

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material
may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose
of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

93404A



934041

Draw a cross through the box (☒)
if you have NOT written in this booklet



S

SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Scholarship 2023 Classical Studies

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Write your answers to your THREE chosen questions in this booklet. Start your answer to each question on a new page. Carefully number each question.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–23 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

Do not write in any cross-hatched area (☒). This area may be cut off when the booklet is marked.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

SECTION A :

CONTEXT A: ALEXANDER THE GREAT

QUESTION ONE - to what extent ~~was~~ was Alexander merely a 'destroyer'; rather than ~~a~~ the creator of a positive, lasting legacy?

ESSAY -

The romanticisation of Alexander the Great throughout contemporary and primary sources alike have attributed to our general perception of Alexander as a heroic, invincible figure. Pragmatically, Alexander was a destroyer. Instilled from his childhood by his father and teacher ~~in~~ Aristotle, was that it was Alexander's "inheritance" to conquer the Persian Empire. As a result, Alexander became tenacious, and in accordance with the statement, ~~certainly~~ to a certain extent, a destroyer. Yet this is what the foundations of Alexander's 'greatness' were built on, and contributed to the creator of a lasting legacy - perhaps not necessarily positive, though certainly memorable.

~~mattered~~

If ~~matters~~ not whether Alexander sought to create and establish a positive legacy, merely so long as it lasted. Alexander was frequently likened to Achilles as a child, his teacher Aristotle referring to him as Alexander-Achilles on several occasions, as Arrian writes. Achilles certainly is not remembered by the majority for a positive, diplomatic campaign at Ilium. He was a destroyer by nature - this is what established his lasting legacy. Alexander, much like Achilles, was raised in war, accompanying his father Philip to several campaigns, even going so far as to command them at age 14. During his earliest times in Persia did Alexander demonstrate a lack of complacency for those who resisted his rule. The murder

of Greek mercenaries at Issus, slaying of the sacred band, siege of Tyre - all the evidence suggests that Alexander was a destroyer, because anything that hindered his progress throughout the campaign hindered his ability to achieve his goal of expansion of the Macedonian Empire throughout Asia, and achieving *Kleos*. John Keegan interprets this as a negative reputation to Alexander's rule - "... his dreadful legacy was to ennoble savagery in the name of glory". This perspective is profoundly ~~contemporary~~ bias in terms of viewing Alexander's campaign through a modern lens. Yes, to a great extent, therefore, was Alexander a destroyer. He earned much of his respect through his savagery. A.B. Bosworth corroborates the latter, arguing that Alexander's reputation has been re-shaped by a "dearth of contemporary sources". In this mindset, it was not even respect that Alexander earned through his savagery as a destroy, but rather fear and intimidation of his subjects - at the core of Alexander's conquest is a driven leader, ambitious autocrat who at any and all costs will secure his dreams of conquering the Persian Empire. Our modern perception of Alexander the Great's rule is that he achieved his reputation through sanctions and diplomatic measures. Certainly, this rendered true in the cases of Egypt and Babylon, however, as Bosworth alludes to, this modern lens has confounded our idea of what Alexander's legacy would have meant to him and the Macedonians. He did not seek to create a positive legacy, Alexander would not be the 'great' if ^{he} secured the Persian Empire by negotiation. The militaristic nature of classical society tells us that from a classical standpoint, Alexander's legacy was positive BECAUSE it lasted, not because he acted on moral instincts rather than destructive ones. Thus for classical society, Alexander's legacy was positive because to a great extent was he a destroyer.

Furthermore, on the topic of a lasting legacy, it was not Alexander's intention to establish a lasting legacy, merely to create an empire without end. Because he was a destroyer who achieved his goals, Alexander earned *kleos* and needed not to establish a dynastic line of succession within the empire to ensure his name was carried down through the glory, much as Philip's was through Alexander. Additionally, Alexander was simply too narcissistic and driven by ambition to risk the glory of his success to be overshadowed by a successor. Thus within his own destructive tendencies, Alexander ensured that only he could be credited for the expansion of the empire - Plutarch often speaks of the "hellenisation" which Alexander seemingly initiated. This alone showed how the destruction of the individual Macedonian and Persian cultures/societies was integral to Alexander creating his empire without end. William Tarn goes onto suggest this hellenisation was a way of making Alexander's rule appear more positive, for he wanted to "blend the Macedonians and Persians in a crater of friendship... removing the vanity of the victor". Much of Tarn's inspiration was drawn from Alexander's decision to hellenise through the ~~two~~ ^{two} weddings (326BC), and Plutarch revering Alexander as a "philosopher in arms" for this action. This shows Plutarch's romanticisation of Alexander's campaign, with the cynical view of these events being that they were a legal measure to blend cultures, thus one single enemy of either the Macedonian or Persian army could not be defined. More than this, the instation of Persian satraps at Babylon further highlight that Alexander did not seek to create a lasting line of succession. When Alexander died, inevitably would the Empire he created crumble under such a vast array of leadership, and the absence of destructive intimidation to ensure the longevity of his empire. HIS empire started and ended with Alexander, meaning

