Government of **Western Australia**
School Curriculum and Standards Authority

ANCIENT HISTORY

ATAR course examination 2022

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.

Section One: Short answer – Unit 3   25% (24 Marks)

Rome 133–63 BC

Question 29   (6 marks)

Explain the impact of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* in the period 133–63 BC, using **one** example.

Description	Marks
Explain the impact	
Explains accurately the impact of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* in some detail	4
Explains the impact of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*	3
Describes the impact of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* in general terms	2
Offers limited description of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*	1
Subtotal	**4**
For the example chosen	
Refers accurately to one relevant example in some detail	2
Makes a generalised reference to one example	1
Subtotal	**2**
Total	**6**

Candidates will clearly indicate the nature of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*, put it into context using an example and will consider its short- and/or long-term impact.

Explanation of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*
• A declaration by the Senate at times of a public emergency authorising a magistrate to act to ensure that the 'state did not suffer injury' - this meant summary justice could be used to deal with offenders i.e., a trial nor any recourse to the law or legal processes was required to deal with 'offenders'.
• In effect this was an acknowledgement that when the state was under threat, the Senate could authorise a magistrate to take whatever action necessary to defend the state. It was therefore a means of retaining the dominance of the Senate, particularly during periods of threats to traditional Senatorial power and dominance. The *SCU* gave magistrates the power to execute citizens with or without trial.

Impact
• The *SCU* appeared as a legal power used by the Senate to reaffirm and re-establish its authority employing any means deemed appropriate. Until Cicero vs Catiline, there was also no accountability of any kind for any action undertaken during an *SCU*. Candidates may indicate that political assassination was effectively sanctioned by the highest authority, perhaps thereby promoting a culture of increased use of political violence which was a key component in the break down in general political procedures and law and order later in the period (in the actions of people like Sulla, Crassus, Caesar, Clodius, Pompey, Milo, Octavian etc.).
• The *SCU* formed an important part of the increase in political violence in the Late Republic. In each case the violence was excessive (and often confusing). While the invocation of the *SCU* can be interpreted as a declaration and affirmation of the superiority of Senatorial authority, it can be argued to have provided official sanction for the use of violence to oppress political opposition.

Possible examples of the *use* of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*
• 121 BC consul L. Opimius led an attack on Gaius Gracchus and his supporters. It is claimed that some 3000 of Gaius' supporters were killed without a trial as a result.
• 100 BC during Saturninus' violent and disruptive campaign for his second tribunate. The Senate reacted by passing the *SCU* for the second time, Marius was ordered to restore law and order. He formed an armed militia and Saturninus and some of his main

supporters were killed (stoned to death). The *SCU* was again responsible for the use of extreme violence in order to restore law and order, emphasising the dominance of the Senate.
- An *SCU* against Sulla when he returned to Italy in the spring of 83. Sulla was given the choice of civil war or surrender. His loyal troops took an oath to leave the local inhabitants alone as they marched towards Rome. On reaching Rome at the beginning of November, Sulla captured the city and ordered the massacre of some 6000 prisoners.
- 77 BC against Lepidus (consul 78) who stirred up a revolt in northern Italy.
- In October 63 against Catiline: Cicero as consul took responsibility to expose the threat. Catiline died on the battle field near Pistoria while supporters were rounded up and executed in Rome.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 30   **(6 marks)**

Identify and describe **three** of Marius' military reforms.

Description	Marks
For each of the three reforms (3 x 2 marks)	
Identifies clearly and describes in detail Marius' military reform	2
Simple identification and/or generalised or incomplete description of Marius' military reform	1
Total	**6**

The Roman army underwent radical change as a result of the reforms introduce by Gaius Marius. Three of the following should be chosen:

Enlistment
- was opened up to all Roman citizens and what had been a conscript-based militia became a professional army made up of volunteers.
- To deal with the problem of recruitment which had steadily declined in the second half of the second century BC, Marius opened up recruitment to the *capite censi* in 107 BC during the war against Jugurtha. This meant those below the minimum property qualification were now able to serve.
- This reform solved one problem, dwindling recruitments, but caused another - what to do with the retired soldiers. Therefore, Marius personally provided land for his veterans by having a land law passed through the *concilium plebis* in 100 BC by the tribune Saturninus. This set a precedent for generals who were personally expected to enter the political process to provide land for their veterans in the future.
- Payment of the recruits also fell to the general who recruited them, not to the state.
- The result of the provision of payment and land by the general was the creation of the client army – an army loyal to a general not the state. Candidates may point out that this development led to fundamental change in the political landscape across the period of study.

