



ANCIENT HISTORY

ATAR course examination 2023

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)

Explain in detail the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' *lex agraria*.

Description	Marks
Explains in detail the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	6
Explains the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	5
Describes the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	4
Describes some aspects of the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	3
Limited description of the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	2
Makes minimal reference to the impact of Tiberius Gracchus' <i>lex agraria</i>	1
Total	6
<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on poor/intent of bill and its terms might be included (see note below). <p>Tiberius' methods in passing the bill were unusual. Candidates may recount relevant points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiberius' election to and use of the position of tribune; his passing the bill through the <i>concillium plebis</i> not the senate; deposing fellow tribune Octavius; use of funds of Attalus III of Pergamum; his disregard for the traditional rights of the senate; his bid for re-election. <p>The reaction to Tiberius was also unusual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiberius' political enemies, led by Scipio Nasica, killed him plus 300 hundred of his supporters • 132 BC Senate inquiry allowed further action against Tiberius' supporters and the Senate's dominance was reasserted. Tiberius had, however, demonstrated the possibilities of a tribune's power • the potential power of the tribunate and of political violence had been unleashed. 	
Accept other relevant answers.	
Note: answers that focus solely on a recount of the terms of <i>the lex agraria</i> should not be rewarded as the question is focused on consequences.	

Question 30

(6 marks)

With reference to **two** examples outline the impact of client armies during the period of study.

Description	Marks
For each of the two examples (2 x 3 marks)	
Outlines the impact of client armies	3
Describes the impact of client armies	2
Simple identification and/or generalised or incomplete identification of the impact of client armies	1
Subtotal	3
Total	6
<p>Recruitment: By the first century BC Marius' recruitment reforms had significantly altered the nature of the Roman army. Recruited men were unpropertied (<i>capite censi</i>). Their allegiance was to their commander (their <i>patronus</i>) rather than the state as a result of discharged soldiers receiving plots of land (in the provinces or Italy) as a pension from their commander who was also responsible for their pay. The relationship between the army and the state was thus changed and powerful individuals created their 'own' armies where a patronage relationship, <i>clientele</i> between a <i>patronus</i> and their <i>cliens</i>, existed.</p> <p>Overall impact: The Senate issuing commands to suitably qualified men was replaced by a system of powerful individuals backed by troops who were tied to them; client armies were used to apply pressure or to dominate political activity and government.</p> <p>Possible examples:</p> <p>Marius</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opened recruitment to the <i>capite censi</i>. Marius' violent struggle with Sulla for political power in 88 (the issue of the command against Mithridates) saw ruthless use of these troops. • From this point the army is used in the struggle for political power. In 87 Marius and Cinna were in control of Rome as a result of their having control over the troops. <p>Sulla</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sulla's use of the army to restore law and order in Rome against his political enemies in 88 is significant – the soldiers demonstrated their loyalty to their commander rather than the state. • Sulla, at the head of an army of 40 000 men invaded Italy in 83 – the Roman army was now the instrument of a powerful individual rather than a servant of the state. <p>Pompey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pompey's career was based on extraordinary commands that resulted from his control over an army loyal to him even though he had never held office – propraetorian power in 79 against Lepidus, he refused to disband his army and received proconsular imperium against Sertorius in 77. • In 71 he was given joint command with Crassus against Spartacus. • Pompey, who had never held office, became a consul in 70 – his career to this point was based on military activities and successes which he achieved largely in command of a client army. • In 67 (<i>lex Gabinia</i>) and 66 (<i>lex Manilia</i>) commands were given to Pompey based on his ability to raise and command a loyal/ effective army. 	
Accept other relevant answers.	

Question 31

(6 marks)

Explain in detail **one** example of how Marius' political career destabilised the political system in the late Roman Republic.

Description	Marks
Explains in detail one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	6
Explains one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	5
Describes one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	4
Describes some aspects of one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	3
Limited description of one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	2
Makes minimal reference to one example of how Marius' political career destabilised the Roman Republic	1
Total	6
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>There was a failure by the governing class to do anything to cultivate military men whose armies were vital to the Republican order. The political <i>laissez faire</i> allowed to these military men resulted in the <i>cursus honorum</i> being repeatedly violated in times of military and political need, thus unravelling political process.</p> <p>Possible examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marius had first been elected Consul in 107 to face Jugurtha. Candidates might indicate that the methods he used to get elected were somewhat unusual. Marius was a <i>novus homo</i> whose ambition alienated his patron and commander Metellus. Thus Marius leveraged support from the Equites and his soldiers' connections in Rome and despite the Senate's decision to prolong Metellus' command, public support for Marius forced the Senate to appoint Marius in Numidia. This set a dangerous political precedent for military men using friendly Tribunes and the mob to force the Senate's hand • Marius' successive consulships (104–100 BC) were closely tied to the threat of invasion by Germanic tribes. However this was contrary to the rules for re-election set down by the <i>Lex Villia Annalis</i> (180 BC) which imposed a gap of two years for successive magistracies and a 10 year gap for re-election to the same office • all of Marius' consulships therefore broke the rules – but were clearly acceptable as long as he was militarily successful and the threat of external enemies was removed. • his final consulship in 100 saw increasing opposition in the Senate from his political enemies (mainly among the Optimates). His subsequent alliance to the volatile tribune Saturninus led Marius using an eruption of violence in Rome to assist in him meeting his political agenda. Saturninus was killed and Marius' popularity and support soon evaporated, however, a precedent for political violence had been accepted and could be easily exploited • the changes to recruitment led to generals having political power as a result of their use of the client armies – overall impact was incredibly destabilising on the Republic and forced commanders to connect with Tribunes • this use of the Tribunate might be argued to be a key theme across his career—he clearly recognised the value of the Tribune as a way to subvert the Republican process. <p>Accept other relevant answers.</p>	

Question 32

(6 marks)

Explain why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed.

