



# **ANCIENT HISTORY**

## **ATAR course examination 2024**

### **Marking key for Rome**

Marking keys are an explicit statement about what the examining panel expect of candidates when they respond to particular examination items. They help ensure a consistent interpretation of the criteria that guide the awarding of marks.

## Rome 133–63 BC

## Question 29

(6 marks)

Identify **two** reforms introduced by Gaius Gracchus and outline their significance.

Description	Marks
Reforms	
Identifies two of the reforms introduced by Gaius Gracchus	2
Identifies one reform introduced by Gaius Gracchus, or makes generalised comments about two reforms	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2</b>
Significance (2 x 2 marks)	
Outlines the significance of a correctly identified reform of Gaius Gracchus with relevant detail	2
Identifies the significance of a correctly identified reform of Gaius Gracchus	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>Gaius Gracchus introduced a series of radical measures to promote the welfare of the people and limit the power of the ruling oligarchy, among the most significant were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lex agraria: Gracchus developed his brother's agrarian law, redistributing public land to the lower classes and the foundation of colonies. Linked with this were measures to strengthen Rome's infrastructure through new roads making isolated farms and rural villages more accessible and more productive</li> <li>• Lex frumentaria: improved the city's food supply by buying grain in large quantities from North Africa and Spain and distributed in Rome at a subsidised price. This measure was predominantly intended to support the plebs urbana, the city poor</li> <li>• Lex de provincia Asia: the decuma (i.e. one tenth of the harvest, collected as tax) of the wealthy new province of Asia sold by the censors in Rome. An auction at Rome was supposed to ensure that corruption would be spotted quickly. The collection of the revenue was sold as an annual public contract, to the highest-bidding <i>publicanus</i>, who reimbursed himself through an official levy. This may have been a way of compensating rich equestrians for losses sustained as a result of the lex agraria</li> <li>• Lex de provinciis consularibus: to prevent corruption, he introduced a law forcing the Senate to designate the consular provinces before the election. The Senate's decision could not be vetoed by the tribunes</li> <li>• Lex militaris: Regulated Rome's army service, the conscription of young men under the age of 17 became illegal; that every soldier was provided free clothing and equipment</li> <li>• Lex iudicaria, lex Acilia and lex de repetundis: these laws were enacted to allow members of the non-political class to control politicians and protect provincials from Roman officials. One law ensured only equites, who had not yet been senators or magistrates, could be chosen as jurors; the other allowed Rome's allies to prosecute Roman magistrates for illegal confiscation of property</li> <li>• Lex de provocatione: only the Roman people could authorise the capital punishment of a Roman citizen. Anyone acting contrary to this law could be executed.</li> </ul> <p>Accept other relevant answers.</p>	

## Question 30

(6 marks)

Explain the meaning of the term *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* using an example from the period 133–63 BC.

Description	Marks
<b>Meaning of <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i></b>	
Explains the meaning of <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i>	4
Describes the meaning of <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i>	3
Describes the <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i> in general terms	2
Makes general statements about the <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i>	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Example</b>	
Uses accurately one relevant example in some detail	2
Makes a generalised use of one example	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>The <i>Senatus Consultum Ultimum</i> (SCU) ‘The Senate’s Final Decree’ was an emergency political measure to prevent the state from suffering harm in times of extraordinary crisis, i.e. violent riots or sedition.</p> <p>Through the SCU, the Senate granted magistrates (in most cases consul/s) additional powers, such as the right to raise armies or to use physical force against Roman citizens.</p> <p>It perhaps encouraged magistrates to disregard legal restraints (i.e. Cicero). In contrast to the dictatorship, the authority granted through the SCU was not independent to the power of the Senate and magistrates could later be brought to justice for their actions. Questions arose if circumstances had justified the SCU or whether the level of force used by the magistrate had been appropriate i.e. Gaius Gracchus’ <i>Lex de provocation</i>, legislation introduced by Clodius successfully held Cicero accountable for his actions in 63 BC leading to Cicero’s exile.</p> <p>Possible examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaius Gracchus (121 BC)</li> <li>• Saturninus (100 BC)</li> <li>• Lepidus (77 BC)</li> <li>• Catiline (63 BC).</li> </ul>	
Accept other relevant answers.	

## Question 31

(6 marks)

Describe changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War and outline their significance.

Description	Marks
<b>Changes</b>	
Describes changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War in detail	3
Describes changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War in a generalised way	2
Makes a limited description of changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Significance</b>	
Outlines clearly and accurately the significance of the changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War	3
Outlines some aspects of the significance of the changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War	2
Makes general statements about the significance of changes to citizenship brought about by the Social War	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prior to the Social War, numerous Italian allies supplied significant numbers of troops to the Roman army but had no access to Roman citizenship or to the privileges associated with citizenship – they were subject allies</li> <li>• the Social War led to extension of Roman citizenship to the people of the Italian peninsula (i.e. south of the Po). This was achieved through: <i>lex Julia</i>, which granted citizenship to all Latin and Italian allies who had remained loyal to Rome (and, of the Latin allies, all but Venusia had stayed loyal); <i>lex Plautia Papiria</i>, which allowed citizenship to anyone enrolled by the praetor within 60 days of the passage of the law</li> <li>• in the short term, the significance was the reduction in one of the main causes of grievance between Rome and its neighbours – citizenship had been the key issue of the Social War</li> <li>• longer term, the change also meant the dissolution (largely) of the distinctions between Roman, Latin and Italian, and the gradual political unification of the Italian peninsula</li> <li>• tension continued because of the way allied citizenship had to be enrolled – in only eight (or 10) of the 35 tribes. Sulpicius' pursuit of change to this limitation was one factor that led to increased political violence into the 70s.</li> </ul>	
Accept other relevant answers.	