Structure
- The army was re-structured into legions and *auxilia* and the cohort (600 men) became the basic tactical unit. Each cohort was divided into six legions of 100 men.
- The cohort, which was made up of three maniples, had been in use since the Second Punic War.

Equipment
- Marius introduced higher standards of training to increase the skills, endurance and morale of recruits.
- His soldiers were to be more self-reliant by the provision of their own emergency rations and hand-equipment for entrenching and cooking. They were known as 'Marius' Mules'.
- They were provided with standardised weapons and equipment
- Marius is also credited with modifying the *pilum* or spear, by using a wooden rivet to fix the spear head to the wooden shaft.

Discipline and training
- New system of drill introduced, based on gladiatorial schools (first used by Rutilius Rufus in 105 BC). Forced marches in full equipment and keeping busy were key (i.e., building canals while waiting for the Cimbri to return). This led to the Roman army becoming the most effective in the ancient world.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 31 **(6 marks)**

Identify key reasons for Sulla's proscriptions, and describe the significance of the increase in violence on Rome.

Description	Marks
Identifies clearly and accurately the key reasons for Sulla's proscriptions and describes in detail the significance of the increase in violence on Rome	6
Identifies the key reasons for Sulla's proscriptions and describes the significance of the increase in violence on Rome	5
Identifies reasons for Sulla's proscriptions and provides some description of the significance of the increase in violence on Rome	4
Identifies simple reasons for Sulla's proscriptions and general description of the increase in violence on Rome	3
Limited identification of reasons for Sulla's proscriptions and limited description of the increase in violence on Rome	2
Makes minimal reference to reasons and minimal description of Sulla's proscription and their impact on Rome	1
Total	**6**

Reasons
Before Sulla returned to Rome in 83 BC, he sent a letter to the senate stating that he would punish those who had 'committed crimes against him'. Candidates should identify what issues had arisen before and immediately after Sulla's departure for the East. After marching on Rome in order to remove his enemies for the first time in 88, Sulla published new constitutional measures to control the Tribunes, and insisted that one of the new Consuls, Cinna, take an oath to abide by these measures. Clearly the political landscape was greatly disturbed by the action of Marius and Sulla in 88, and indicates high levels of division in the senate at the time. However, a great deal of the reasons for Sulla's proscriptions in 83 might be linked to Cinna's subsequent behaviour: the tension over his registering the new tribes led to his being driven out of Rome and declared a public enemy; he then raised an army, joined Marius and marched on Rome; Sulla's laws were then repealed; Sulla was declared a public enemy and his property was confiscated. One can assume that many in the governing classes had been involved in these actions/processes after 88, providing Sulla with an extensive list of enemies who later appeared on the lists of the proscribed.

Significance of increase in violence on Rome
• A campaign of violence was unleashed by Sulla's supporters in the city and throughout Italy.
• The killings were uncontrolled - many motivated by greed, pleasure and revenge. Rome was now ruled through terror and appalling brutality.
• Protests about the arbitrary nature of the killings led to Sulla publishing a list of names of those who would be executed (the proscribed) - they were condemned to death without a trial, their property was confiscated and their descendants were prevented from holding office for two generations. The long term repercussions on these families was immense.
• Lawlessness and societal breakdown were accelerated: rewards were paid to those who killed the proscribed or provided information leading to their capture; it was illegal to protect anyone whose name appeared on a list and a reward was paid for killing a proscribed man - a slave would be paid for killing his master - the presentation of a severed head was the usual proof required for payment.
• Appian reports that 40 senators and 1600 equites were proscribed in the first list - lists were distributed in Rome and in the Italian towns, this destabilised the power structure and led to a fundamental change in the demographic of senate membership.
• The brutality of Sulla's control over Rome meant he was in complete control, his real and imagined enemies had been murdered or driven out, their families ruined, their property stolen.
• Sulla's closest supporters benefitted from all of this. Many, like Crassus and Catiline, continued to play a significant role in Roman political life after Sulla's death. Many

Question 31 (continued)

• benefited from the proscriptions - Crassus enthusiastically supported the proscriptions and enriched himself by buying up the property of many of the proscribed.   • Despite Sulla's efforts to re-establish a traditional form of senatorial government in Rome, politics and political activity remained unstable.   Sulla provided a model of what could be acheived by a general backed by a loyal army.   Roman politics after Sulla became more unstable.
Accept other relevant answers.