Description	Marks
Explains why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	6
Describes why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	5
Describes some reasons why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	4
Limited description of reasons why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	3
Identifies why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	2
Makes minimal reference to reasons why Sulla's reforms to the Senate and Tribunate failed	1
Total	6

Answers could include:

Overall reasons for the failure of the reforms:

- the *Lex Villia Annalis*, passed in 180 BC, regulated the career structure of magistrates through a ladder of office that regulated those holding offices of government, Magistracies were limited by time and the age of candidates. Because the number who could hold office was small, high office was limited to a small elite of men creating a nobility, a senatorial aristocracy. Sulla's reforms inadequately addressed a key factor in the developing weakness of the political system which was the destabilisation of the system by 'radical' tribunes and military commanders (like himself and Pompey) who had the support of an army.
- reforming the system by restoring a reactionary form of government run by a Senate which was dominated by a social elite, did not acknowledge the emergence of military leaders with political ambitions, who knew how to leverage circumstances to pressure the Senate in order to meet their personal goals.

Sulla's reforms:

Sulla's changes to reforms such as those listed below might be used to explain their failure.

- Sulla planned to strengthen and revive the power of the Senate and strengthen the rules of the *Lex Villia Annalis* after his own (and Marius') use of political violence had demonstrated how easily the Senate could be undermined by military men with the support of an army.
- A strict *cursus honorum* (order to offices held) would be imposed. This had been and continued to be ignored by Sulla through the promotion of Pompey who held no office on the *Cursus*.
- Tribunes' power to introduce legislation was stripped from them – and the sole responsibility returned to the Senate. This response to Marius' use of the tribunate to meet his own political goals was undermined by ambitious men who saw the potential in the precede Marius set for the use of tribunes and was overturned in 70 BC by Pompey and Crassus when they achieved the Consulship, an office for which Pompey was not qualified under the original lex or Sulla's reforms to it.
- He limited the tribune's power of veto and weakened the office further by forbidding anyone who held the tribunate from advancing to other offices – the tribunate became a political dead-end. This was overturned in 70 BC by Pompey and Crassus for the reasons above.
- Sulla's *Lex de Magistratibus* (81) reformed the ladder of offices setting minimum ages for office – the quaestorship at 30, praetorship at 40 and the consulship at 43. The quaestorship became the sole means of entering the Senate. This was all ignored in Sulla's own lifetime by Pompey and continued to be ignored by others who (probably correctly) assumed that there was no need to adhere to the reforms.
- Sulla took action to strengthen the Senate – it was given the sole power to make appointments to provinces, the responsibility for the courts was restored to the Senate. This was ignored by members of the first Triumvirate.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 33

(6 marks)

Describe the reasons for, and outcomes of, **two** of Pompey’s extraordinary commands.

Description	Marks
For each of the two commands (2 x 3 marks)	
Describes the reasons for and outcomes of one of Pompeys’ extraordinary commands	3
Identifies the reasons for and outcomes of one of Pompeys’ extraordinary commands	2
Simple identification of reasons for and/or outcomes of one of Pompeys’ extraordinary commands	1
Subtotal	3
Total	6

Answers could include:

Note the non-traditional nature of Pompey’s career and some of the damage Pompey’s unusual career was able to inflict on the Republican system.

Early career:

- as a result of support for Sulla, Pompey received his first command and his triumph (possibly 81 or 80) and married Sulla’s step-daughter. Pompey allegedly achieved this triumph by threatening Sulla with use of force. Being awarded a triumph at this point in his career was unusual, but his service to Sulla and military success led to his achieving phenomenal political and public recognition by his mid-twenties. Additionally his political marriage aligned him to the top of political power in Rome. He had succeeded in sidestepping the *Cursus honorum*.

Other commands:

- Pro-Praetorian imperium against Brutus (who supported Lepidus’ revolt) in 77
- Proconsular imperium in 77 against Sertorius in Spain and after that helped finish the Servile War in 71 – again he celebrated a triumph. None of these commands followed traditional career progression. Pompey was given several important military commands without ever holding office – he never entered the *cursus honorum*. Even as early as 71 Pompey had enjoyed considerable military success and a number of triumphs which technically should only have been granted to those who had held the office of praetor or consul – Pompey had held neither. These anomalies destabilised the political system
- Pompey’s first consulship in 70 BC was one of many offices for which Pompey had no qualification. Pompey disbanded his army after he celebrated his triumph at the end of 71 following the defeat of Spartacus, and was therefore a civilian when he became a consul, however, it can be argued that keeping his army nearby in effect used threat of force to achieve the consulship.
- *Lex Gabinia* 67 – failed attempts to control pirates had had put pressure on food supplies to Italy. Accepting the proposal of the tribune Gabinius, the Senate appointed Pompey a number of special powers to meet this threat (3 years, greater authority than any other magistrate up to 50 miles inland, huge supplies of money ships and men). This was challenged in the Senate by Catullus who raised concerns regarding the risk of giving one individual too much power. Nonetheless, it went ahead and Pompey’s quick success led to the Senate having to find him another appointment. The subsequent removal of Lucullus’ command against Mithridates fed future hostility between factions in the Senate, agitating discontent among the Senatorial class that manifested in civil war in 49 BC.
- *Lex Manilia* 66 – using another Tribune Pompey was appointed command against Mithridates using the forces given to him under the *Lex Gabinia*. Pompey was incredibly successful, achieving a settlement in the east that significantly benefitted Rome and himself. His success was viewed suspiciously by his political enemies (including Lucullus), who blocked his attempts to ratify the settlements, ultimately forcing Pompey to ally himself with his future Triumviral partners Crassus and Caesar.

- grain supply command 58 – resulting from a requirement to manage grain supplies to the city after several riots over grain shortages and high prices. Pompey's excellent organisational skills quickly brought success. However, the propaganda value of this success put him at odds with his triumviral partners, and increased political pressure at the time.

Accept other relevant answers.

Section Two: Source analysis – Unit 4

25% (20 Marks)

Rome 63 BC–AD 14

Question 34

(10 marks)

Assess the extent to which the source reliably represents the impact of violence in Roman politics in the period of study.

