy, to amuse and advise, and to win the festival competition. They might also note that this integration of dramatic elements is a mark of Aristophanes' literary genius.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

The following extract is from the parabasis of Lysistrata. In this play, produced in 411 BC, the women set out to bring the war to an end, seeing that the men cannot do so. Compare this extract with other parabases you have studied, commenting on theme and dramatic purpose.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Lysistrata is a strongly feminist play and the mainspring of the plot has the women denying the men their marital rights in order to force them to make peace. The passage quoted is one of conflict between the men and the women, with the women emerging victorious.

Candidates must discuss the theme of the passage. They should note that the men are shown to have a decidedly retrogressive, traditional, male-oriented outlook, and are discredited by the radical comments of the women. This provides a different emphasis from the more conservative viewpoints expressed in the *parabases* of other plays.

Aristophanes' readiness to vary a traditional format in the interests of the plot is also evident. He has two Chorus leaders participating in the *parabasis*, rather than one, and has them address each other rather than the audience.

In making these comparisons, candidates should make specific reference to the passage quoted, as well as other plays by Aristophanes that they have studied.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates may comment on the futile attempt by the Leader of the Men's Chorus to draw strength through self-initiated identification with Aristogeiton and Harmodius.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might look at the ways in which Aristophanes shows his empathy with the women's desire for peace, contrasting their sensible, pragmatic attitude with the vapid idealism of the men.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC SIX: VIRGIL

Question One

To what extent are the problems confronting Aeneas an image of the universal problems that concern humanity as a whole? Discuss.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should make a broad statement about what Aeneas' problems are, trying to differentiate between those that are common to humanity and those that are peculiar to him.

In the former category were those problems that involved his *furor* and *pietas*, and his struggle to reconcile these two elements, particularly in his love for Dido. In addition, there were the challenges involved in his role as leader, such as the need to persuade reluctant refugees to journey with him to a new land after the fall of Troy, and the need to conceal his own feelings as he cares for his men after shipwreck in Africa.

With regard to problems specific to Aeneas, candidates might discuss his role as 'Man of Destiny' and his heroic status as son of Venus, with its attendant supernatural complications.

Discussion should involve frequent reference to the text of the *Aeneid* and brief quotations where appropriate.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might analyse the complex and contradictory emotions that assail Aeneas as he brings his relationship with Dido to an end.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might reflect that what are represented by Virgil as divine forces, such as the influence of Juno and Venus in Aeneas' passionate relationship with Dido, could also be seen as an externalisation of his own instincts and desires.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Discuss the degree of ambivalence displayed by Aeneas in the earlier parts of the poem. To what extent is this ambivalence resolved by the end of Book VI?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should recount some of Aeneas' earlier uncertainties and hesitations, such as his wish to return to the fighting as the Greeks sack his city and his reluctance to leave Troy without Creusa, before analysing the climactic ambivalence of his liaison with Dido.

They should also consider the course of events in Book VI, charting Aeneas' increasingly profound understanding of his destiny, culminating in the ideal put before him by Anchises.

Candidates should then attempt to assess the degree to which this realisation finally brought his doubts and uncertainties to an end. Those who have read the whole poem may also be able to comment on the difficulty Aeneas has in maintaining an unwavering commitment to his goal, once the wars in Latium are underway.

Discussion should involve frequent reference to the text of the *Aeneid* and brief quotations where appropriate.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might identify and interpret key moments in Aeneas' character development, such as the seizing of the golden bough.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might evaluate the influence of supernatural forces on Aeneas' decisionmaking, both in general terms and with reference to specific examples, such as the visits of Mercury in Book IV.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Discuss the comments and undertakings made by Jupiter in this passage, and Juno's reactions to them. Then relate this response to Juno's behaviour earlier in the poem.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should discuss and explain Jupiter's references to Juno's "waves of bitterness", and also his comment about her "violence of spirit". They should then expand upon his undertakings about the future of the Italian people, perhaps explaining how these promises worked out in practice.

They must then explain how these undertakings mollified Juno, and compare her attitude at the end of the poem with her earlier attitudes and actions, particularly with reference to her activities against (and in conjunction with) Venus.