Question 32 **(6 marks)**

Outline the reasons why Pompey was given commands against Lepidus **or** Sertorius in the 70s BC.

Description	Marks
For each command:	
Accurately outlines reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius in detail	6
Accurately outlines reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius	5
Outlines some reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius	4
Identifies some reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius	3
Limited identification of reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius	2
Makes minimal reference to reasons for the command against Lepidus or Sertorius	1
Total	**6**

Candidates should know the immediate impetus for Pompey receiving these commands. However, the discriminator will likely be a capacity to articulate the impact of the wider disruptions taking place in the political and military landscape during and after Sulla's leadership.

Pompey's military and political careers were both unorthodox and his unusual career pathway is one of the key reasons for his being awarded these commands. Many of the unusual opportunities for Pompey arose because of an array of political and military emergencies during the period. Candidates might point out some of this: he joined Sulla in his early 20s as the commander of his own small army, crushed Sulla's opponents in Sicily and Africa and was granted a *praetorian imperium* by the Senate. He was sent to Africa where he was again successful. Sulla then informed Pompey that his work was done and he should disband his army. Pompey disobeyed him and returned to Italy with his troops, demanding a triumph - which he celebrated on 12 March 81 BC - a significant move that was a message about Pompey's future intentions.

Against Lepidus
- M. Aemilius Lepidus supported Sulla and benefited politically and financially from the proscriptions and Sulla's brutal rule. Despite this he supported those Marians who had suffered from Sulla's rule and supported their claims for the return of land that Sulla had confiscated.
- Lepidus became consul in 78 BC (along with Catulus) and was sent to deal with rebellious dispossessed farmers in Etruria. The consuls soon fell out (Lepidus possibly supported the farmers) and concern grew that civil war might erupt. Lepidus was granted Transalpine Gaul (and possible Cisalpine Gaul) as his proconsular province.
- He refused to return to Rome and demanded a second consulship, raised troops along with Brutus, and was reported to be marching on Rome at the beginning of 77 BC. Thus, Lepidus represented a serious threat to the SPQR and the Senate responded by passing an *SCU.*
- The proconsul Catulus was given a command against Lepidus, who he defeated. Pompey, in the meantime, had been granted a *propraetorian imperium* (Pompey had not yet held a magistracy) and marched north to besiege Brutus at Mutina.
- Lepidus was attacked by Pompey at Cosa in Etruria and fled to Sardinia where he died. Lepidus' rebellion had been quite easily crushed. Pompey's reputation grew and he managed to leverage his promotions from his victories despite his lack of a traditional or formal career partly because of his command of a loyal army.

Against Sertorius
- One of the reasons that Pompey was given a command against Serotius was that he had been instructed to disband his army after his victory against Lepidus, but ignored these orders and remained with his troops outside of Rome. This action clearly shows that Pompey recognised the importance of having the support of troops and that he was prepared to pressure the senate into granting him another command.

Question 32 (continued)

• The command in Spain against Sertorius was a prize Pompey wanted. The two consuls for 77 BC, D. Junius Brutus and Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus, refused the command.
• It was proposed by L. Phillipus that Pompey should be employed, supporting Metellus Pius the proconsul of Further Spain, thus removing him and his army from Rome.
• Sertorius was a capable commander who had been added to Sulla's proscription list and declared an outlaw. He had fled Rome, first to north Africa and then Spain, and successfully commanded Spanish troops against Rome. Many reliable experienced and respected Roman individuals who were likewise proscribed or who perhaps believed that Sulla's Rome was corrupted beyond repair, also fled to join Sertorius who represented an alternative to Sulla's Rome. As such Sertorius was a significant threat to the Sullan Senate. Like the commanders before him, Pompey found Sertorius to be a capable and difficult enemy and failed to achieve the victory he expected until Sertorius was betrayed by one of his own men.
Accept other relevant answers.

Question 33 **(6 marks)**

Describe the outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy.