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

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of violence in Roman politics in 63–52 BC. Shows thorough understanding of the source and makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the impact of violence in Roman politics in 63–52 BC. Shows understanding of the source and makes some detailed reference to the historical context.	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the impact of violence in Roman politics in 63–52BC. Shows generalised understanding of the source and makes generalised reference to the historical context	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the impact of violence in Roman politics in 63–52BC. Shows limited understanding of the source and makes limited reference to the historical context	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the impact of violence in Roman politics in 63–52BC. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or to the historical context. May include errors	1–2
Total	10
<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the source reliably represents a sharp increase in political violence at the time, and thus, the increasing significance of violence as a political tool. Alternatively, political violence was noted as entrenched by 63 BC and the eruption of chaos at the time of the source was simply another expression of this the increased use of political violence in the period outside the people and incidents referred to in the source i.e., earlier incidents involving the Gracchi, Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Sulpicius, Saturnius, Lepidus, Catiline, Cicero (arguably), and the Triumvirs all of whom deliberately cultivated political violence to achieve their goals. Stronger candidates may also recognise the connection between the period of violence in the source and the impending Civil War violence in Roman politics was common in the period of study, however, stronger candidates may note that Publius Clodius' tribunate both cultivated violence and added a new dimension to it. Clodius' early career had been controversial, his association with Catiline's conspiracy and the Bona Dea scandal put him at odds with Cicero resulting in Clodius and Cicero being bitter enemies. The Triumvirate also appear to have used Clodius' support to harry one another – Caesar may have been behind Clodius' actions against Pompey. The numerous resulting incidents and responses to them (including through other agents such as Milo) in themselves increased lawlessness in the streets. contextual understanding of the interplay between Clodius and his contemporaries to inform the representation of the impact of violence in the source political rivalry was most evident between two dominant factions at this time – the Triumvirate and their enemies. This was bitter, disruptive and became increasingly violent. It is in this context that Clodius' political career developed and led to the chaos depicted in the source the laws Clodius introduced were also controversial and increased political conflict: Censors could only expel senators after a judicial enquiry had been held; magistrates could not use <i>auspices</i> or observations of ill-omens; corn would be distributed free to 	

citizens; *collegia* or political clubs would become legal again – this final one was very influential in facilitating the use of what was effectively legalised gang violence for political ends

- Clodius turned against Pompey over Pompey's capture of the Armenian prince, Tigranes. One of Clodius' slaves was arrested and accused of planning to assassinate Pompey increasing confrontation
- Pompey's response was to withdraw, briefly, from public life. While perhaps theatrical this response does indicate the widespread scale of violence in the streets
- Clodius fell out with Caesar and Crassus soon after but was also hostile to the Senate
- Clodius' political activity was extremely disruptive but, in reality, did not disrupt the political relationship between Caesar, Pompey and Crassus – their alliance, strengthened and reaffirmed at the Conference of Luca in 56, clearly established their authority with Pompey and Crassus elected as consuls in 55
- however, Political corruption and violence forced the consular election of 55 to be postponed, indicating the acceleration of political violence and systemic breakdown to this point
- Clodius' power was weakened but he still managed to be a candidate for the praetorship of 52 but was murdered before the election which had also been postponed because of rioting
- the result of the fire in the Senate house started by the funeral pyre of Clodius was that the Senate issued an SCU, giving Pompey authority to use troops to restore order – Crassus' death and Caesar's absence, campaigning in Gaul, left Pompey in control and he was awarded a rather anomalous sole consulship granted, at least in part, to restore order
- Clodius' contribution to the anarchy and disruption that developed at this time and his actions and death set the scene for a 'showdown' between the two most powerful men in the Republic – Caesar and Pompey

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 35

(10 marks)

Assess the accuracy of the representation in the source of the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study.

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

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which the source accurately represents the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study. Shows thorough understanding of the source and makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the extent to which the source accurately represents the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study. Shows understanding of the source and makes some detailed reference to the historical context	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the extent to which the source accurately represents the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study. Shows generalised understanding of the source and makes generalised reference to the historical context	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the extent to which the source accurately represents the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study. Shows limited understanding of the source and makes limited reference to the historical context	3–4
Makes superficial assessment of the extent to which the source accurately represents the actions of the Second Triumvirate during the period of study. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or the historical context. May include errors	1–2
Total	10
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>Assess whether the incident in the source is a fair and accurate representation of the Second Triumvirate's <i>modus operandi</i>, and whether or not the triumvirs did in fact curtail their actions after the death of Cicero.</p> <p>There was much brutality in the period. Reasons for such brutality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the political/legal position of the Triumvirs was by no means unassailable. They also had some powerful enemies despite the Second Triumvirate being formalised by the 'election' of Antony, Lepidus and Octavian on 27 November 43 for five years, the <i>Lex Titia</i> established the Triumvirate as legal and somewhat absolute despotism, giving each of the Triumvirs consular imperium and total power over all appointments and public affairs. Their despotism was unpopular at all levels a proscription they carried out, focusing on 300 senators and 2000 equites, facilitated their murdering many rivals which further allowed them to confiscate money, property and estates in order to pay their troops they had also confiscated the land from 18 of the richest Italian communities (such as Capua and Venusia) and distributed it among their men creating additional opposition to them in short, the Triumvirs were not opposed to using any means of leverage, including force, to achieve their goals. <p>Accuracy of the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the description in the source of the murder of Cicero in 43 BC was a prelude to a bloody struggle for power in the Roman world, so it represents the nature of political control at the time. However, it was not the full extent of expressions of political violence, which were shortly to escalate to war against the Republicans and finally between the Triumvirs themselves. 	

- the source illustrates the measures that the key participants were prepared to go to in order to destroy their enemies and win power. Better candidates may indicate that this kind of behaviour had been building over previous decades and provide examples to demonstrate this, and may also note that the actions of the Triumvirs were perhaps some kind of recognition of the failure of Caesar's approach in sparing his enemies
- violence is the underlying theme of this struggle for power in Rome in the last decades of the Republic.