## Question 32

(6 marks)

Explain reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC.

Description	Marks
Explains accurately reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC in detail	6
Explains reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC	5
Describes reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC	4
Describes reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC in a generalised way	3
Makes a limited description of reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC	2
Makes little reference to reasons for Sulla's First March on Rome in 88 BC. May include errors	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>

Answers could include:

- the key issue was the reversal of the tribune Sulpicius' transfer of the Mithridatic command; this command had legitimately fallen to Sulla as the consul of 88 BC, but Sulpicius had enacted legislation which, without any legitimate cause, transferred this command to the aged Marius
- Sulpicius' actions as tribune not only undermined Sulla's prestige (and removed from him a key opportunity to increase his own standing and wealth) but caused an immediate threat to Sulla's personal safety; the violence used against the consuls' attempts to block Sulpicius led to Sulla seeking refuge in Marius' house
- Sulla's march was made feasible by the fact that he was able, through Marius' inactivity, to secure the loyalty of the legions he had mustered for the war. His rivals, Marius and Sulpicius, who had remained in Rome, had no troops available to them. Sulla's overwhelming military superiority allowed him to act as he did.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Question 33

(6 marks)

Explain in detail the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy.

Description	Marks
Explains in detail the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy	6
Explains the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy	5
Describes the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy	4
Identifies the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy in generalised way	3
Makes a limited identification of the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy	2
Makes little reference to the significance of the Catiline Conspiracy. May include errors	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to Cicero, crushing the conspiracy brought about a temporary harmony among those in both senate and <i>equites</i> who valued the stability of the Roman Republic – Cicero's vaunted <i>concordia ordinum</i>. Different sectors of Roman society had united to ward off Catiline, whose program of debt cancellation posed threats to the interests of many. It might be noted that crushing the conspiracy did nothing to address the widespread discontent (e.g. among failed veteran farmers) that had fuelled the conspiracy, therefore large pockets around Italy remained susceptible remained to such mobilisation against the state</li> <li>the outcome had significant impacts for Cicero. In the short term, his prestige reached its zenith (the acclamation as <i>pater patriae</i>); however, the political landscape shifted and condemning Roman citizens to the death, without trial, became a liability for Cicero - Clodius was able to have Cicero exiled because of it</li> <li>passing the <i>Senatus Consultatum Ultimum</i> should be mentioned. Its use against the conspirators, and the subsequent tribulations faced by Cicero because of it, brought the ambiguity of use of the SCU into sharp focus and acted as a source of discontent about the powers of the senate.</li> </ul>	
Accept other relevant answers.	

## Section Two: Source analysis – Unit 4

25% (20 Marks)

## Rome 63 BC–AD 14

## Question 34

(10 marks)

Evaluate the accuracy of the perspective in Source 1 that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War.

Refer to Source 1 and to your understanding of the period of study in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive evaluation of the accuracy of the perspective in the source that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War. Shows detailed understanding of the source and makes accurate detailed reference to the period of study	9–10
Makes an appropriate evaluation of the accuracy of the perspective in the source that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War. Shows understanding of the source and makes accurate reference to the period of study	7–8
Makes a generalised evaluation of the accuracy of the perspective in the source that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War. Refers to the source and makes generalised reference to the period of study	5–6
Makes a limited evaluation of the accuracy of the perspective in the source that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War. Shows limited understanding of the source and makes limited reference to the period of study	3–4
Makes a superficial evaluation of the accuracy of the perspective in the source that the Optimates were responsible for the Civil War. Shows little understanding of the source and makes little or no reference to the period of study. May include errors	1–2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>It could be argued that Caesar's comment that 'they brought it on themselves' is not accurate, and that Plutarch's comment that Caesar had a 'love of power' is valid. It can also be argued that the Optimates were at least as aggressive as Caesar. Stronger responses may propose that the Optimates and Caesar plus their various supporters all contributed to the outbreak of war.</p> <p>The Optimates regarded themselves as the best men, combining moral and social superiority. This group emerged as an identifiable/exclusive group at the time of the Gracchi and made up the majority of the Senate. As the governing class they dominated Roman society through influence in government, courts, religion and the army. Events since the Gracchi highlight the willingness of this group to go to great lengths to protect and promote their power and status. From 61 BC the First Triumvirate and then Caesar's success were a challenge to this group. Challenges included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the dispute between Caesar and his political enemies who dominated the Roman Senate had been occurring for some time</li> <li>Caesar's statement 'They brought it on themselves', puts blame for the outbreak of war onto his political enemies, the Optimates – i.e., the 'die was cast'</li> <li>Caesar's enemies – Cato, M. Marcellus, Ahenobarbus, Bibulus and others – saw themselves as the preeminent men who opposed the political threat represented by Caesar. To them Caesar was arrogant and had deprived them of their rightful glory and success</li> <li>Marcellus proposed that Ahenobarbus should replace Caesar in the Gallic command – this would strip Caesar of his <i>imperium</i>, and was unacceptable to Caesar</li> </ul>	