that his personal legacy lasted far longer than what it would have, and under the control of his destructive leadership style.

Naturally, there are arguments for the contrary - Alexander was actually a paranoid, destructive leader with no clear goal in mind, only driven by motivation and dangerous ambition. In this sense, Alexander to a great extent, may be viewed as a destroyer morally, and in no way the creator of a positive, lasting legacy. Eugene Borzo reads this narrative, suggesting that there was a "Macedonian administration from beginning to end", implying and rejecting the concept of hellenisation that Plutarch and Tarn propose. Borzo views Alexander as only a destructor, which when Alexander's campaign in Persia is taken out of context, is a fairly understandable viewpoint to hold. However, the argument lacks historical empathy ~~not~~ which can be drawn upon from the nuances in evidence from Arrian about Alexander's childhood, and his expectation to conquer the Persian empire - just like Achilles, he was raised as a destroyer, a weapon of war, with the purpose of establishing a legacy, regardless of whether it was positive or negative.

An understanding of ideas and values in classical society, particularly Greece and Macedonia, are integral to our understanding of Alexander's character. His ~~the~~ blind ambition was fostered through a born desire for kleos and to fulfil his 'birthright' of conquering the Persian empire. By nature, to a great extent was Alexander the Great a 'destroyer' - this was essential to achieving the command of his ever-growing empire, and to assure he could achieve his goals without many distractions from his own

men. As a destroyer - both physically in battle and metaphorically as a destroyer of the individual Macedonian and Persian cultures, Alexander fabricated his own civilisation wherein "hellenistic" associations would forever ensure the longevity of his empire in spirit, and the lasting of his legacy. Because Alexander's legacy is not entirely positive because he was to a great extent a destroyer, his legacy has lasted longer and become more widespread than what it would have if it was completely positive. Alexander's pithos for success meant that to a great extent was Alexander a destroyer, but this meant that he could establish a lasting legacy, ~~regardless~~ because it was not entirely positive.

SECTION A :

CONTEXT H : ROMAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE

QUESTION FIFTEEN : to what extent was restraint in displaying the divinity of the emperor evident in Roman art?

ESSAY -

All Roman art and architecture is allegorical. Seen most profusely during Augustus' regime, art and architecture provided emperors with indirect affiliations with divinity and power as a measure to legitimise their rule and ensure favour with the Roman public. This, in turn, would ensure the security and longevity of their regimes. On the contrary inappropriate symbolisation and misuse of art and architecture in Rome was quite as easy as a digital footprint nowadays leading to our demise. Hence, to a great extent was restraint in displaying the divinity of the emperor in Roman art evident, as it was a necessity for their personal sake.

Augustus was a successful emperor and able to transition from a fractured republic to empire because of the failures of Julius Caesar. When upon Caesar was murdered for displaying himself as divinity, Augustus saw it important to show restraint from doing the same. Interestingly, similar stories are observed during Alexander's time - risking discontent with his own men for "inflating his honour to that of a god" (Arrion). Caesar and Alexander show us the sensitivity of hubris and excessive personal honours, and the subsequent effects of the latter on the person in question. However, Julius Caesar was indifferent to the idea that he was not descended from divinity - Augustus used a comet seen in the sky during Caesar's death to reaffirm that this was his ascent to heaven as a god. In using this, coins were

minted with the symbol of a comet on one side, and a picture of a bust of Augustus on the reverse with inscribed "divi filius" - meaning 'descended from the gods', essentially. When these coins were circulated upon Augustus' rise to power, they propagated Augustus as a son of a god (Julius Caesar), and thus legitimised his right to rule, using religion as a means of gaining popularity with the ~~majority~~^{majority} whilst also being careful to restrain himself from actually displaying himself as divinity. The inscription of "divi filius" is important - it shows that Augustus does not view himself as a reincarnation of Julius Caesar, and makes it explicitly clear that Augustus himself is not a god. Instead it highlights that he is merely the son of a god, which in the eyes of the Romans, was acceptable - Aeneas, their founder, was revered as the son of Aphrodite (Venus). In this sense, Augustus is also drawing ~~parallels~~^{parallels} to himself and Aeneas, further legitimizing his claims to divinity. This is seen further in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*.