Description	Marks
Describes accurately and clearly the outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy in detail	6
Describes the outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy	5
Describes some outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy	4
Describes some outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy, may be generalised	3
Identifies and/or describes limited outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy	2
Makes minimal reference to the outcomes of the Catiline Conspiracy	1
Total	**6**

Candidates should not discuss the narrative of the Conspiracy of Catiline.
- Cicero's actions saved Rome from another prolonged bloody civil conflict.
- Many of Catiline's supporters were executed, after which many others disappeared.
- Catiline attempted to leave Italy.
- Catiline's army was crushed by armies of Celer and Petreius.
- Cicero was awarded the title of Pater Patriae conferred by Catulus in a show of what appeared to be genuine gratitude.
- New laws were introduced providing for greater distribution of grain to the poor.
- Cicero conceived his *Concordia Ordinum* in order to promote lasting reconciliation between the Senate and equestrians.
- Cicero was banished by Clodius in 58 BC for executing the conspirators without trial in 63 BC. Clodius may have specifically passed legislation to punish anyone who had put citizens to death without trial to remove Cicero from Rome, perhaps at the behest of the Triumvirs, or perhaps out of desire for personal revenge.

Accept other relevant answers.

Section Two: Source analysis – Unit 4 **25% (20 Marks)**

Rome 63 BC–AD 14

Question 34 **(10 marks)**

Assess the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC.

Refer to the source and your knowledge of the historical context in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC. Shows thorough understanding of the source, makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC. Shows understanding of the source, makes some detailed reference to the historical context	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC. Shows generalised understanding of the source, makes generalised reference to the historical context	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC. Shows limited understanding of the source, makes limited reference to the historical context	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the perspective in the source for its contribution to our understanding of the reasons for the opposition that developed toward Caesar during and after 49 BC. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or to the historical context. May include errors.	1–2
Total	**10**

Plutarch's perspective is that Caesar wanted to be King (*Rex*). He proposes later in his account that this was an important contributing factor in Caesar's assassination. Plutarch's assertion about Caesar's ambition is contested by several non-contemporary sources (i.e., Syme, Scullard, Cary). Candidates should be aware of the evidence and main points supporting both sides of the argument to enable their discussion of the reasons proposed by Plutarch for the opposition which developed toward Caesar.

- In effect Caesar was the custodian of Rome at this time. He took total control over all aspects of Roman life. His position was a peculiar one at a time when politics in Rome was undergoing a transition.
- He nominated many of the magistrates and deprived the people of electoral rights.
- He had invaded Italy, he said, to defend the tribunes but in 44, when the tribunes displeased him, he deposed them.
- During the civil war the Roman people suffered and in 48 BC a year's remission of rents had to be granted and was possibly renewed in 47 BC. Until 46 BC Africa was in Pompeian hands and Rome was cut off from one of its chief corn suppliers which resulted in a massive increase in corn prices, the poor had less money and debt steadily increased. In 48 and 47 there were bloody riots in the city - demands that rents and other debts should be remitted. Caesar acquitted debts to ease social tension.
- Caesar dealt with many socio-economic problems by taking direct control over a number of roles that had traditionally been senatorial responsibilities: candidates may note that this might indicate his desire to be an absolute ruler (monarch). They may be aware of his management of the economy, the range of his public works, his oversight of provincial governance, his stimulation of employment opportunities, infrastructure improvements

that were undertaken and a wide range of other reforms all of which had traditionally been in the remit of the senate. Alternatively, responses might comment that Caesar thereby blocked the traditional functions of the senate, and in this way increased the resentment toward him among the ruling classes.

- Despite holding the senatorial Republic in contempt (he called it a 'mere name without a substance') he accepted offices, powers and titles from a subservient Senate. This created a sense of legality about his constitutional position which, in reality, rested upon his capacity to mobilise armed forces.

- The dictatorship had originally been created as a strictly temporary position for use in times of emergency. However, in 49 BC he was dictator, then consul; after 48 he held the consulship continuously. In 46 he became dictator again, first for ten years, then for life - which gave him absolute imperium free from any interference inside or outside Rome. In effect he had the power of a king, candidates may suggest that he did not need to become king.

- After the Battle of Munda he was made sole consul and in 45 was guaranteed the tribune's sacrosanctity with full tribunician power. In 46 he was 'prefect of public morals' and therefore held the power of a censor. Since 63 he had been Pontifex Maximus or head of the state religion.