**Question 34** (continued)

- when his command was debated by the Senate, Caesar counter-proposed (through the Tribune Curio) that Pompey should also lose his command. Plutarch states Pompey had 'plunged into a mood of unlimited confidence; for Caesar's power he felt nothing but contempt.' (Pompey, 57) i.e. Pompey was unwilling to put aside his own power, even if it meant risking civil war
- that Caesar could conclude that 'They brought it on themselves' is not surprising – it is also a declaration that 'it is not my fault'. This is debatable. His decision to continue to pass legislation during 59 BC, despite the situation with Bibulus, had far reaching consequences on his career – it was the threat used by his enemies to impeach his command thereafter; he had arguably staged the flight of the Tribunes before the war; he had crossed the Rubicon
- on the other hand Caesar's offers to Pompey to lay down their power (which Pompey refused) on several occasions show that he did try to avoid conflict; the Optimate's suggestion of replacing him with Ahenobarbus was provocative; the decision by a small band of most influential Optimates to completely ignore the overwhelming vote of the majority of the senate (370–22 BC) to accept Caesar's proposals to avoid conflict demonstrate the bellicosity of this group
- the civil war that erupted in 49 BC was probably unavoidable to an extent because the political system in Rome had become very corrupted by the first century BC and was easily manipulated by individuals and power factions.

Accept other relevant answers.



## Question 35

(10 marks)

Assess the usefulness of Source 2 in contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study.

Refer to Source 2 and to your understanding of the period of study in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the usefulness of the source in contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study. Shows thorough understanding of the source, makes accurate detailed reference to the period of study	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the usefulness of the source in contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study. Shows understanding of the source and makes accurate reference to the period of study	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the usefulness of the source in contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study. Shows generalised understanding of the source and makes generalised reference to the period of study	5–6
Limited assessment of the usefulness of the source in contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study. Shows limited understanding of the source and makes limited reference to the period of study	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the source's contributing to our understanding of the use of political violence in the period of study. Shows little understanding of the source and makes little or no reference to the period of study. May include errors	1–2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>The last century of the Roman Republic is characterised by outbreaks of violence that cost thousands of lives, motivated mainly by political reasons. However, not all of this was the result of the actions of leaders or would be leaders. The source states that political violence was motivated more by political rivalry than plebeian uprising. Answers can argue that the source is useful in demonstrating how violence was led by the political elite, and/or that the source is useful for demonstrating violence was not always initiated by the elite. A good answer should support its argument with relevant evidence from the ancient and/or modern source and/or historical narrative.</p> <p>Answers might argue that Gruen's comment is a useful reflection of the political culture in Rome. Violence by the plebs did occur but were not the major cause of violence. Almost all of the violence in Roman politics was a result of politicians using their followers, clients, slaves or retainers to support their own interests or attack others.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• much of the violence in Rome in the period was a result of political rivalry and activity by powerful individuals and/or factions. The instability that undermined Roman politics was a result of a system that increasingly operated around powerful individuals and factions – the plebs Romans were called upon to vote, but elections existed to give the political elite power and were often carefully staged. The power the plebs had in their tribunes can be argued to have diminished from the dictatorship of Sulla</li> <li>• the next decade saw fierce political rivalry: Julius Caesar and his opponents; the return of Pompey from his successful campaigns in the East; the turmoil of fierce political factional fighting; the First Triumvirate is formed by Pompey, Caesar and Crassus promoted their interest in the face of fierce opposition in the Senate by their various opponents. They used the threat of force with Pompey's veterans to achieve political goals; Caesar and Crassus used the tribune Clodius to disrupt the interests of Pompey and Cicero; Clodius and his gang of followers harassed and intimidated Pompey and gang warfare erupted between Clodius and Milo. Clodius was murdered in early 52 BC, his funeral pyre burned down the Senate House</li> </ul>	

**Question 35** (continued)

- Political violence was so common place by 52 BC that Pompey was granted a sole consulship to restore order - Pompey aligned himself with the Optimates and used this opportunity to create more political trouble by undermining Caesar's position
- events after this led to civil war and are clearly a consequence of rivalry between Rome's leaders and their factions. Pompey's move to the anti-Caesar faction inevitably led to war.

Violence originated by the plebs may have occurred and that Gruen's recognition that this was less common is useful. Relevant examples should be provided to support this.

Examples:

- there was irritation as a result of Caesar's land bill in 59 BC
- the power of the tribunes can be argued to have diminished from the dictatorship of Sulla, this could be argued to have motivated the mob to stir into action, i.e. the so-called *flight of the Tribunes* preceding the outbreak of civil war between Pompey and Caesar triggered widespread breakdown in law and order
- the increase of gangs and thugs from 58 BC suggests that violence was normalised beyond leaders and leadership – by 56 BC this was so bad that very little official business could be conducted. By 54 BC the situation had deteriorated so much that by the end of the year no consuls had been elected
- Clodius' murder in 52 BC led to widespread rioting, his followers burned his body in the Senate, the fire got out of control and burned the Senate House down. Martial law was declared, Pompey was given power to restore law and order in 52 BC – his singular control over politics until 49 BC and the outbreak of civil war indicate the prevalence of violence which was occurring beyond incidents incited by others beyond key leaders/individuals.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Question 36

(10 marks)

Assess the reliability of Augustus' claim in *Res Gestae* 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people.