The *Ara Pacis Augustae* (9-12BC) was another significant historical piece of Roman architecture which served as a symbol of Augustus' descent from divinity. Again, to a great ~~extent~~^{extent} was more restraint shown in displaying the divinity of Augustus. The *Ara Pacis* walls a particularly fine line, and it would be understandable to ~~not~~^{wary} realise at this point in time, Augustus became less ~~wary~~^{wary} of his affiliation with himself as a god. The altar in the *Ara Pacis Augustae* was to "Roma" - the goddess personifying the spirit of Rome. Augustus had often referred to himself as "princeps", meaning "first citizen"; and later as the guardian spirit of Rome. ~~This~~^{This} close association between himself and Roma highlights the significance

of religion and divine favour in the imperial age of Rome. Furthermore, this draws parallels to the leadership and heroism antics of ancient Greece, where divine favour was essential to be regarded as a leader. By showing restraint in the outward expressions of divinity, Augustus was simultaneously transforming the ideals of the former Roman Republic to the earliest version of the Roman empire, speaking to the significance of the display of divinity within Roman art and architecture, reaffirming the point that all Roman art and architecture is allegorical. More so, the Ara Pacis depicts the entire ^{foreseeable} ~~merely~~ future of the Julian family line ^{thereabouts} (~~merely~~) on the same panel as Augustus, on the wall adjacent to a depiction of Ixeneas, Romulus and Remus on one side, and Tellus Mater and Roma on the other. Diana Kleiner asserts that this is a deliberate action, and way of "expanding and ~~extending~~ ^{coalescing} the imperial family through a program of synchronised resemblance." To a great extent was the restraint of displaying not only the emperor, but the rest of the future imperial family important in the context of the Roman empire. This shows that any pre-humorous association with divinity was negative, though propaganda through Roman art and architecture was the most significant way in which emperors could legitimize their rules and gain favour with the Roman population.

(20BC)

Augustus in the Prima Porta is arguably the most prolific example of emperors showing restraint in displaying their divinity in Roman art and architecture. The Prima Porta is the first significant use of the Greek idealistic style of portraiture since the days of the Roman monarchy. This ^{would have instilled} ~~instills~~ a vast range of emotions within the Roman people - the monarchy was forcibly abandoned largely because of the close association with gods kings and monarchs had. Furthermore, it was a blatant way of Augustus turning his back on

the Roman Republic, which he promised to the people to reinstate.

During the Roman Republic, the veristic style of portraiture was used.

Veristic, deriving from the Latin term "verus", meaning "true", was a "warts and all" depiction of a leader's age, experience, and earned right to rule Rome. On the contrary, the idealistic style was associated with divinity because it essentially immortalised the figure in youth, giving them perfect features with no obvious symbols of age, experience, or hardship. Augustus immortalises himself as the guardian spirit of Rome - through the idealistic style of the Prima Porta, Rome's spirit and youth as an emperor displayed.

~~Furthermore~~ Furthermore, Augustus in the Prima Porta is depicted in bare feet with ~~as~~ a dolphin (symbol of cupid/Venus' son) at his feet. This further expresses the idea that Augustus is the son of a god, not a god himself.

At the core of all Roman art and architecture produced by Augustus is a symbol of divinity. However, to a great extent is Augustus careful in avoiding/restraining depicting himself as a god because of his first-hand understanding of the negative implications this would have on ~~his~~ popularity amongst the Roman people. Because Augustus ruled on auctoritas, appropriation and access... (Aina Kleiner) as opposed to secured role of emperor, it was imperative that he showed restraint from displaying himself as divinity - this would propagate his status and undo his legitimacy to establish the Roman Empire. Augustus' restraint show careful understanding and learning of Roman traditional values - something the likes of Nero and Caligula in their later years of ruling, became blindsided to. Thus to a great extent, restraint in displaying divinity of the emperor

evident in most Roman art and architecture, and Augustus, by adhering to this and understanding Roman values thus demonstrating competency as an emperor, is the best at showing this through coins, the Ara Pacis Augustae, and the Prima Porta statue.