Actions of the Triumvirs:

- the Triumvirs made sure that the names of their victims were not recorded, meaning that those carrying out the murders would be safe from any possible punishment. This is indicative of the disorder that government had fallen into
- moreover, the Triumvirs took the opportunity to settle old scores by murdering their enemies – Cicero was probably their most illustrious victim. This was effective in removing many political obstacles to their progress
- many, who were not on a proscription list, also lost their lives and property – either as a result of being hated or for their property. The source alludes to the widespread nature of the violence
- the source clearly indicates that there was a reign of terror – legalised assassination and confiscation. Candidates may be aware that there was a fee of 25 thousand denarii paid on delivery of the severed head of the victim
- not indicated in the source, but stronger candidates may be aware that the Triumvirs forced those who owned property to the value of 100 thousand denarii, who were not on the proscription list, to provide loans and donate a year's income to the Triumvirs. This kind of pressure may not be violent, but it indicates the blunt nature of triumviral control over the state
- similarly slave owners were to pay 100 sesterces per slave and wealthy women were taxed. The desperation to raise money is evident and may account for some of the violence used by the Triumvirs
- soon after the incident in the source Lepidus became a consul and Antony and Octavian launched a war against the Republicans, their victory consolidated their control, but ultimately led to them to look to eliminate their fellow Triumvirs through further conflict. Nonetheless, over the next decade the Triumvirate completely dominated the Roman world until the death of Antony and Cleopatra in 30 BC.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 36

(10 marks)

Evaluate the perspective in the source about the nature and origins of Augustus' power.

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

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the perspective of the source about the nature and origins of Augustus' power. Shows thorough understanding of the source and makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the perspective of the source about the nature and origins of Augustus' power. Shows understanding of the source and makes some detailed reference to the historical context	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the perspective of the source about the nature and origins of Augustus' power. Shows generalised understanding of the source and makes generalised reference to the period of study	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the perspective of the source about the nature and origins of Augustus' power. Shows limited understanding of the source and makes limited reference to the period of study	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the perspective of the source about the nature and origins of Augustus power. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or the period of study. May include errors	1–2
Total	10
<p>Answers could include:</p> <p>The source states that Augustus accrued power gradually through various means including adapting traditional powers to suit his needs and bribing the army and common people. Certainly Augustus had a flexible interpretation of the way traditional powers applied to particular roles like the Tribune, for example, might benefit him. However, Augustus also insisted that the army and citizens swore allegiance to <i>him</i>, and he created layers of control through his various Settlements to facilitate the elevation of a single <i>Imperator</i> above the Senate. Additionally, Augustus' understanding that political power required control over the armies to rest with the state (i.e. him) perhaps represents the real core of his authority. The discriminator in answers will likely be the detail candidates use to articulate Augustus' creation of a power structure around his position as first citizen, and their success in commenting on how well this is represented by the source. Stronger answers may indicate the sophisticated nature of Augustus' reforms, above and beyond what is indicated in the source, and conclude that the comments in the source are an oversimplification of Augustus' power base.</p> <p>Discussion may include some of the following to support evaluation.</p> <p>Augustus' powers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in political terms, Octavian's power was based on a number of things – he had been consul in 33 and continuously between 31–23, and he still held his Triumviral powers (although these were not advertised) and an oath of loyalty to him had been sworn in military terms he had complete control of the armed forces of Rome after Actium. This was the real base of all of his power he did, in the Settlement of 27, give up his extraordinary, dictatorial power – but this was replaced by control for 10 years over a huge province which included Gaul, Spain, Syria, Cyprus, Cilicia and Egypt – a virtual private estate. Control over most of this was renewed over the next decades. <p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in 23 he seems to remodel the base of his 'power' on the tribunician powers he was granted – ancient sources are not clear about when this actually occurred, but it seems that in 23 his tenure became 'annual and perpetual' 	

- however, these tribunician powers were specially ‘modified’ for him:
 - the right of putting 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 was being oppressed by other magistrates – and this included the right to investigate the actions taken against the citizen.
- in effect Augustus’ special tribunician powers clearly comprised a way for him to influence governance outside the traditional role of the former pinnacle for power – the Consulship
- as Governor of Provinces, Augustus also held a proconsular imperium. This was modified because a proconsul was obliged to forfeit his imperium on entering the city of Rome. Augustus’ imperium remained continuous throughout Rome and the provinces because it was *maius imperium* or ‘greater’ than other proconsular power. Additionally, his authority was clearly greater than the governors of all other provinces because they operated under his auspices (i.e. proconsul Marcus Licinius Crassus’ being denied the right to dedicate *Spolia Opima* after he had killed the Bastarnae king Deldo)
- the creation of the title ‘Princeps’ – the First Citizen – is confirmation of the primacy of his position, as was his creation of, and the acceptance by the Senate of, the new name/title, ‘Augustus’.

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
Introduction	
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
Subtotal	3
Understanding of historical narrative/context	
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
Subtotal	7
Argument	
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
Subtotal	6
Use of evidence	
Uses relevant sources with accuracy and detail throughout the essay. Refers to relevant evidence at points where it provides support for the argument/viewpoint	6
Uses relevant sources with accuracy throughout the essay. Refers to evidence at effective points to provide some support for the argument/viewpoint	5
Uses relevant sources in the essay. Refers to 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
Subtotal	6
Conclusion	
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
Subtotal	3
Total	25

Question 37

(25 marks)

Evaluate the proposition that the actions of the Gracchi brothers threatened Republican Rome and contributed to its eventual collapse.

Answers could include:

A simple recount of the brothers' reforms will not answer the question. Better answers will effectively refer to the reforms themselves as a threat, the way in which each brother carried out their reform program as a threat to the Senate, and will refer to the Senate's responses including the Senate's use of violence and utilisation of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* (SCU) to control political enemies as other key factors in destabilising the political system.