Refer to the source and to your understanding of other evidence and/or examples of Augustus' position and power during the period of study in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the reliability Augustus' claim in <i>Res Gestae</i> 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people. Shows thorough understanding of the source, makes detailed reference to the period of study	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the reliability Augustus' claim in <i>Res Gestae</i> 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people. Shows understanding of the source, makes some detailed reference to the period of study	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the reliability Augustus' claim in <i>Res Gestae</i> 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people. Shows generalised understanding of the source, makes generalised reference to the period of study	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the impact of the reliability Augustus' claim in <i>Res Gestae</i> 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people. Shows limited understanding of the source, makes limited reference to the period of study	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the reliability Augustus' claim in <i>Res Gestae</i> 34 that he ruled with 'universal consent' after handing power to the Senate and people. Shows little understanding of the source and makes little or no reference to the period of study. May include errors	1–2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>There is a lack of reliability of Augustus' propaganda and the actual nature of Augustus' power. His propaganda might have contained the messages that it did. It is necessary to assess where Augustus' true power lay, recognising the impact of Augustus' propaganda on what we know about changes to the power structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Augustus enjoyed dominance because of 'universal consent' is unreliable. There was an oath of loyalty, but the term 'universal consent' implies that his powers were granted by the people, they were not. Perhaps universal acceptance or acknowledgement would be more accurate</li> <li>• Augustus' intent in constructing the <i>Res Gestae</i> and/or his methods of displaying it. It is a heavily edited piece of Augustan propaganda cultivated to record his greatest achievements. It is therefore not historically accurate in a number of places</li> <li>• Augustus made the claim he transferred his power to the 'Senate and people of Rome' in his sixth and seventh consulships in 28/27 BC using the settlements of 27/23/19. This is only partially true. He maintained control over political processes and power structures by remodelling traditional ones</li> <li>• his decision to purge the senate using the censorial powers before 27 BC leaving approximately 600 senators who were likely to support him</li> <li>• this 'restoration' was seen positively by some Roman writers (Ovid and Velleius) though others (Dio and Tacitus) were more cynical</li> </ul>	

## Question 36 (continued)

- he had complete control of the armed forces after Actium. This was the real base of his power
- Octavian's political power was based on several things - he had been consul in 33 BC and continuously between 31—23 BC. He continued to hold Triumviral powers (although these were not advertised) and an oath of loyalty to him had been sworn until the Settlements
- in the Settlement of 27 BC, he gave up extraordinary dictatorial power. However, this was replaced by control for 10 years over a huge imperial province which included Gaul, Spain, Syria, Cyprus, Cilicia and Egypt - a virtual private estate. Control over this area was renewed over the next decades
- in 23 BC he remodelled the base of his power on the tribunician powers, for which tenure was annual and perpetual. His tribunician powers modified the traditional role of the Tribune and effectively granted him primacy over people and Senate:
  - the right to put the first motion at any meeting
  - the right of veto
  - the right of *coercitio*, the right to compel a citizen to obey his orders
  - the right to help any citizen who were being oppressed by other magistrates, this included the right to investigate actions taken against the citizen.
- as governor of imperial provinces, Augustus held a proconsular imperium. This had to be modified because proconsuls traditionally had to forfeit imperium on entering the city. Therefore, Augustus' imperium was continuous and *maius imperium* or 'greater'. Therefore, his authority was greater than the governors of all other provinces, who operated under his auspices (i.e. proconsul Marcus Licinius Crassus' was denied the right to dedicate *Spolia Opima* after he killed the Bastarnae king Deldo)
- the creation of the title 'Princeps', First Citizen, is confirmation of his primacy as was his creation, and acceptance by the Senate, of the new name/title 'Augustus'.

As a result, Augustus does appear to have had some of his powers removed/reduced, but his unique tribunician power and control over the armies through his *maius imperium* clearly compensated for these losses. His claims in RG34 and the Settlements create an illusion that he handed power back to the Senate and people. However, his political authority and power had actually been enhanced and approved by the Senate. The overwhelming power of one man, supported by control of the army in the imperial provinces and the praetorian guard in the city is the reality of Augustus' power base after the Settlements, all of which contests the propaganda in the source.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Section Three: Essay

50% (50 Marks)

## Part A: Unit 3

25% (25 marks)

## Rome 133-63 BC

Marking key for Questions 37–39

Description	Marks
<b>Introduction</b>	
Defines the focus of the topic/question, defines key terms and provides relevant background information. Provides a proposition that articulates the direction of the essay in terms of line of argument/viewpoint	3
States the topic/question and provides some relevant background information. Provides a simple proposition indicating direction to be taken in relation to the focus of the essay	2
States the topic/question and provides limited background information	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Understanding of historical narrative</b>	
Produces a relevant, sophisticated narrative that demonstrates an understanding of the interrelationships between events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	7
Produces a relevant, comprehensive narrative that demonstrates an understanding of the relationships between events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	6
Produces a relevant, coherent narrative that demonstrates an understanding of some connections across events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	5
Produces a narrative that identifies some connections across events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change in the narrative, and/or shows some understanding of the reliability of the ancient evidence in the narrative	4
Produces a simple narrative which is mainly chronological and makes some reference to events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or shows limited understanding of the ancient evidence	3
Produces a simple narrative which is often incorrect and makes minimal reference to events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or demonstrates minimal understanding of the relevant ancient evidence	2
Makes general/superficial statements about the narrative	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Argument</b>	
Constructs a sustained, logical and sophisticated argument which shows a depth of analysis in relation to the topic/question	6
Constructs a coherent, analytical argument in relation to the topic/question	5
Produces a logically-structured argument that shows some analytical thinking in relation to the topic/question	4
Provides relevant points/information in relation to the topic/question and indicates direction for argument	3
Makes generalisations and some relevant statements in relation to the topic/question	2
Makes superficial, disjointed statements in relation to the topic/question	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Use of evidence</b>	
Uses relevant sources with accuracy and detail throughout the essay. Refers to this evidence at points where it provides support for the argument/viewpoint	6
Uses relevant sources with accuracy throughout the essay. Refers to this evidence at effective points to provide some support for the argument/viewpoint	5
Uses relevant sources in the essay. Refers to this evidence at some appropriate points	4
Provides some relevant evidence. Refers to this evidence but with inaccuracies	3
Provides some limited evidence with inaccuracies. Makes an attempt to refer to some of this evidence	2
Provides minimal evidence which is often irrelevant or inaccurate	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
Draws together the argument/viewpoint of the essay, linking evidence presented with the original proposition	3
Summarises the argument/viewpoint of the essay, making some reference to the topic/question	2
Makes general/superficial statements about the focus of the essay	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>

## Question 37

(25 marks)

Describe significant events in Gaius Marius' career and analyse their influence on the power and authority of the Senate and the Roman Republic.

