

93404A



12.30

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

S



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY  
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD  
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

## Scholarship 2015 Classical Studies

9.30 a.m. Monday 23 November 2015

Time allowed: Three hours

Total marks: 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.

Choose THREE questions from Question Booklet 93404Q: TWO questions from Section A, and ONE question from Section B. Each question is worth 8 marks.

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

Check that this booklet has pages 2–27 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

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

Alexander: Q2. //

Alexander the Great, that general spoken of in song and story for more than two thousand years, <sup>certainly</sup> quite possibly one of the most inspired, ~~if not~~ perhaps even the most inspired commander and conqueror the world has ever known; as Peter Green says, "genius Alexander had in full measure", but he ~~had~~ had little interest in applying that genius to the administration of an empire. Alexander has been idealized ~~as~~ by many — including the Romans, to whom one of our most reliable sources, Arrian, belongs — as a conqueror with a lofty Panhellenic vision, but while his empire may have left ~~an~~ legacy to that effect, given the evidence ~~this~~ is relatively unlikely. Alexander made only token efforts to bind his conquests "into one"; like many great generals of history, he ~~was~~ belonged on the battlefield, not at home administering a kingdom. //

Perhaps one of the reasons Alexander's motives have been idealized over the years lies in his mastery ~~of~~ over propaganda; many scholars, Plutarch and Arrian apparently included, have idealized Alexander for his military prowess, and seem to find it fitting that a general possessed of such tactical flair should also have a lofty motive. ~~This~~ Alexander's own propaganda plays conveniently to this impression, but the truth ~~is~~ is that it was likely no more than that: <sup>official</sup> his attitudes ~~were~~ were highly inconsistent. Before Ephesus, Alexander had "tended to back oligarchies", as Green puts it; backing the democracy for a change, however, was a convenient way to win support, and so this is precisely what he did. His attitudes towards his conquered peoples varied widely depending upon which he thought would be most effective:

in Egypt he made a great deal of respecting the local religion and customs, even taking a tour through the exotic land and sacrificing to local divinities, but this was more or less simply ~~done~~  
to court the favour of the Egyptian people; the Persians had treated the realm as little more than a large purse, and so to present himself as their antithesis suited him quite well. In Phoenicia, and in India, on the other hand, he made no such efforts. Alexander knew well the value of propaganda, but it was insufficient to keep his ~~king~~ empire together following his death.

Alexander's ~~at~~ controversial adoption of Persian customs, and his efforts to combine peoples of many races together in his government, was certainly quite a foreign idea to his Macedonian contemporaries, and one of the most convincing arguments for an Alexandrian vision of global unity. Granted, Alexander was far from completely incompetent at administrative matters, and he knew well that maintaining his power depended upon the various elements of his court functioning together coherently. One would think, however, that if Alexander genuinely had in mind global peace and union, he would have spent more time consolidating his conquests after he won them rather than pressing on incessantly; one would also think that, had he genuinely been devoted to binding his conquests "into one", he would have applied his ~~immensely~~ ~~an~~ keenly acute knowledge of the minds of men, which he used many times very effectively to destroy political opponents and force victory on the battlefield, with a little more subtlety and finesse than he in fact did. The mass marriages at Susa were more or less a disaster; the burning of Persepolis, too, was not a move undertaken by a king who wanted to enforce unity,

ASSESSOR'S  
USE ONLY

and although many ancient historians "prefer to blazon the episode ~~as~~ on the silken tongue of a woman", as Freeman puts it, there was evidence of premeditation — such as the prior removal of valuables from the complex — in Alexander's actions. As it was, Alexander's attempts to make his multi-farious government go along seem <sup>purposed</sup> more out of necessity than out of a genuine desire for peace and unity. And, as it was, Alexander's efforts predictably fell apart after his death.