- He was tribune, censor, consul and dictator simultaneously and collectively. He blocked the cursus honorum thus thwarting the ambitions of the ruling class. Since his power was absolute, the title of Rex was somewhat redundant, but his enemies were aware of the unpopularity of the notion of a monarchy and seem to have perpetuated the rumour that he desired kingship. Candidates may recount the stories in the ancient sources about Caesar being offered a diadem several times and refusing it, or his punishing those who placed a diadem on his statues as evidence of his rejection of the position of king, or they may relate his other behaviours – he wore a purple toga, sat on a gilded chair, refused to rise to meet the Senate, planned a trip to Parthia and had his likeness put on coins - as evidence that he did aspire to be king. All/either is acceptable in terms of supporting the interpretation of Plutarch's statement.

- As a consequence, Caesar did become a symbol of the death of the Republic, which had transformed into a society that was dependent on one man - this meant the end of a culture that had been completely dominated by a rich and powerful aristocratic culture in an oligarchic arrangement for centuries. The perspective in the source effectively reflects the sentiment of this dispossessed elite.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 35 **(10 marks)**

Assess the usefulness of this source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control.

Refer to the source and your knowledge of the historical context in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the usefulness of the source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control. Shows thorough understanding of the source, makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the usefulness of the source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control. Shows understanding of the source, makes some detailed reference to the historical context	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the usefulness of the source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control. Shows generalised understanding of the source, makes generalised reference to the historical context	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the usefulness of the source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control. Shows limited understanding of the source, makes limited reference to the historical context	3–4
Makes superficial assessment of the usefulness of the source in understanding the use of violence by the members of the Second Triumvirate to consolidate their control. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or the historical context. May include errors	1–2
Total	**10**

The source graphically illustrates the attitudes of the Triumvirs toward their political enemies (perceived or real), and the level of violence they were prepared to use to gain what they wanted. The source is also useful for indicating that the proscriptions had three aims - to kill their enemies, confiscate property to pay their troops and fund their campaigns (this also resulted in expanding their own wealth), and strengthen their control through violence and terror, all of which they did. However, there were other methods used by the members of the Second Triumvirate to gain and maintain control, and candidates are expected to be able to relate balanced evidence in order to effectively assess the usefulness of the source.

- The Triumvirs had 45 legions between them and were capable of enforcing whatever they wanted through their military supremacy.
- Appian refers to 'putting on the list those whom they suspected', as Sulla had done. A Reign of Terror was a key method used to gain and consolidate power by the Second Triumvirate, this method had been adopted/adapted across the period of study. Some of the actions carried out on 'enemies' at this time were clear messages to others who might stand against the trio, for example Cicero's objections to Antony had been very public. He was probably their most famous victim: Antony ordered his head and hands displayed on the Rostra in the Forum. Appian notes 'There were brothers and uncles of the triumvirs in the list of the proscribed, and also some of the officers serving under them who had difficulty with the leaders, or with their fellow-officers.' Clearly there was a level of pragmatic brutality, perhaps aimed at achieving obedience among survivors in this set of proscriptions.
- Copying Sulla, they issued their proscription list with a bounty of 25 thousand denarii paid for each head delivered. Death warrants for some 2000 equites and 300 senators were drawn up. In this way political opposition was purged.
- The property and estates of victims was confiscated – through these proscriptions the triumvirs enriched themselves and paid their troops. Equally, land confiscated from 18 Italian communities was also distributed to their men, easing their financial challenges. They also forced those with a property value of 100 000 denarii (the equestrians) to

provide them with loans and donate a year's income. Wealthy women were forced to declare the value of the capital they possessed. Thus there was a great deal of economic control used to consolidate the dominance of the three which also alleviated their financial difficulties. Interestingly, the amount of property that came on to the market caused a glut and prices fell, thus the Triumvirs soon found they were short of funds needed for their campaigns.

- Political methods were used by the triumvirs to shore up their power and position which was formalised and they were 'elected' for five years (until the end of 38 BC), after this they effectively shared absolute power between them.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 36 **(10 marks)**

Assess the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'.

Refer to the source and your knowledge of the historical context in your answer.

Description	Marks
Makes a comprehensive assessment of the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'. Shows thorough understanding of the source, makes detailed reference to the historical context	9–10
Makes an appropriate assessment of the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'. Shows understanding of the source, makes some detailed reference to the historical context	7–8
Makes a generalised assessment of the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'. Shows generalised understanding of the source, makes generalised reference to the period of study	5–6
Makes a limited assessment of the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'. Shows limited understanding of the source, makes limited reference to the period of study	3–4
Makes a superficial assessment of the reliability of Augustus' claim that he established the 'best possible Constitution'. Shows superficial understanding of the source and/or the period of study. May include errors.	1–2
Total	**10**

For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document.