Answers could include:

Stronger responses will carefully choose which events in Marius' career best demonstrate his impact on power structures during the republic and will consider the effect of decisions made by the senate. A simple description of events will not address the question.

- Gaius Marius' remarkable career was a result of anomalous circumstances in times of crisis. The powers granted him by the senate protected the state in the short term but had disastrous long-term political impact. His career highlighted the weaknesses of the senate and the republican system
- Marius' career demonstrated the system could be manipulated. Ambitious generals with men and veterans to provide for were soon manipulating political process for their own interests
- in the years before his first consulship in 107 BC Marius needed a consulship to take on a military command. He achieved this through support from the Equites and the threat of Jugurtha and a Germanic invasion all of which needed a competent military commander. However, this had a clear influence on elections and demonstrates the power of the tribunes and people to interfere in the traditional powers of the Senate
- in Marius' consulship of 107 BC he began his military reforms which created a new type of Roman army by recruiting landless volunteers, creating a 'professional' army. This changed the relationship between commanders and their men and resulted in loyalty to the commander not the State
- after a break with former patrons Marius used his military successes and his support from the equestrian ranks to achieve six successive consulships. These successive consulships (104 -100 BC) were extraordinary commands and a result of threat from invasion by Germanic tribes. Marius manipulated political process to achieve power and military command against the Germanic tribes. His commands highlight the State's blindness to the growing status and influence of the military leaders. Marius' own failure to use his veterans and army to achieve private ambition, until after Sulla showed how military support could be beneficial, reflects the senate's ignorance of the situation created by the military reforms
- the threat of German invasion of Italy led to his successive consulships until 100 BC - this broke the rules for re-election set down by the *lex Villia Annalis* (180 BC) which imposed a gap of two years for successive magistracies and a ten year gap for re-election to the same office. This created a precedent for later individuals like Pompey who exploited the willingness of the senate to break the rules when needed
- Marius was a successful general (e.g. Jugurtha, the German tribes) - his status was enhanced by significant military victories, his success also encouraged the senate to continue to grant him extraordinary powers and commands, setting dangerous precedents
- he returned to Rome and took up the consulship in 100 BC for the sixth time facing increased opposition from his political enemies (mainly the Optimates). He allied himself to the tribune Saturninus who was killed by an angry mob. There was the increasing use and impact of political violence. After this however, Marius' popularity and support vanished. This was the first major consequence of Marius political career - his successive consulships broke the rules and could be said to have contributed to an environment of political instability at the time

- Marius was a better general than a politician. His military reforms clearly had benefits for Rome, but the character of the army had changed. The bond between commanders and army became a destabilising factor in politics which was eventually exploited by Marius as well as others such as Sulla, Pompey and Caesar – the marches on Rome during Marius' later life mark the beginning of significant uses of client armies to disrupt political process and led, eventually, to the collapse of the Republic because the soldier's loyalty was to their commanders not the State.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Question 38

(25 marks)

Assess the impact of Pompey's extraordinary commands on the power of the Senate to 63 BC.

Answers could include:

Pompey's commands were against forces/individuals considered a threat to the Senate and the Republic (i.e. Spartacus' slave uprising, piracy resulting in the *lex Gabinia*, grain shortage in the 50s etc). To an extent these commands strengthened the authority of the Senate; the extraordinary nature of those commands, however, and the degree to which they concentrated power repeatedly in the hands of an individual despite the political traditions of the Republic system, ultimately served to undermine the senate and the Republic.

- his extraordinary command against the Marian forces in Sicily and Africa was stated to be a defence of senatorial interests, but the violation of the *lex Villia Annales* (Pompey was 24) weakened the processes regulating access to power
- Pompey's first command of an army (personally raised in Picenum) arguably undermined the authority of the senate – Sulla's reforms were undone by permitting Pompey command over this privately levied force. This also represented a longer-term threat to the stability of the State
- the senate granted command against Lepidus and Brutus after passing the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* against the two rebels. Pompey was therefore acting for the senate, protecting its power and authority. However, the senate being willing to violate the laws (again) to confer this command (Pompey was still too young and had not held senatorial office) represents gradual weakening of the traditions and practices of the Republic
- transferring power to a young unqualified man was a dangerous practice. To achieve the command against Sertorius, Pompey refused to disband his army after the defeat of Lepidus, his demand to be given the Sertorian campaign was granted - usurping senatorial power, recognised at the time by some of his astute peers (Philippus)
- the *Gabinia* and *Manilia* commands gave Pompey unprecedented military power, and unprecedented political power in the eastern Mediterranean. This impinged on the traditional role of the senate in foreign policy. Catullus' opposition to the *Gabinia* indicated awareness among some of his peers of the threat Pompey's career posed
- the role of the tribunes in some of Pompey's later extraordinary commands (i.e. *lex Gabinia* and *Manilia*), and the impact of these in promoting the will of the people over the Senate should also be addressed.