Tiberius Gracchus

- Tiberius had a significant impact on Roman politics by bringing to the fore key underlying socio-political tensions around the displaced agrarian workforce of Italy.
- his reform attempt (notably his *lex agraria*) in some ways created the rift that would eventually see Rome divided between the populares and optimates, and culminate in civil wars and the overthrow of the Republic
- Tiberius understood the potential of the tribunate and actively exploited this which in turn sparked a backlash from the Senate
- his referral of the Attalid will to the people when such matters were dealt with by the Senate was seen as a challenge to the power and authority of the Senate
- candidates may note that Tiberius did not act alone, and that others, such as Appius Claudius Pulcher aided and supported his political actions
- his attempt to gain a second tribunate led to a violent reaction and eventually to his death, but the violence used to secure his death was unprecedented
- the use of violence in politics is instituted by Tiberius' brutal death as a result of the actions of Scipio Nasica, and although the Consul Scaevola had refused to issue an SCU, the precedent for the use of violence to 'champion the liberty of the republic' was firmly established
- his impact on his brother was noteworthy. Candidates might mention Gaius' continued interest in the Lex Agraria and may include the impact the use of the ager publicus had on the Latin and Italian allies, his pursuit of Popilius and Octavius for their part in the death of Tiberius, and his involvement with Carbo's introduction of the measure to legalise re-election to the Tribunate by secret ballot (defeated by the Senate), all of which had a larger impact on the state.

Gaius Gracchus

- Gaius' career trajectory is very similar to his brothers, with his election to the tribunate in 123 BC being the key position of importance in his career
- answers could discuss the wide-ranging scope of Gaius' reforms, which indicate his impact in numerous areas. Particular mention might be made of his introduction of a *lex frumentaria* (corn dole) and measures for the allies which were key innovations in populist politics and will have significantly increased Gaius' following in his own lifetime as these are crucial to the role that Gaius played in the political landscape of the late second century BC. Gaius' reform program was necessary but met with resistance from the elite oligarchic faction who opposed change. This clash was the beginning of long-term political division which characterised the next century
- his introduction of policies specifically aimed at restricting/challenging the power of the senatorial aristocracy met with a great deal of opposition
- his policies were quite aggressive and there are indications that Gaius' popularity in Rome was waning by late 122, when he was unsuccessful in securing office for 121 BC. Rival tribunes proposed the repeal of items of his legislation. The collapse of Gaius' status in Rome is evident in the passing of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* by the Senate, after which Gaius was killed in a violent altercation with forces led by the consul, Opimius

Question 37 (continued)

Destabilising the system:

- the introduction and use of the *SCU* indicated how violence could be used as a formidable tool to shore up the power and authority of the Senate
- the extent of his influence (and that of his brother before him) may be measured in the Senate's response to both brothers – Tiberius was killed by a group of senators led by the Pontifex Maximus, his supporters were tracked down, prosecuted and executed; an *SCU* was passed to immobilise Gaius and his supporters, and many were killed in a clash on the Aventine. However, the Senate suffered a loss of prestige as a result of its handling of the situation
- the violence that preceded Gaius' death gives a good indication of the degree to which his acts had divided Roman society broadly into populares and optimates factions, a rift that was to be evident for much of the next century

the people's assemblies realised their power. Thereafter the 'mob' were more than ready to support any aspiring politician who promised them reform.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 38

(25 marks)

Assess the actions taken by Marius and Sulla that contributed to the various marches on Rome between 88 BC and 83 BC.

Answers could include:

The question requires consideration of the key factors that contributed to, and were influential during, the civil war between Marius and Sulla, and which later contributed to the clash between Sulla and opposition to him among the Senatorial class. A key discriminator will likely be an emphasis on how actions taken by Marius and Sulla were significant in fomenting the use of armies to solve political differences.

- Marius' change to recruitment gave the soldiers little reason to give their loyalty to the state – their future lay in the hands of their commander and what he could achieve. Marius had exploited this earlier when he used his soldiers to pressure the Senate to give him his final consulship in 100, however, at this time he did not use the armies to their fullest extent – Sulla was the first to fully exploit the new relationship between the armies and their commanders in the 88 march on Rome.
- The civil war between Marius and Sulla had its origin in Sulla's Mithridatic command. The war against Mithridates had been assigned to Sulla in the normal way but a Tribune, P. Sulpicius, introduced a bill, which was passed, to transfer the command to an ambitious Marius. To lose the command would have been humiliating to Sulla and his reaction was revolutionary – he quickly left Rome and joined the army that was preparing for the war against Mithridates and convinced it to support him.
- All his officers except for one refused to join him – but Sulla had the support of Pompeius Rufus and six legions and marched on Rome which was the first time that a Roman army had marched on the orders of its commander on the city.
- Sulla claimed that he was liberating Rome from tyrants
- This changed relationship is clearly seen in Sulla's march on Rome in 88 against Marius and his supporters.
- Resistance to Sulla was at first fierce – people pelted his soldiers from rooftops with broken tiles – but Sulla's troops finally prevailed and Marius, Sulpicius and their forces fled.
- Sulpicius' was captured and executed and his laws were repealed and Sulla had a law passed that re-established the domination of the Senate. Sulla and Pompeius Rufus assumed consular roles and Sulla left Italy for his command against Mithridates. Pompeius Rufus was murdered when he tried to take his command – nothing was done to punish the murderers or discipline the rebellious troops – the relationship between commanders, the army and the state had irrevocably changed
- In 87, L. Cornelius Cinna and Cn. Octavius were elected consuls and Cinna soon gained the support of the troops who remained in the Campania.
- The situation in Rome was volatile and violence erupted between Cinna's supporters and Octavius' supporters – the army backed Cinna and Marius raised an army of slaves to back him.
- Marius soon entered the city and let loose his army – after five days of slaughter with heads of victims displayed on the Rostra in the Forum, Cinna's troops surrounded and killed the slave army.
- Cinna and Marius were made consuls without being elected, though Marius died on 13 January 86.
- Cinna was the virtual dictator of Rome during Sulla's actions and he reappointed himself consul in 85 and 84, perhaps unwisely declaring Sulla *hostis* in his absence.
- In 83 Sulla returned to Italy and civil war erupted between Sulla and the consular forces lead by Carbo and C. Marius (Marius' son). After a bitter and bloody campaign Sulla recaptured Rome.
- Sulla's army was utterly uncompromising in its treatment of his enemies – 6000 prisoners were systematically butchered. Plutarch states (Sulla 30) that as Sulla addressed the Senate 'the shrieks of such a multitude, who were being massacred in a narrow space, filled the air'.