Discussion should involve frequent reference to the text of the *Aeneid* and brief quotations where appropriate.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might explore possible reasons for Jupiter's offer to waive his own wishes. Alternatively, they may recall Juno's momentary kindness in sending Iris to allow Dido's release, and comment on the complexity of Virgil's characterisation.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might wonder whether Juno's sudden change of heart is too facile to be entirely plausible.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC SEVEN: JUVENAL

Question One

Consider whether Juvenal sees the deterioration of the patron–client relationship as a reflection of the degradation of Roman society as a whole.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should begin by explaining what Juvenal believed was the ‘ideal’ state of the patron–client relationship in former years – a relationship of mutual support, respect and responsibility. This should be followed by an explanation of the present situation, with everyone in for what they can get, and self-respect at a minimum. This analysis should be supported by appropriate quotations and specific references to the *Satires*, particularly to Satire V.

Candidates should then turn to Juvenal’s picture of the contemporary scene as a whole, considering aspects that in some way mirror the patron–client relationship. Two relevant areas of comparison would be the corrupting power of wealth and the decline of social responsibility.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, they might examine Juvenal’s allegation of sadism in the patron’s treatment of a client.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider whether there were redeeming features in the contemporary scene, and whether the ‘good, old days’ were in fact as good as Juvenal suggested. They might, for instance, mention the reign of terror under Sulla and the decades of social crime and unrest that followed the proscriptions.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates’ essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Comment on Green’s suggestion that Juvenal writes from a very limited viewpoint, and that the scope of his satire is restricted as a result.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates might begin by considering the validity of Juvenal’s famous lines that “all human endeavours, men’s prayers, fears, pleasure, joys and pursuits, make up the mixed mash of my book”. They need to be aware that this is just not the case.

Having made this point, they should outline the main themes of Juvenal’s writing, the subject matter of the satires, and the actual areas on which he places emphasis.

With this established, and reinforced by relevant quotations, they then need to outline the parameters within which he operates, and to draw some conclusions about the extent to which the scope of his satire is restricted.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, they might note that at the end of Satire I, Juvenal seems to contradict his earlier statements by restricting his focus to the past.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might recognise that one limitation of Juvenal’s viewpoint is his lack of conception of any reform of the social order, however critical he is of the current state of affairs; in fact he is severely critical of any variation of the traditional order.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates’ essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

The following extract comes from Suetonius' brief biography of Domitian. Compare this picture of Domitian with the one presented by Juvenal in Satire IV and elsewhere. To what extent do they tell the same story, and what impression of Domitian do they leave us with?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates need a good knowledge of *Satire IV*, and must be prepared to provide references and quotations from this and other satires that match or contrast with the description given by Suetonius. For example, the total fatuity of the council meeting to consider the best way of cooking a fish is well-paralleled by Suetonius' description of Domitian and the fly-killing.

They should point out that Suetonius, although he observes Domitian's cruelty and readiness to kill, does not picture, as Juvenal does, the abject terror felt by the councillors as they are summoned to the paranoid imperial presence.

Suetonius also sees some redeeming features in Domitian, which Juvenal does not.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, they might note that both writers make a humiliating reference to Domitian's baldness.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might compare Suetonius' more balanced account with the savagery of Juvenal's attacks on Domitian, look at the possibility of a personal grievance, and consider whether there is any historical justification for such an assumption. They might also contrast Juvenal's attack on Domitian – personal and sustained – with his attitude to other emperors.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC EIGHT: SOCRATES

Question One

In what ways, if at all, could Socrates' death be seen as the triumphant culmination of his life?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

At one point in the *Phaedo*, Socrates says that true philosophers make dying their profession, and at another, that those who apply themselves in the right way to philosophy are directly preparing themselves for dying and death. Candidates should refer to those or similar statements to show that Socrates himself (and Plato as well) considered that death was the culmination of his life.

Other quotes from other dialogues reinforce this view, but also emphasise the total consistency that Socrates displayed in maintaining these principles throughout his life. Candidates should show that the manner of his death was completely in accord with these principles, and might argue that his death was a triumphant affirmation of the life he had led. They might go even further and suggest that his defeat in his trial was, in a way, a victory.

Some candidates, however, might reasonably contest the word "triumphant", seeing Socrates' death as unnecessary, avoidable and even as somewhat of an anti-climax. Such arguments must not be disregarded. On this matter and others, candidates' reading should extend beyond the set dialogues and might include the writings of Xenophon or secondary sources.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might observe Socrates' similar demeanour at his trial and at the time of his death.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider whether, if the word "triumphant" is justified, Socrates' death could be seen as martyrdom. Could he have ever seen himself in that light? Would his sense of humour have allowed it?