Accept other relevant answers.



## Question 39

(25 marks)

Analyse how changes to the role of the tribunate influenced Roman politics and/or society between 133 and 63 BC.

Answers could include:

There are a number of examples that can be used to demonstrate changes to the Tribunate. Stronger responses will carefully choose appropriate examples to best demonstrate the change. A list of tribune's actions will not appropriately 'assess' the impact of changes.

The role of the Tribunate:

- the Concilium Plebis chose Plebeian magistrates - the Tribunes and Plebeian Aediles
- the role of the tribunes was to defend the lives and property of the plebeians. Their power was based on *sacrosanctitas* (inviolability), they could not be physically attacked - an oath was taken by the plebs to uphold this
- the powers of a tribune were extensive - they had the right of *intercessio* (veto) over any act by a magistrate, against laws and *senatus consulta* (advice of the senate to magistrates), and elections
- they had the power to call assemblies, propose resolutions or *plebiscita*, and assert the right of *plebiscita*
- each tribune had the power to stop (veto) the action of another tribune.

Changes to the role of the Tribunate:

- the tribunate represented the *plebs*, thus a useful instrument for reform - however this challenged the domination of the traditional authority of the ruling class who controlled the Senate
- the tribunate became a platform for aspiring politicians; an instrument of reform and disruption; and an effective way to manipulate power structures and resources to suit individual agenda.

The Gracchi:

- the tribunes became agents of powerful and ambitious individuals rather than agents of the plebs. A general discussion about what Tiberius did as tribune - his land bill, Octavius' opposition and veto and TG's reaction would be appropriate, his attempt to enforce the authority of the people provoked a violent reaction from the Senate which resulted in the deaths of Tiberius and many of his supporters. The normalisation of violence in politics after this is significant
- Gaius' program of reform was wide ranging, a general discussion about his reforms as tribune is relevant as it demonstrates the increasing role of the tribunes in holding various magistrates accountable, and many of Gaius' reforms undercut the privileges of the ruling class. Additionally, the violence which occurred around Gaius' re-election led to and SCU being passed - the consuls acted to ensure that the Republic was unharmed resulting in the death of Gaius and 3000 of his supporters, thus political violence was legitimised by the introduction of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*

Saturninus:

- Saturninus' tribunate (103 BC and 100 BC) promoted reforms that were arguably against the interests of the Senate i.e. Saturninus unsuccessfully attempted to introduce a *lex Frumentaria* to fix the cost of grain at a very low price
- Saturninus allied to Marius to distribute land for Marius' veterans. The events of 100 BC were violent, after Saturninus and his supporters seized the Capitol the Senate passed an *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*. Marius was ordered to restore order. In the end, violence was widespread and Saturninus and many of his supporters were executed. Increase in use of violence as a political tool is significant.

**Question 39** (continued)

Other examples:

- M. Livius Drusus (91) policies and murder contributed to breakdown in relations between Rome and its allies in Italy which led to the outbreak of the Social War
- Sulpicius allied with Marius in 88 transferring the command against Mithridates from Sulla to Marius. Sulpicius' private force of *equites* (the 'anti-Senate') and 3000 armed men menaced the city. When consuls Sulla and Pompeius Rufus were driven out of Rome, Sulpicius and Marius took control. Sulla responded by marching on Rome. This significant use of political violence is relevant because the increase in political breakdown was partly a result of the actions of the Tribune Sulpicius
- when Sulla regained control of Rome in 81 BC one of his political reforms was to strip the tribunate of most of its traditional powers to remove the Tribunate as a political threat. Until 70BC ambitious men avoided it because Tribunes were disqualified from holding other magistracies
- in 70 BC, Pompey and Crassus as consuls introduced a law to fully restore power to the tribunate
- In 67 BC Gabinius took action to interfere in a traditional function of the Senate - the appointment of military commanders (in this case for the Lex Gabinia) for the first time. This use of the tribunate was repeated in 66 BC by G. Manilius - the Eastern command was transferred to Pompey.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Part B: Unit 4

25% (25 marks)

## Rome 63 BC–AD 14

Marking key for Questions 40–42

Description	Marks
<b>Introduction</b>	
Defines the focus of the topic/question, defines key terms and provides relevant background information. Provides a proposition that articulates the direction of the essay in terms of line of argument/viewpoint	3
States the topic/question and provides some relevant background information. Provides a simple proposition indicating direction to be taken in relation to the focus of the essay	2
States the topic/question and provides limited background information	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Understanding of historical narrative</b>	
Produces a relevant, sophisticated narrative that demonstrates an understanding of the interrelationships between events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	7
Produces a relevant, comprehensive narrative that demonstrates an understanding of the relationships between events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	6
Produces a relevant, coherent narrative that demonstrates an understanding of some connections across events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or reliability of the ancient evidence	5
Produces a narrative that identifies some connections across events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change in the narrative, and/or shows some understanding of the reliability of the ancient evidence in the narrative	4
Produces a simple narrative which is mainly chronological and makes some reference to events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or shows limited understanding of the ancient evidence	3
Produces a simple narrative which is often incorrect and makes minimal reference to events, people and ideas, and/or continuity and change, and/or demonstrates minimal understanding of the relevant ancient evidence	2
Makes general/superficial statements about the narrative	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Argument</b>	
Constructs a sustained, logical and sophisticated argument which shows a depth of analysis in relation to the topic/question	6
Constructs a coherent, analytical argument in relation to the topic/question	5
Produces a logically-structured argument that shows some analytical thinking in relation to the topic/question	4
Provides relevant points/information in relation to the topic/question and indicates direction for argument	3
Makes generalisations and some relevant statements in relation to the topic/question	2
Makes superficial, disjointed statements in relation to the topic/question	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Use of evidence</b>	
Uses relevant sources with accuracy and detail throughout the essay. Refers to this evidence at points where it provides support for the argument/viewpoint	6
Uses relevant sources with accuracy throughout the essay. Refers to this evidence at effective points to provide some support for the argument/viewpoint	5
Uses relevant sources in the essay. Refers to this evidence at some appropriate points	4
Provides some relevant evidence. Refers to this evidence but with inaccuracies	3
Provides some limited evidence with inaccuracies. Makes an attempt to refer to some of this evidence	2
Provides minimal evidence which is often irrelevant or inaccurate	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
Draws together the argument/viewpoint of the essay, linking evidence presented with the original proposition	3
Summarises the argument/viewpoint of the essay, making some reference to the topic/question	2
Makes general/superficial statements about the focus of the essay	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>