Question 38 (continued)

Though not part of the march on Rome itself, Sulla's army now carried out a merciless and bloody campaign of hunting down and killing his political enemies – the first of the proscribed. Candidates might comment on the proscriptions as a significant factor in Sulla's use of his army to consolidate his control.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 39

(25 marks)

Discuss the key events and outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy and evaluate the role that Cicero played in dealing with this crisis.

Answers could include:

There had been earlier rumblings; however, the second 'conspiracy' by Catiline became the dominant focus of Cicero's consulship.

- Cicero was a *novus homo*, a 'new man'. He was not born in Rome but in Arpinum some 110 kilometres south-east of Rome. (Marius was also born in Arpinum). These two factors made Cicero's political advancement extremely difficult – his success is largely a result of hard work and exceptional ability as a lawyer. These difficulties might have impacted his dealings with the conspiracy.
- Catiline, had been prosecuted for abuse of power while governor of Africa in 66. This prevented his standing for the consulship in 65 and 64 and he was further frustrated in 62 as a result of being defeated in the consular elections by Cicero.
- Debt in Rome was at crisis point and calls had already been made to address this. The political environment in Rome was toxic and Catiline was becoming dangerous.

Key events:

- Catiline had been defeated in the elections, held in 64, for 63 and stood again in the elections held in 63 for the consulship of 62
- widespread bribery occurred at these elections and Catiline campaigned for a cancellation of debts but was defeated thereby inflaming his hatred of Cicero and the Senate
- Catiline planned a widespread revolt throughout Italy and then the violent seizure of power in Rome but Cicero was soon made aware by his network of spies of the plot
- a number of anonymous letters warning of a massacre fell into the hands of Crassus who passed them onto Cicero who then shared them with a small, select group of senators. Cicero was authorised to investigate but found nothing
- rumours that a revolt was being organised and C. Manlius organised a revolt in the north at Fausulae that prompted the senate to pass a *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* on 21 October.
- there was no evidence that Catiline was involved and a revolt did not occur
- the rumours continued over the next weeks and Cicero eventually discovered that supporters of Catiline had approached some envoys of the Allobroges (a Gallic tribe) for support but the envoys exposed the plot – the conspirators had written to the Allobroges for assistance
- Cicero finally had proof. A trap was set, five conspirators were captured and Cicero was able to parade them to the Senate, which met in the Temple of Concord, where they all confessed
- candidates may suggest that Cicero's evidence was contestable – much of it is uncorroborated or circumstantial, for instance, the written evidence of the Allobroges may not have been genuine, and much of what Cicero claimed the conspirators had planned never actually occurred. The extent of the plot, and thus Cicero's part in foiling it, becomes questionable in this case
- Cicero was rewarded with a special thanksgiving being offered to the gods by the Senate and Cicero was hailed as *pater patriae*.

Outcomes

- the conspirators were too many to be jailed so they were held under house arrest until a suitable punishment was agreed to
- in the debate that followed the consul-designate, D. Junius Silanus, called for the death sentence – this was supported by all the speakers but Julius Caesar who called for the novel idea of permanent imprisonment
- M. Porcius Cato argued for the death penalty which the Senate eventually agreed to and the conspirators were strangled on Cicero's orders
-

Question 39 (continued)

- Catiline and his supporters were soon hunted down and killed. Violence was used in the conspiracy to both achieve political ends (by Catiline) and to prevent political breakdown (by Cicero). It didn't end well for either of them.

Cicero's role in the crisis

- because the Senate was not a court of law it was not empowered to sentence any citizen and the SCU was limited so that Cicero's action could be viewed as being illegal
- the plotters in Rome had talked of a conspiracy but had not actually taken up arms. It is difficult to ascertain how genuine the threat was. Cicero be seen as guilty of exaggerating events in order to succour his tenuous status as a *novus homo* of non-military background

Cicero pursued his Concordia Ordinum afterwards. Though unsuccessful, this philosophy represented much needed cohesion at the time. Cicero can be viewed as another victim of the Catiline conspiracy – he was seen by many as an outsider, and many in the Senate soon turned against him.

Accept other relevant answers.

Part B: Unit 4

25% (25 marks)

Rome 63 BC–AD 14

Marking key for Questions 40–42

Description	Marks
Introduction	
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
Subtotal	3
Understanding of historical narrative/context	
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
Subtotal	7
Argument	
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
Subtotal	6
Use of evidence	
Uses relevant sources with accuracy and detail throughout the essay. Refers to relevant evidence at points where it provides support for the argument/viewpoint	6
Uses relevant sources with accuracy throughout the essay. Refers to evidence at effective points to provide some support for the argument/viewpoint	5
Uses relevant sources in the essay. Refers to 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
Subtotal	6
Conclusion	
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
Subtotal	3
Total	25

Question 40

(25 marks)

Assess the factors for Pompey's failure and Caesar's success in the Civil War of 49–45 BC.

Answers could include:

A narrative of the events of the Civil War will not answer the question appropriately. A strong answer requires careful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each side.

It might be concluded, given the resources available to both sides and their relative positions at the outset, that Caesar should not have won, thus that Pompey's loss was a significant factor in Caesar's victory. However, Caesar's management of his troops, the quality of his troops, their combined experience and his personal characteristics contributed significantly to his success. Conversely, Pompey was hampered by considerable division within the ranks of his 'supporters', thus despite his greatly advantageous position at the outset of the war, he was unsuccessful in uniting the efforts of his followers and seems to have been constantly forced to manage the Pompeians, while simultaneously trying to effectively foil Caesar. Of the two, Pompey's overall position was arguably the weaker, regardless of his initial geographic, material and manpower advantages.