For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document.

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 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
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)**

Discuss how the political actions and reforms of the Gracchi challenged the power and authority of the Senate and explain the Senate's reaction.

Candidates are required to discuss two things - the violent reaction to the Gracchi and the consequences of the actions of the Gracchi. A simple narrative of their lives and reform programs is not required by the question. Instead, an answer should use relevant examples and evidence to consider why the response of the Senate to the Gracchi was so violent and, how both the actions of the Gracchi and the response of the Senate to the brothers set in motion key long-term political change that had significant repercussions throughout the period of study.

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 L*ex agraria*) in some ways creates the rift that would eventually see Rome divided between *populares* and *optimates* and culminate in Civil Wars leading to the overthrow of the Republic. Cicero remarked that he had 'shattered the stability of the state', despite this Tiberius does not seem to have been intentionally revolutionary. Responses should refer to aspects of his reform program as examples to elucidate the impact of his role in Roman politics, forming the foundation for an argument that explains the Senate's response to him.

- His key public position was that of tribune and he realised that the tribunate was also immensely influential. His actions as Tribune sparked an immediate backlash from the Senate, which feared that Tiberius may be creating precedents for direct control by the people in major areas of government via the *concilium plebis.*
- Tiberius did not act alone, he was part of a group of influential individuals such as Appius Claudius Pulcher who aided and supported his political agenda, thus some of the impact credited to Tiberius does not belong to him alone.
- His land bill - *Lex Sempronia Agraria* - brought about an immediate reaction from the Senate because he had taken the bill to the Concilium Plebis without first submitting it to the Senate - this was not illegal nor unprecedented, but it was unusual and effectively sidestepped any possible senatorial opposition. The terms of the Lex also created opposition among the landed class who were likely to lose some of their access to the ager publicus. Any investment or improvement they may have made to the ager publicus was also therefore lost. The obvious economic impact let to additional opposition to Tiberius.
- A series of *contiones* or public debates were held where Tiberius was opposed by a fellow tribune Marcus Octavius who represents much of the Senatorial opposition to Tiberius.
- Heated debates and meetings ended with Tiberius putting a bill forward to expel Octavius from the tribunate because he defied the will of the people. This was an unusual step and increased resentment to Tiberius in the Senate.
- Tiberius' emphasis on the people was seen by the Senate as a dangerous challenge to its authority.
- His referral of King Attalus III' s bequest to the People caused an outrage. Normally economic matters were dealt with by the Senate thus this was seen as a direct challenge to the power and authority of the Senate.
- His attempt to gain a second tribunate was seen by many as more outrageous and led to a violent reaction and eventually to significant political violence.
- Led by Scipio Nasica, a mob of senators attacked Tiberius and his supporters. Tiberius was eventually clubbed to death by P. Satureius, a fellow tribune. Some 300 of his supporters also died.
- Nasica escaped into self-imposed exile and the Senate held an enquiry, purging opposition to it along the way. Tiberius' death was condoned, and the use of violence became a political tool.

Question 37 (continued)

Gaius Gracchus
• Gaius' journey is like his brother's, with an election to the tribunate in 123 BC being the key position of importance in his career.
• Gaius' reform program was much broader than Tiberius'. He wanted to avenge his brother's death, to develop his broad program of reforms, and thus perhaps intended to shift the balance of power in Roman politics away from the Senate. He also intended to deal with problems with the Italian allies. Much of his program of change was a direct threat to the power and authority of the Senate.
• As part of his program, a series of laws were introduced, for example, *Lex de Abactis* (aimed at M. Octavius), *Lex de Provocatione* (making illegal capital punishment without the authority of the people), control over juries in the extortion cases to the Equites, the assigning of consular provinces, a law in favour of the Equites concerning the collection of taxes in Asia, a law providing for the distribution of a regular monthly distribution of grain, a *Lex Agraria* to deal with the distribution of public land and many others.
• Gaius' reform program was necessary but met with resistance from the elite oligarchic faction who opposed change. This clash was the beginning of the 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 i.e., the foundation of colonies overseas, the construction off a network of roads, the *Lex Acilia* which targeted corrupt officials.
• His policies were quite aggressive and there are indications that Gaius' popularity in Rome was waning by late 122 BC, 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 at 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.
• The introduction and use of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* indicated how violence could be used as a formidable tool to shore up the power and authority of the Senate.
• The extent of the influence of the Gracchi 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 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 in the case of both brothers.
• 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' was able to be manipulated by ambitious and unscrupulous politicians and was more than ready to support any aspiring politician who promised them benefits and relief. Thus, the assemblies became pawns in struggles for political supremacy.
Accept other relevant answers.