Alexander's mass purge of his satraps as he returned from India demonstrates that his inclination for the administrative duties that came with such a vast and fragile empire fell quite a length short of his passion and genius for conquest. The majority of Alexander's governors appeared to take matters into ~~his~~<sup>their</sup> own hands as soon as his back was turned, including one of his closest friends, Harpalus. While Alexander had no shortage of personal charisma, and certainly knew how to win the favour of his subordinates when it mattered to him — within his army — he seemed to fall short of making his governors love him as fully as his troops did, with the result that very few actually remained loyal when Alexander and his fearsome military process were out of sight (a notable exception appears to be Porus). As many scholars have noted, Alexander's empire "depended upon his physical presence to ~~remain~~ retain cohesion" — far from being bound "into one", they ~~scattered~~ his conquests scattered and revolted as soon as he left the region. Green notes that "to pacify ideological opposition the only answer Alexander had was sheer terrorism"; Alexander had an "almost superhuman" (as Freeman puts it) ability to inspire his army, but in

inspiring the civilian masses and their rulers he appears to lack the same flair.

~~This~~ This contributes substantial evidence to the notion that Alexander in fact had no interest in binding his conquests "into one" and creating a unified empire. Multiple times — when Greeks <sup>for example</sup> rebelled under Memnon and Agis, ~~after he left India~~ — revolts sprung up behind him as soon as he left a region but he each time decided to push on with his campaign rather than turn back, as most sensible rulers would have done, to consolidate his hold. In fact, he very likely would never have returned after India if it were not for the mutiny of his soldiers, who had finally fled ~~now~~ <sup>of</sup> after they realized that Alexander apparently had very little intention to stop. ~~This~~ <sup>clearly</sup> Alexander's attitudes clearly indicate that his passions lay in the realm of conquest and not in the formation of any real empire: his hold on all of his conquered realms was shaky at best, but, governed more by ambition than pragmatism or desire for continuity, he might well have pushed all the way to Ocean had he not been stopped by his weary men. The ancient sources report that he sank into something ~~of~~ a depression after he finally returned to Babylon; he apparently knew not what to do with himself without the glitter of the next conquest on the horizon. Indeed, Augustus expressed great surprise in later times that Alexander did not consider the consolidation of an empire as honorable a task as that of creating one.

Fuller's assertion that Alexander "<sup>his</sup> won ~~the~~ peace...and bound the whole into one", in short, is slightly difficult to believe.

Alexander's vast empire promptly crumbled after his death at age thirty-two; he had not genuinely achieved any union at all—in many of the lands which he conquered he was viewed as little more than a "passing terrorist"—and while, had he lived to an age beyond that of which he died, he might have eventually achieved the unification that Fuller credits him for, he showed amazingly little intent in doing so. The evidence, therefore, points to the contrary: Alexander was never a unifier, ~~but~~ but only a conqueror blessed with extraordinary military skill.

Roman religion: B15.

The Romans believed that making and maintaining contact with the gods was vitally important, for only by courting divine goodwill could an individual secure good fortune and happiness for himself and those whom he held dear. In many ways, religion was as important as medicine might be today—and the Roman state had good reason to keep it that way. The sources provide us with insight into ~~just~~ how important their relationships with their gods were to the Romans, and also with a fascinating <sup>insight into</sup> perspective on why this was beneficial to the state.

The Romans believed in a transactional relationship with their gods, which, of course, rendered the observation of religious ritual vitally important in everyday life, for if one failed to honor the gods and fulfill one's own side of the bargain then the gods would without fail retaliate, just as a business partner might after an unscrupulous deal.

The relationship was simple and direct, as evidenced by many Roman sources: the underlying principle was "I give so that you may give". The drama "Pot of Gold", for instance, tells of how ~~the~~ the Lars of one household reveals to the paterfamilia the location of a long-desired pot of gold, in direct exchange for the daughter's many sacrifices and piety in her devotion to the household god, so that the father ~~with~~ might more easily find her a husband ~~in~~ Source E, Livy too highlights the very business-like relationship that Romans had with their gods: just like one might entertain guests (anxiously) to render them more amenable to a proposal, so Livy describes the Romans setting out couches for the gods and furnishing them lavishly. Source G shows that the Romans had anthropomorphic visions of many of their gods, just like the Greeks, and just like Greek gods Roman gods were not always reasonable, could be vindictive and liked flattery. Therefore, it was ~~also~~ quite reasonably crucial to maintain the gods' favour, and fulfil one's own side of the bargain — by sacrificing regularly and correctly, like Source H ~~as~~ shows, ~~the~~ the gods, too, needed nourishment — for the ~~gods~~ divine could be just as merciful and vindictive as humans in their reprisals.