Caesar's actions and success

- Caesar's infantry proved itself to be the best (arguably) in antiquity, Caesar knew how to effectively employ his troops' endurance, marching and entrenching skills.
- Resources: four legions in Belgium; four legions in North Rhone; his support in Italy was uncertain; he took one legion with him when he crossed the Rubicon; he was apparently aware of the low morale of some of his troops and prevented this becoming an issue by replacing some of his legions (the 13th) and placing others in northern Italy before 51 BC, recalling them later; Pompey stationed troops in the south of Italy rather than meeting him in the north.
- Many of Caesar's infantry had spent years in Gaul, thus they were practised and professional. Suetonius and Plutarch relate many stories about the devotion of the men to Caesar and to each other. The men themselves were hard, courageous and fearless. There were numerous examples of the personal bravery of individuals among them and of them having defeated enemies despite being greatly outnumbered. Moreover, the military engineering expertise and siege works of Caesar's army were legendary i.e. the bridge across the Rhine and the fortifications built during the fight against Vercingetorix.
- Caesar's leadership. He used hand-to-hand weapons capably and was a skilled horseman; he proved himself capable of great endurance and was personally unafraid; his tactical caution meant he never exposed the army to unnecessary risks, but he was also prepared to act with great daring when required; he rallied his troops in person, ate with them, and shared their hardships. His training methods were harsh, but effective and he was harsh on insubordination; he treated everyone in his army equally basing his judgement of them on their ability not their status or social position. By all accounts Caesar loved his men dearly, spoke of them as 'comrades' and in so doing earned their trust and loyalty.
- Similarly, Caesar's strategic and tactical understanding was outstanding. His victory at Dyrrhachium and Pharsalus are excellent examples of better planning and application of troops in the environment. Candidates might relate some of the course of these battles by way of example, and/or they may note Caesar's methodical approach to breaking down Pompeian resistance over the course of the Civil War, and/or they might relate the strategic blunders of the Pompeians of which Caesar took great advantage.

Pompey's actions and failure

- Resources: He had the support of the Senate and control over all of Italy; he controlled the seas through a large fleet; had access to all the resources of the East – Caesar was an unknown in the East and many there owed debts to Pompey; he had access to all the grain growing areas (Sardinia, Africa, the East, Sicily) so in the event of any blockade by Caesar this avenue would always be open to Pompey; he had seven legions in Spain; two veteran legions in Italy; he had been given permission to levy troops and aimed to raise 130 000 new recruits, though he never met this quota.

- In his career Pompey had been an opportunist, often exploiting violence to further his political advancement and he had used fear of violence and force to leverage advancement. His entire career had consisted of successive high profile extraordinary commands – by the time of the Civil War he had held almost continuous imperium (12 magistracies, compared to Caesar's two). His military successes were also political successes and many of his previous military accomplishments were achieved as a result of other commanders' hard work i.e. Lucullus, Crassus. Faced with serious military opponents he had often been able to avoid lengthy campaigning i.e. Sertorius was murdered and Mithridates died. Thus, Pompey was a competent commander and soldier. This was not enough against an opponent like Caesar. Candidates might use the examples of Dyrrhachium and Pharsalus as evidence of the difference between the two.
- The troops he commanded could not perhaps be relied upon completely either – he was disturbed by rumours that they planned to remove him as soon as Caesar was beaten.
- Pompey's strength lay in logistics and diplomacy: raising an army for Sulla at the age of 24; ending piracy under the Lex Gabinia; his settlement of the East; the Grain supply command etc. The confrontation with Caesar required skills beyond these.
- However, Pompey's position as leader of the members of the Senate during the Civil War was, probably, the biggest obstacle to his success. They were his peers, and-as-such Pompey was never really free nor able to make decisions as the commander in chief even though they had appointed him to this role. Conflicting opinions among the group led to unclear strategic direction, his every action was followed by criticism, and he was also apparently aware that Cato planned to replace him. Plutarch states that Pompey was a 'slave to his own idea of glory' (Pompey 67) thus this kind of talk from the senatorial members of the group took its toll on Pompey's leadership, resulting in his putting aside his own plans in order to try to meet their hopes and impulses. The stories of senators practising electioneering speeches and going about the camp arguing about who would be praetor or consul after Caesar's defeat also demonstrates the extent to which they underestimated their opponent and underscores their lack of action or commitment to the actual victory itself. The result was ineffectual decision making and leadership by the whole Pompeian camp which emasculated Pompey, and of course the attendant military failures are evidence of this widespread malaise in leadership.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 41

(25 marks)

Assess the extent to which Caesar's constitutional position and influence led to his assassination in 44 BC.

Answers could include:

Focus should be on events leading to Caesar's assassination, rather than on the ways that Caesar remodelled traditional constitutional elements in order to facilitate new methods/definitions of leadership. The political context after the Civil War may or may not have justified his actions, and candidates might argue this either way. Stronger answers will recognise the destructive impact of Caesar alienating his peers.

- The Civil War caused much dislocation – after four years of civil war there were 35 legions still under arms and Caesar was faced with the problem of reconstruction.
- Unlike Sulla, Caesar did not carry out proscriptions – former Pompeian soldiers were pardoned, disbanded or re-enrolled in the Caesarian forces. Former officers were pardoned – Brutus and Cassius were Pompeian officers who received immediate promotion. Cicero shared in the general amnesty, others had to wait Caesar's pleasure – for example, Marcellus' case was brilliantly argued by Cicero in his *Pro Marcello*.
- Peace brought an array of complex problems – one of Caesar's first tasks was to pension off as many veterans as possible and this required a large-scale land distribution programme and the establishment of citizen communities in Italy and the provinces. Caesar probably settled some 20 000 plus veterans in nearly 40 communities – particularly in the Iberian Peninsula. His colonies included veterans plus the workless poor. The reforms needed to pursue his obligations were unpopular with the ruling elite.