Question 38 **(25 marks)**

Examine the role of the tribunate in Roman politics and analyse the way that changes to this role led to a challenge to other power structures during the period of study.

Candidates should provide a brief explanation of what the tribunate was and what a tribune did – they might note that in Appian's 'Civil Wars' the tribunate is seen as destructive. There are numerous examples thereafter that candidates might choose to support their argument about the manipulation of the office of the Tribunate and the impact of this change. The discriminator will likely be the effective use of a set of well-chosen examples to support the argument being constructed, as opposed to a simple recount of the actions of one or more tribunes.

Role of the tribunate
The Concilium Plebis chose the Plebeian magistrates - the tribunes and the Plebeian Aediles - and could enact laws (plebiscite). In 287 BC the Hortensian law was passed giving *plebiscites* the force of laws *(leges)* and were binding on all the people. The role of the tribunes was to defend the lives and property of the plebeians and their power was based on *sacrosanctitas* or 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) of any act by a magistrate, against laws and *senatus consulta* (advice of the senate to magistrates) and elections. They also had the power to call assemblies, propose resolutions or *plebiscita*, assert the right of *plebiscita*. Each tribune had the power to stop (veto) the action of another tribune.
- They had, in other words, the potential to be extremely positive or disruptive. Their ability to counter the power of the other magistrates in the Roman political system was remarkable. Most represented the 'ordinary people'.

Changes to the role of the tribunate - the Gracchi
- Between a year of turmoil and violence in 133 BC and a year of turmoil and violence in 63 BC the role of the tribunate changed and increasingly the tribunes became more the agents of powerful and ambitious individuals rather than agents of the plebs. A general discussion about what the Gracchi did as tribune - his land bill, Octavius' opposition and veto and the Gracchi's reaction would be appropriate.
- The significance of Tiberius' actions are the steps that were seen as a threat to the power, prerogatives and wealth of the ruling class in Rome. His agrarian bill and his attempt to enforce the authority of the people provoked a violent reaction from members of the Senate which resulted in the deaths of Tiberius and many of his supporters.
- Tiberius' brother Gaius was tribune 10 years later with a program that was more wide ranging. He raised the issue of his brother's death as a result of political violence, and much of his reform program shifted the balance of political power from the Senate to the people; he drew attention to the issue of provincial misconduct and extortion, how provincial appointments were assigned to consuls, the distribution of grain to the poor, the restoration of the land commissioners, and addressed the unpopular issue of citizenship for Rome's Italian/Latin allies.
- All of this undercut the privileges of the ruling class. Gaius' election for a second term as tribune only inflamed opposition to him from within the Senate, and M. Livius Drusus was supported by the Senate as a tribune to undermine Gaius' support which was slowly waning and when he attempted to win a third term as tribune he failed.

When one of the consuls, Lucius Opimius, convinced the Senate that strong action needed to be taken, the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* was passed. The consuls were empowered to ensure that the Republic was unharmed, violence erupted and Opimius led armed senators and Equites to attack Gaius and his supporters. Gaius and 3000 of his supporters were killed.

Question 38 (continued)

- This is a critical point - the Senate used a volatile situation, for which it was partly responsible, to re-assert its dominance and this was 'legitimised' by the introduction of the *SCU.*

Saturninus
- Another example of the political struggle between the Senate and a radical tribune was tribunate of L. Appuleius Saturninus (103 and 100) who unsuccessfully attempted to introduce a *Lex Frumentaria* to fix the cost of grain at a very low price. This was an important reform.
- Saturninus was also closely allied to Marius with the aim of distributing land for Marius' veterans. The events of 100 were particularly violent with factions using unfavourable omens to block voting, brawling in the streets and eventually the murder of one of Saturninus' opponents, C. Memmius.
- When Saturninus and his supporters seized the Capitol, the Senate passed an *SCU* and Marius, who was consul, was ordered to restore order. In the end, violence won the day and Saturninus and many of his supporters were murdered.
- Saturninus' tribunate had been used to promote reforms that were seen to be against the interests of the Senate and the people who dominated it.