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Describe and discuss Socrates' attitude towards Athens, and Athens' attitude towards Socrates.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should show that Socrates' attitude towards Athens appears in two ways: first by his famous metaphor of the stinging fly stirring a lazy horse into action; secondly by his imaginary dialogue with the Laws of Athens in the *Crito*. Both these attitudes should be looked at in detail.

Athens' attitude to Socrates seemed to consist of long-term and growing resentment on the part of many, particularly older citizens, who objected to being shown up by the Socratic *elenchus*, and saw Socrates as inciting irreverence among the younger generation. This generation, however, provided a small but enthusiastic group of supporters.

In dealing with these points, candidates should show, by reference or quotation, the results of careful reading of the set dialogues and, preferably, also of others as well.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might discuss Aristophanes' portrayal of Socrates in *The Clouds*.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might discuss the apparent dichotomy between Socrates' civil disobedience and his respect for the laws. They might also look at the probability that he was seen as anti-democratic.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare the following pictures of Socrates with each other. What other impressions of him have you gained from your reading?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must examine each passage closely and comment on both of them in detail.

Analysing the extract from *The Clouds*, they should explain the comic references, but look beyond them to the much more serious suggestion of heresy in the reference to Zeus. Some may be able to refer to other parts of the play.

Alcibiades' eulogy should be analysed carefully, particularly the second part, when the emphasis is placed on an in-depth perception of what Socrates is saying. Some candidates may know enough of *The Symposium* to elaborate on this passage, and also discuss the relationship between Socrates and Alcibiades, which is mentioned earlier.

Candidates should then add other impressions of Socrates that they have gained from the set texts, from other dialogues, or from wider reading, including Xenophon.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. A comparison of the two passages, one a caricature and the other a eulogy, will reveal that even Alcibiades concedes that first impressions of Socrates can give a sense of the ridiculous.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might provide further information about Alcibiades himself, and the Socratic circle generally, or say more about Aristophanes and his attitudes toward the 'new ideas'.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC NINE: GREEK SCIENCE

Question One

Analyse the development of Greek astronomy from the time of Homer to the later Pythagoreans (Heraclides, Ecphantus and Hicetas). To what extent was this progression a continuous development?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should first look at the concepts of the Homeric age, noting that many constellations had already been identified. They should explain the standard theories that the earth was flat, stationary and at the centre of the cosmos.

Following on from this, they should outline and discuss the development of the Pythagorean concepts, including the introduction of the idea of a spherical earth at the centre of the cosmos, the theory of the spheres, and Philolaus' development of this model.

They should then go on to the ideas of the later Pythagoreans, who proposed that the earth, while central, spun on its axis. They should discuss whether or not these ideas had evolved smoothly from earlier concepts, or were the results of radical new thinking.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might examine the variation between the Pythagoreans and the more orthodox thinking of their contemporaries.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might consider the reasons why developments and refinements of the Pythagorean theories occurred, such as the desire to account for the supposed movement of the spheres and to explain man's inability to hear the harmony of the spheres.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Discuss some of the false conclusions reached by Greek medical thinkers. To what extent were these conclusions inevitable?

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates might confine their discussion to the human heart and the four humours.

With respect to the heart, they should examine Erasistratus' outline of the workings of the human heart and his (incorrect) theory that a dual network pumped blood and *pneuma* (air) around the body. They should comment on the way in which *ad hoc* observation or, at best, dissection (and vivisection) of criminals in adverse circumstances in Egypt led to false conclusions.

With regard to the four humours, they might discuss the earliest Hippocratic documents that identify the humours of water, blood, bile and phlegm, then examine reasons for the later removal of water.

They should also acknowledge the lack of modern technology, such as microscopes, blood analysis and computers, and consider the importance of observation in developing medical theory and the ways in which this led to false conclusions.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. They might, for instance, point out that Erasistratus completely ignored the problem of how blood got from the left-side to the right-side of the heart. They could note that one way in which ancient physicians dealt with problems was by ignoring them.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might discuss the way in which the social and political ethos of the time led to erroneous theories and conclusions. They might even compare these with similar problems in medieval times. They might also go beyond the third century BC and consider the work of Galen and his revision of Erasistratus' ideas about the heart, or examine the development of ideas about the four humours in the light of Aristotle's theory of matter.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare and contrast the information provided in the question booklet about Hero's water-clock with what you know about the water-clock of Ctesibius. You may sketch a diagram of the Ctesibius clock if you wish.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must examine carefully the information given in the question booklet about the Hero water-clock, and provide an analysis of both the diagram and the information, bringing out the salient points.