Constitutional position and influence

- Caesar made changes to the composition of the Senate – numbers were increased from 500 or 600 to 900 and nearly half of the new members came from outside Rome.
- The appointment of consuls – conservative, reliable men were appointed during Caesar's years of dictatorship – five nobles (including three of Caesar's own patrician class) and four novus homo. Caesar's innovation was that they owed their election to him and him alone. He fixed senior appointments quite openly.
- Caesar increased the aediles from four to six; praetors from 16 to 20; quaestors from 20 to 40. As dictator he was assisted by masters of the horse, Antonius and Lepidus. He instituted eight praefecti to assist in his absence – thus foreshadowing the establishment of the monarchy.
- He deprived the people of electoral rights, and refused to rise to meet his 'equals'. Wore purple and sat on a 'throne' of gold.
- He had invaded Italy, he said, to defend the tribunes but in 44, when the tribunes displeased him, he deposed them.
- He clearly held the senatorial Republic in contempt – he called it a 'mere name without a substance'.
- However, he accepted offices, powers and titles from a subservient Senate – thus casting a veil of legality over his position which in the last resort rested upon armed force.
- In 49 he was dictator, then consul; after 48 he held the consulship continuously.
- In 46 he became dictator, first for 10 years, then for life – which gave him absolute imperium free from any interference inside or outside Rome.
- Since 46 he was 'prefect of public morals' and therefore held the power of censor.
- In 45 Caesar became *dictator rei publicae constituendae causa* – Caesar's third dictatorship.
- After the Battle of Munda (45) he was made sole consul and was guaranteed the tribune's sacrosanctity with full tribunician's power.
- Since 63 he was *pontifex maximus* – head of the state religion.
- Greeks declared him to be a god – his statues were placed in temples and cults were established in his honour (not to worship him).

- At the beginning of 44, when he was dictator for a fourth time, his head began to appear on coins with the inscription *Dictator Perpetuo* – dictator for life – a visible sign that he was not the same as ordinary citizens.
- In the last months of his life many of the honours heaped upon him were undeserved from an obsequious Senate the month *Quinctilis* was renamed *Julius*, he was named *Parens Patriae* (*parent of the nations*) after Munda, his statue carried with that of *Victory*, a temple erected to his *Clemency*, a new college of priests was established – the Julian Luperci and a priest (*flamen*) were appointed – perhaps in his honour rather than for his worship.
- At the time of his death, Caesar had influence over the whole *Cursus Honorum* – tribune, censor, consul and dictator simultaneously and collectively. His peers were deprived of what they considered to be their traditional rights to any facet of meaningful leadership through his blocking their access to coveted positions among the political 'class'.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 42

(25 marks)

Analyse the steps taken by Octavian/Augustus to transform Rome from a Republic into the Principate.

Answers could include:

Answers should consider the settlements as part of a broader series of adaptations carefully taken to mask Augustus' creation of what was, in effect, a monarchy.

Octavian in power

- At the beginning of 27 Octavian renounced all his powers and placed them in the hands of the Senate and the people. This was a stage-managed action whereby the Senate was primed to offer protest in order that Octavian could be *persuaded* to receive a giant province consisting of Gaul, Spain and Syria and prompting the Senate to grant him *maius imperium*.
- On 16 January the name 'Augustus' was added to 'Caesar' and he adopted the title *Princeps* or 'first citizen'. He restored the constitutional forms of government rather than the Republic itself.
- He resigned from his eleventh consulship on 1 July, 23 after the second settlement.
- The Senate strengthened his *imperium* by making it a *maius imperium proconsulare*. This meant that he had a superior *imperium* over the Senate, the whole empire and army.
- He was also granted the *tribunicia potestas* which gave him extraordinary powers – he could submit 'bills' and summon the Senate, he had the power of *veto*, the power to compel obedience (*coercitio*) and the power to help citizens (*ius auxilii*).

Transition

- The traditional forms of government were maintained – the 'shell' – there was a Senate, consuls, praetors, debates, traditional ceremonies and so forth.
- But, behind it all stood Augustus a new title with exclusive powers – his authority rested on his *tribunicia potestas* and his *imperium maius* – the first gave civil power in Rome and the second gave complete control of the armies and provinces.
- These two powers were the constitutional basis of the *Principate*.
- Rome was ruled (at least in appearance) jointly by Augustus and the Senate – a 'standing committee' of Augustus, a consul and other magistrates prepared business for the senate to consider.
- Candidates may note that Augustus' concerns with the problem of finding a suitable successor indicate his focus on maintaining the *Principate* as a continuous system.
- The result of his changes were that the Republic was dead – Rome became a 'monarchy' without the ill-fated word *rex* being attached to the role.

Redefining the system

- Octavian faced the dilemma of what to do in the relationship between traditional political power and authority in the state and his unique political position in 29 BC.
- If he followed the example of Sulla and retired, political turmoil would surely erupt again, and if he followed the example of Caesar he would risk assassination and political turmoil.
- A solution needed to be found that would accommodate traditional political culture and at the same time preserve his unique and extremely powerful position – the turmoil of the last century needed to be avoided.
- In 28 he began his sixth consulship (his second with Agrippa) and carried out a census which also gave him also the opportunity to revise the roll of the Senate which at the time numbered 1000 members – 50 were persuaded to retire and 150 were expelled.
- This redefinition was achieved through the implementation of two programs – the First Settlement (27 BC) and the Second Settlement (23 BC). The settlements were a clever piece of illusion.
- In 19, Augustus was also given the position of prefect of morality (*praefectura morum*).

- His powers were supported by his tribunicia potestas, imperium maius, nomination of candidates (as a triumvir), the power to nominate juries and the power to conclude treaties, the control of foreign policy.
- Every Roman soldier swore an oath of allegiance to him and he never relaxed his control over his provinces and therefore the armies that went with them.
- The urban populace of Rome gave him consistently strong support. The reality was that his power was not really based on his constitutional position, but on the loyalty of the legions under his command.
- The traditional Republic had been eroded by generations of conflict between social classes and ambitious politicians. In the period from Caesar to Augustus Rome ripped itself to pieces – Augustus was clever enough to offer a new stability to the Republic while, in reality, he was creating an imperial monarchy.

Accept other relevant answers.

Copyright

© School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2023

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.

An *Acknowledgements variation* document is available on the Authority website.

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