The sources demonstrate that Romans, accordingly, set a great amount of store by religion. Cicero, in some of his other writings, proudly attributes Rome's military domination to the way in which "Rome excels all others ~~in~~ in religio", or religious respect and devotion; as Source E ~~shows~~, and F demonstrates, the oracles and auspices were accounted ~~to~~ for in any ~~and~~ work of great crisis or monumental decision, right from ~~and~~ the

level of individual Roman commoner families to — as Source E and F document — ~~the~~ matters of state such as plague, titles and war. Many Romans attributed their unequalled military success to their unsurpassed devotion to the gods, in line with the transactional view expanded upon earlier. Virgil, in his "Aeneid", shows — albeit in a romanticized fashion — how the "gods" might literally determine life or death for Romans: previously having made a decision to stay and ~~be annihilated~~ die in Troy, Anchises changes his mind upon seeing a divine portent. As can be seen, religious devotion was a matter of great importance to the Romans, and it ~~is~~ interfered regularly with every aspect of life.

One might suspect, then, that the Roman populace would be quite easy to sway ~~on the~~ with the use of religion as a tool to put forward one's own agenda — and this, indeed, was the case. The use of religion to advance a political agenda was certainly not a Roman invention — centuries before the age of Augustus, Alexander the Great was famous for claiming Zeus-Ammon as a father — but the Romans ~~certainly~~ made an art out of it. Cicero's writings in Source F lay bare how much of Rome's religious devotion was also a vital political device: Julius Caesar used his cloak in religious affairs to great political advantage, and Cicero is writing about one of his many machinations to advance his political power under the name of religion. Cicero's polished skepticism shows that Romans — educated ones, at least — ~~did~~ certainly did not all believe everything that was claimed to be "divine will"; while the masses might consider the "will of the gods" to be ~~a~~ irrefutably important, Cicero's writings indicate

that the Roman elite were quite well-aware of the political advantages to which religion could be used, and indeed were involved in many cases of manipulating the general populace by these means. In this context, therefore, the "importance of making and maintaining contact with the gods" takes on a second meaning: the Romans' populace might have taken religious devotion at face value, but those who governed the city were well aware of another reason that "maintaining contact with the gods" was "important"; that of political usefulness. //

The Romans believed in a transactional relationship with their gods, characterized by the principle of "I give so that you may give", and so set a great deal of store by religion, to the point where religious devotion was a part of almost every major decision and event in Roman life; this was a state of affairs that the statesmen of Rome would certainly have encouraged, for while even they may have believed in the efficacy of sacrifices to some extent, they were also acutely aware of the political usefulness of religion. There\* was, therefore, two "importances" of making and maintaining contact with the gods in Roman life; one was motivated by the genuine belief that the gods had to be constantly appeased, but the other was rooted in the political advantages that every religion and the "will of the gods" effectively could bring. //

Virgil's Aeneid: AIO //

Virgil clearly intends his Aeneas to be a human hero, a man with <sup>capacities for</sup> grief, fear, love and loneliness in his heart; much has been

made of the contrast between Homer's smashbuckling Odysseus and Virgil's more sensitive, conflicted Aeneas. Yet his attempts to bring worthy inner conflict to Aeneas are not always successful; what is supposed to be a profound emotional struggle between Aeneas' compassion and his duty to father often leaves the reader unsatisfied and Aeneas seeming like a very detached ~~per~~ individual. Nevertheless, we must keep in mind the difference between the Roman emotional and moral perspective and ours today as we ~~are~~ examine the character of Aeneas, and judge how successful Virgil has been in constructing a sensitive and unbattled hero. /