This must be followed by a similar description of the Ctesibius water-clock, including perhaps a sketch. There should be reference to simplicity, number of moving parts, portability and precision of scale.

Candidates should then compare the two water-clocks, listing major differences and similarities, and evaluating the merits of both.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might establish a distinctive feature of each clock that sets it apart from the other.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might discuss why the Ctesibius clock was the most widely used in classical times.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

TOPIC TEN: ROMAN RELIGION

Question One

Describe and discuss the motives and common elements underlying the main ceremonies and festivals of Roman religion.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must make a selection of main ceremonies and festivals (both public and domestic), discuss their purposes and procedures, and analyse the elements that they have in common.

One common element was propitiation, of the gods, of ancestors, or of specific *numina*. Another very important feature of most ceremonies and festivals was sacrifice, and the methods and procedures of sacrifice should be outlined and described in detail, together with basic principles, such as nourishing and strengthening the deities concerned. Another element common to many religious observances was that of public spectacles and games. Comments about these might include: achieving *pax deorum*, keeping the people happy, and winning popularity for aspiring politicians. Other frequent elements included prayer, divination and purification.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might give an account of one of the more orgiastic celebrations such as the Lupercalia and suggest reasons for its ongoing popularity.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might analyse the psychological basis of these festivals and ceremonies, and their emotional impact, if any, on the people.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Two

Discuss the Roman attitudes to foreign religions and philosophies, and the reasons for their success at Rome.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates should establish, with specific examples, that in general, Romans were at least tolerant of new religions. When they encountered them in the extended empire, they endeavoured to assimilate them into orthodox religion.

They should, however, explain that they also usually required that the state gods were paid proper respect, and consequently some of the more exclusive religions, such as that of the Jews, were less tolerated. This was also for some time the case with Christianity, which was, in addition, initially seen as socially unacceptable.

Many religions were welcomed for their novelty; some of the orgiastic cults, such as those of Cybele and Dionysus were greeted enthusiastically (too much so with Dionysus); some intellectual philosophies, particularly Stoicism, became an integral part of Roman society; and some eastern faiths, such as Christianity and Mithraism, appealed for their spiritual aspect.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. For example, candidates might examine the significance of the *Quindecimviri* recommending that Cybele was brought to Rome.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might discuss how significant the lack of spiritual depth in the orthodox religion was in encouraging the popularity of foreign cults, as compared with the other attractive features of these cults.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Question Three

Compare the two passages that follow, discussing the differing social and philosophical attitudes that they represent.

Performance indicators:

Scholarship

Candidates must analyse both passages, discussing the widely differing attitudes of each. They should draw a contrast between the primitive superstition displayed in the Lemuria, with its strange irrational procedures, and the rational, humanistic approach of Lucretius.

The Lemuria appears to go back to the early days of Rome, and involves the propitiation of ancestors and a fearful preoccupation with death and mortality.

The Lucretius passage, on the other hand, comes from the last century of the Republic. Epicureanism, although distinct from Stoicism, shared a concern with the problems of human pain, and set aside the fear of an afterlife.

The essay writing criterion is concerned not only with style and structure, but also with the ability to make a significant point at a crucial time in the essay. Candidates might, for example, examine the significance of the darkness and magical elements involved in the Lemuria.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

Outstanding candidates might observe that the ideas in both these passages must have co-existed, and speculate as to which might have had the greater impact, and why. They could add that the ideas behind each passage might appeal to different groups at Rome.

The style and structure of outstanding candidates' essays should be of exceptional quality.

Judgement Statement

Scholarship	Scholarship with Outstanding Performance
<p>Evaluate critically an aspect of the classical world, referring to a range of ancient, and, where appropriate, secondary sources.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Develop a cogent argument, based on depth of knowledge about classical subjects.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Synthesise particular examples into general principles within the various topics and, where appropriate, about the classical world.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Communicate ideas effectively in essay format.</p> <p>3 × S or 1 × S and 1 × O (where all three questions answered)</p>	<p>Scholarship <i>plus</i></p> <p>Develop a cogent argument with insight and/or originality.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Communicate ideas effectively with precision and an element of expressiveness that focuses the reader's attention on salient points.</p> <p>3 × O</p>