SECTION B : QUESTION SEVENTEEN (Gender and Society in Ancient Rome)

→ discuss at least three of the resources and the insight they give into women's roles in religion.

* sources E - H

Resource E:

resources E, F, and H show continuity within the theme of women's roles in religion taking shape in a motherly role.

This speaks to two expectations of women to show obedience,

chaste, Chastity, and ~~patricide~~ patricide in their day to

day lives. Furthermore, it provides insight towards the

roles of women within Roman society. Women, although

largely restricted to the ~~oikos~~ (domestic sphere), were

admitted into religious aspects of Roman life. Despite

their roles in religions however - Juno, Vestal Virgins, women remained

subjugated throughout and prior to the Roman Empire within their

roles of religion, being ~~pro~~ portrayed as motherly figures,

establishing perspectives towards women in wider society.

Resource E discusses a funeral eulogy to Berenice, following an

inscription which is said to have most likely been on the base

of a statue. This alone ~~implies~~ implies Berenice's status -

evidently, she played an important role within religion, and

was most likely a part of the aristocracy. Cicero was prolific in

highlighting than in the late Roman Republic/early empire (though

these honours would have been provided well into the Roman Empire),

that all those in positions of Roman social power should come

from the aristocracy - women were no exception. To have an epigraph

and potentially a statue does highlight that women within the

patrician ruling class could become influential in the religious

sphere of Roman life - a rather ~~significant~~^{significant} sphere at that. Berenice was said to have been a priestess of Demeter and Persephone, later promoted to high priestess and that in those roles, she conducted herself well, in a "holy and well mannered matter". Most importantly, it was important for women, especially within the religious sphere to uphold social and moral values. The resource goes onto say that Berenice had raised children, and credits her first and foremost before her achievements as the wife and daughter of clearly prominent men in Rome. It appears that despite women holding positions of power within religion, it was equally important to uphold their standards as wife and mother - career in religion was merely a beneficiary for which women still had to be profusely grateful. Additionally, the resource states that Berenice has "given up her life", implying she died of suicide, and not natural causes. Perhaps Berenice gave up her life in a sacrifice for the gods as a part of her role. In this way, Berenice can be likened to Lucretia - another respected Roman woman from times of the Roman monarchy who was assaulted, and gave up ~~to~~ her life as to retain her honour. This represents a pattern - where women had to for their honour (and probably specifically within the role of religion), they reached the apotheosis of the ideal values within Roman society. Berenice provides insight into the respect of women who devote their lives to the service of the Roman state through their roles in religion.

Similar is seen in resource H, depicting Cybele being shown as the mother goddess. The resource tells us that given the realistic portraiture, as opposed to the ideal for divinity, this may be a high priestess taking on the role

of a goddess. Similar to how military commanders were shown to have the veristic style to show their experience, this may be an indication, as it was with Bævenice's honours, to show the ~~the~~ wisdom, experience, and the professionalism of the priestess being displayed. More importantly, it may be a way of demonstrating that the priestess is an extension of the goddess, and thus giving Romans a reason to 'trust' the priestess, demonstrating that merely because women held high roles in religion and the temples, their domestic ties were still the most important characteristics of womanhood in ancient Rome.

This point is corroborated in Resource F, where married women were instructed to take money out of their dowries to offer to Juno whilst Rome was under severe threat from Carthage. This shows that the woman's role in conflict is with religion, and highlights the importance of religion to the women's life - women could give themselves to the Roman state by remaining true in the religious sector of life, ~~&~~ just as men did by going to war. Because in this instance the "prodigies only affected married women", as is seen between Resource E and F are the similarities throughout time in Rome between a woman's duty first and foremost to her husband, where from there, the second duty is to the Roman state and carried out through religion. Women, in sources F and H, are also tied to female gods - here it is Queen Juno. Although those female gods hold a considerable amount of power - they are seen as emotional and

temperamental.

Scholarship

Subject: Classical Studies

Standard: 93404

Total score: 16

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	5	The answer takes a general approach and makes useful references to secondary source reading. The ideas are wide ranging but focus on Alexander as a 'destroyer' to create an empire. It differentiates his personal legacy from that of the legacy of empire.
2	6	The answer is sustained and the argument remains relevant to the question. There is a solid analysis of well-selected examples and key points are drawn out. Interesting evidence such as coinage has been utilised.
3	5	This is a good close analysis of the sources. Reasonable points have been made on each source. Overall, the approach has been analytical and points have been communicated clearly.