Virgil's Aeneas appears to display genuine tenderness ~~and~~ <sup>towards</sup> those close to him and compassion for his friends; there is little doubt that Virgil was attempting to infuse him with a sensibility quite lacking in the Homeric heroes of ~~from~~<sup>Aeneas</sup>. He often refers to his son as "dear ~~Anchises~~ Ascanius", such as in "but Aeneas could not rest without seeing that dear Ascanius was safe and present", before Ascanius fetches the gifts and is promptly replaced by Cupid in Book I; towards his father, he expresses all of the love and duty that a filial Roman son should — "Did you truly believe, that I, your son, would leave you behind in peril? Could a father's lips truly utter such chilling words?" — often following where Anchises points in Book III even though he is frequently wrong. When he arrives in Carthage and sees the fallen of Troy celebrated in art, he weeps with both grief and joy at seeing sympathy expressed for the Trojan toils — something that Homer's hard-bitten heroes would likely not be seen dead doing, and indeed testament to the deep humanity of Virgil's Aeneas. /

Yet, particularly from a modern perspective, the reader is frequently jolted out of the drama by the cold way in which Aeneas often abruptly ~~suddenly~~<sup>modern</sup> behaves. In Book II Creusa ~~is~~ entirely forgotten by Aeneas, ~~left behind and killed~~, although he returns to search for her afterwards, calling her name in a frenzy and attempting futilely to embrace her ghost; the reader is left somewhat nonplussed at the fact that he could forget his wife at all, even preoccupied with son and father that he was. In Book IV this side of Aeneas once again appears: Aeneas' first thought after receiving the message from Mercury ~~is~~ is not of Dido, but a frankly surprising "he wanted now nothing more to leave the place (Carthage)". Dido's inconsolable grief and beggary — "I ask of him now not to restore our marriage to the honour it once enjoyed, but only — for his own sake — to award a favorable wind" — makes Aeneas seem almost heartless when he "remained unmoved". Although he certainly seems to think of her tenderly still — as indicated by his surprised and sorrowful greeting ~~in~~ in the Underworld — this forms an almost odd contrast to his behavior after the missive, preparing his ships without first considering in Dido and then essentially terminating their relationship in the ~~most~~ <sup>harshest</sup> way possible ("Has he once sighed in response to my tears, or even spared a glance, ~~a~~ much less a tear of pity for his love?"). Clearly Virgil is attempting to ~~make~~ have Aeneas live up to his epithet, and redeem himself after his displays of favor in ~~the~~ Troy and his languishing in Carthage, but Aeneas' behavior in these situations is so cold that ~~this~~ Virgil's attempts to reinstate his compassion afterwards seem almost out of place.

We must keep in mind, however, that as modern readers our perspectives will invariably be tinted by the moral ~~and~~ order,

that have evolved out of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which will be quite different to those which Virgil's Roman ~~the~~ readers held. Susanna Braund argues that "the greatest and most Roman of Roman virtues is self-control": to a Roman audience, Aeneas' pietas might well have been a worthy conflict for his sense of compassion and tenderness, but to the modern reader, who values self-restraint and emotional detachment in a sensitive situation incomparably less — in fact, who would likely value the opposite — Aeneas' sudden and brutal rejections of the women he supposedly loves seems surprising and almost misplaced. A modern Aeneas would be more likely to fight desperately for Creusa but have her snatched from his arms, and perhaps attempt to reconcile the unfortunate Carthaginian queen but ~~fail~~ find her irreconcilable; the modern mindset clearly values passionate love and heroic self-sacrifice, ~~although not~~ while ancient Romans thought of love as a pathology — as evidenced by Virgil's vivid descriptions of Dido "afire with love... like a doe caught by a hunter's arrow" — and valued self-restraint and duty to the greater good above personal commitment. As such, as modern readers we are quite liable to place undue emphasis on Aeneas' abrupt acts of coldness compared to a Roman readership.

To the modern reader, then, Virgil's Aeneas is likely to surprise the audience by ~~suddenly becoming~~ abruptly changing from being <sup>an</sup> ~~hero~~ unfeeling and cold "due" to the demands of his pietas; although Virgil clearly intended Aeneas to be a human, feeling hero, perhaps even for a Roman audience Aeneas' inner conflict concerning his ~~not~~ compassion and his duty could have been a little more convincing, and not quite so binary. There is little doubt, however, that as modern readers we are liable to ~~over~~ overemphasize this contrast in our /

minds, as compared with a Roman readership, for our moral codes  
are substantially different.

ASSESSOR'S  
USE ONLY

8