## Question 40

(25 marks)

Analyse the reasons for, and the short- and long-term consequences of, the formation of the 'First Triumvirate'.

Answers could include:

Reasons:

It was expediency that drew Pompey, Crassus and Caesar together. Each faced problems with political enemies (many of whom they shared), each had ambitions that might help the others in the short term, and each had resources that could be used for mutual benefit.

Pompey:

- Pompey returned at the beginning of 61 BC from a spectacularly successful military campaign in the East. He was careful not to give offence to the Senate or fuel his enemies. His armies had been disbanded and he refused honours many wished to shower upon him
- he aimed to ratify his eastern settlement and provide land for his veterans
- opposition to him was intense in the Senate despite the support of the consul L. Afranius who had been one of his commanders. Pompey also had the support of a tribune (L. Flavius) but Flavius was incapable of opposing pressure from those who opposed Pompey
- Cicero states massive bribery was used in the election of both Afranius and Flavius
- Caesar managed to engineer a reconciliation between Pompey and Crassus who had initially given support to Pompey's enemies in the Senate. This marked the beginning of the more formalised arrangement referred to as the 'First Triumvirate'
- the Senate should perhaps have harnessed Pompey's ambitions rather than alienate him.

Crassus:

- Crassus had given support to a group of *publicani* (tax-gatherers) who demanded compensation for low levels of tax they had been able to gather in Asia after Pompey's Settlement, but fierce opposition in the Senate (largely led by Cato) frustrated this
- Crassus and Pompey had been co-consuls in 70 BC, but were not politically or personally aligned.

Caesar:

- Caesar had borrowed from Crassus before his proprietorship in Further Spain.
- he wished to stand for the consulship of 59 and wanted to celebrate a Triumph but, as commander, he could not enter the city. He requested to be allowed to contest the election *in absentia*
- this was not an outrageous request as precedents had occurred, but his political enemies would not acquiesce. Cato filibustered and the Senate meeting ended before Caesar could make his request
- this was an insult to Caesar, but he gave up his Triumph and contested the election. In the end he was the first consul elected. He then proceeded to use his legislative power as Consul to ignore his allocated province (*silvae callesque*) and granted himself, Pompey and Crassus lucrative commands in Gaul, Spain and the East.

Consequences:

- Cicero warned Cato that humiliating three powerful, wealthy and ambitious men like Pompey, Crassus and Caesar was a grave mistake and would only have the effect of pushing them together. Cicero himself indirectly fell afoul of the Triumvirs through the actions of Clodius

- Caesar's legislation of 59 BC was problematic because of Bibulus' actions. There are aspects of Caesar's legislative program as seeds of future political confrontation i.e. ignoring his allocated province, the *silvae callesque*; granting himself and the others commands and armies; the *lex Campania* itself and the methods used to pass it were contentious/problematic; recognition of Egyptian kings and German leaders as 'friends of Rome'; his use of various Tributes including Clodius
- it was initially a secret *amicitia*, an informal arrangement to enable them to achieve their individual aims. In reality, they were probably the three most powerful men in Rome and the optimates unwisely made them stronger and more determined by forcing them together
- such an alliance might have been avoided if Cato and his supporters been more astute and understood their enemies better
- the autocracy of these individuals is underscored by their actions at Luca to divide territory and power among themselves, and perhaps more importantly by the attendance of 200 senators at the meeting to ratify its decisions. Clearly the Senate was already quite disempowered and contributing to its own impotence at this point
- Varro's comment that the Triumvirate was a 'three headed monster' who many feared might lead to the rise of another dictator like Sulla, which it did in the longer term.
- the breakdown of relationships between the Triumvirs and the enmity of their political enemies led to significant changes in the way political power was allocated and utilised, and was arguably a key factor in causing the Civil War in 49 BC.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Question 41

(25 marks)

Evaluate the reasons for the reform program enacted by Caesar as dictator.

Answers could include:

This question requires an articulation of key components of Caesar's reform program. A simple description of the reforms is insufficient. Credit should be given for knowledge of the reforms themselves. Many of the reforms sought to address long-standing issues that had plagued the Republic throughout the first century BC.

- Catiline had led an uprising in 63 BC promising to abolish debt, the issue had remained a cause for discontent and was a threat to the stability of the Republic. Relief was provided by the suspension, for a year, of small rents for tenants, and interest that had accrued on loans since the start of the civil war was remitted
- since Gaius Gracchus the provision of grain to the urban mob had been a volatile political tool. Caesar attempted to address this in a suite of measures which included curbing the numbers of those eligible for free grain in the city and created new colonies to settle the surplus urban population. Food supply was also tackled by the creation of more arable land outside Rome through draining the Pontine Marshes and Fucine Lake
- the establishment of new colonies (also a policy advocated by Gaius Gracchus) addressed some of the other problems exacerbated by the presence of a large urban poor, such as urban violence, overcrowding and sanitation issues. Caesar's colonies made use of land outside Italy (i.e. in Africa, Gaul, Greece). Caesar's reasons for establishing these colonies concerned not only the urban poor but, even more pressingly, his own veterans. Caesar sought to address the problem of veteran settlement, a problem that had faced many Roman commanders from Marius' time on, a problem that had had significant political ramifications for the state over the period
- an extensive building programme gave Rome amenities appropriate to a city that was now the centre of an empire, and provided work for the urban poor
- effective communication across the Italian peninsula was an increasingly important issue. Roman armies were required to fight increasingly further away; the extension of the franchise across Italy meant that many more Italians had reason to come to Rome. Therefore roads needed an upgrade because infrastructure had not kept pace with expanding needs
- infrastructure in Rome received attention i.e. new Tiber walls to stem the threat of flooding which had been a real problem for Rome, draining the marshes helped reduce malaria
- Roman tax-gathering companies had been greedy which fuelled provincial unrest. Caesar addressed this by fixing the tithes/tributes/land taxes of some of the provinces (e.g. Transalpine Gaul, Sicily, Asia)
- a great deal of instability had been caused by concentrating power in the hands of individual commanders, often through extended periods of command. Caesar sought to impose temporal limits on governorships
- Collegia, or guilds, had been a source of political violence in the late Republic (e.g., under Clodius and Milo). Caesar suppressed many of these groups, probably to curb urban violence.

Accept other relevant answers.

## Question 42

(25 marks)

Assess the reasons for the breakdown of the 'Second Triumvirate'.

Answers could include:

- despite this Triumvirate being a legally enshrined entity (unlike the 'First'), it was arguably unstable from its inception given the rivalry between Antony and Octavian for leadership of Caesar's faction and the fact that the inclusion of Lepidus was driven by the presence of his troops near Rome at the time of Caesar's murder rather than any long-term contribution Lepidus might make
- the defeat of the Liberators at Philippi removed one of the few common causes that could unite Antony and Octavian
- divisions between Antony and Octavian surfaced over Octavian's attempts to secure land for veterans; this onerous task was made worse when Antony's wife and brother aided farmers who were protesting against Octavian's seizure of their land. The stand-off at Perugia undermined relations between the two triumvirs, i.e. they almost came to blows when Antony landed at Brundisium
- the attempts to strengthen this Triumvirate through marital ties, a strategy that had worked reasonably well for the 'First Triumvirate', proved a source of tension when Antony slighted Octavia through a very public relationship with Cleopatra
- distance and lack of communication, with Octavian in Italy and Antony in the East, exacerbated problems. In early 38 BC Antony failed to provide troops as requested by Octavian to assist in the war against Sextus, subsequent negotiations over troops and ships almost sparked an open rift, which a renewal of the triumvirate at Tarentum in 37 BC did little to either mend or disguise
- Sextus Pompeius was a divisive influence as was Lepidus at times. Octavian's eventual suppression of Sextus and his therefore being able to secure Rome's grain supplies gained Octavian important support in Italy. He capitalised on this with a building program and the provision of cheap food. From a new position of strength, he then began to distance himself publicly from Antony. Antony's behaviour in the East provided Octavian ample material with which to undermine his colleague to a Roman audience
- the donations of Alexandria, and the rumours that Antony intended to make Alexandria the capital of the empire were used to stir up sentiment against Anthony in Rome. This made it possible for Octavian to break with Anthony, it is significant that Octavian had most of the senators with him when he crossed to Greece
- the recognition by Antony of Caesarion as Caesar's son was a direct challenge to Octavian that he could not ignore.

Accept other relevant answers.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Question 34

Paragraph 1, dot points 2 and 6 from: Suetonius. (1987). *The Twelve Caesars* (Julius Caesar: 30) (R. Graves, Trans.). Penguin Books, p. 27. (Suetonius c. AD 69-c. 130)

Information from: Appian. (1979). *Appian's Roman History* (H. White, Trans.) (Vol. III). Heinemann, p. 259. (Appian c. AD 95-c. 165)

Pompey Quote from: Plutarch. (1972). *Fall of the Roman Republic: Six Lives by Plutarch* (Caesar) (R. Warner, Trans.). Penguin, p. 219. (Plutarch c.46 - c. 119 CE)

### Question 39

Information from: Cary, M., & Scullard, H. H. (1980). *A History of Rome: Down to the Age of Constantine* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Information from: Swain, H., & Davies, M. E. (2010). *Aspects of Roman History 82 BC–AD 14*. Routledge.

Information from: Crook, J., Lintott, A., & Rawson, E. (Eds.). (1994). *The Cambridge Ancient History: Vol. 9. The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–43 BC* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

### Copyright

© School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2024

This document – apart from any third-party copyright material contained in it – may be freely copied, or communicated on an intranet, for non-commercial purposes in educational institutions, provided that it is not changed and that the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (the Authority) is acknowledged as the copyright owner, and that the Authority's moral rights are not infringed.

Copying or communication for any other purpose can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with prior written permission of the Authority. Copying or communication of any third-party copyright material can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with permission of the copyright owners.

Any content in this document that has been derived from the Australian Curriculum may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons [Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) licence.

Published by the School Curriculum and Standards Authority of Western Australia  
303 Sevenoaks Street  
CANNINGTON WA 6107