Other examples
- M. Livius Drusus (91), the son of Drusus above. His policies and murder contributed to the breakdown of relations between Rome and its allies in Italy which in turn led to the outbreak of the Social War.
- In 88 the tribune Sulpicius was allied to Marius, with the aim of transferring the command against Mithridates to Marius. Sulpicius was supported and protected by a force of young *equites* (the 'anti-Senate') and 3000 armed men. When the two consuls, Sulla and Pompeius Rufus were driven out of Rome and Sulpicius and Marius were in control. Sulla responded by marching on Rome with an army, a momentous event in Roman history. Note: when Sulla regained control of Rome in 81, one of his political reforms was to strip the tribunate of most of its traditional powers and it became a 'dead-end' office. Those who held it were disqualified from holding other magistracies. This action clearly recognised and attempted to manage the potential of the Tribunate for reform and disruption.
- In 70, Pompey and Crassus, as consuls, introduced a law that fully restored the powers of the tribunes. In 67 a tribune Aulus Gabinius took action that was to benefit Pompey immensely. It was the first time a tribune had interfered in what was traditionally a function of the Senate - the appointment of military commanders (in this case for the Lex Gabinia). The process and the law to get Pompey appointed to a command to deal with the pirate problem was cleverly crafted by Gabinius in the face of fierce opposition from the Senate and the *optimates.* The next year, another tribune, G. Manilius, proposed that the Eastern command should be transferred to Pompey.

How the tribunate formed a challenge to other power structures
- All of these examples illustrate the changing role of the tribunate. It became a platform for aspiring politicians, an instrument of reform, an instrument of disruption, an instrument for the manipulation of power structures and resource allocation to suit individual agenda.
- The tribunate, as an office that represented the *plebs*, had become an active instrument for reform. However, it came up against the domination of the traditional authority of the ruling class and its instrument of power, the Senate.
- Sulla stripped power from the tribunes and attempted to make it an unattractive path to follow for a political career. This was extremely unpopular with the people and tribunes such as Sicinius (76) and Opimius (75) who attacked the Senate, thus the consul G. Aurelius Cotta drafted a law to cancel Sulla's law banning tribunes from further office.
- They were followed by Quinctius in 74, who attacked Sulla's program and revived public meetings (*contio),* and Licinius Macer in 73. These tribunes do not appear to have had much impact. In 70, the consuls Crassus and Pompey introduced a law that restored the powers of the tribunes, acknowledging the importance of their role as representatives of

the *plebs.* Despite this Pompey and Crassus used tribunes to gain benefits, both political and military, for themselves. The tribunate has been introduced to promote the interests of the plebs, and was clearly being manipulated for other purposes by this time.

- By the first century BC tribunes had been instrumental in bringing about reforms, inspiring violence and revolts and agents promoting the careers of the powerful and ambitious.
- During the last century of the Republic the tribunate had become an effective weapon to be used by the powerful to manipulate the political agenda, neuter their opponents and advance their own careers.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 39   **(25 marks)**

Assess how the Roman army was used to advance the political careers of powerful individuals in the period from 133 BC to 63 BC. Refer to **two** of the following in your answer:
• Marius
• Sulla
• Pompey.

The answer should go well beyond providing a narrative/biography of the individuals chosen and might seek to compare and/or contrast individuals' employment of the army as a political weapon. Candidates should be able to explain the way the client army imposed a military and political responsibility on generals, some of whom were poor politicians, and all of which was poorly managed/responded to by the Senate.

Marius
• Marius' political career was orthodox before becoming consul in BC 107, which was then followed by five unprecedented consulships 104, 103, 102, 101 and 100. Marius' recruitment strategy changed the relationship between general and army forever. The client army was born. Marius' military reforms, especially dealing with recruitment, had transformed the army into a 'professional' career rather than a service and duty that must be done when called on to protect the state. The immediate effect on Marius was that he needed to secure the acquisition of land for his veterans, in the long term this became a central concern for all generals in the period.
• This destabilised the political environment in Rome throughout the period. In 100 BC Marius' used his veterans to influence votes on legislation which was in their favour, and the campaign by the tribune Saturninus unleashed a violent reaction in Rome, some of which was directly attributable to Marius' veterans. As a consul Marius was then faced with the problem of dealing with the arrest of Saturninus and the subsequent violence that erupted resulting in the murder of Saturninus, Glaucia and supporters. While Marius had been able to leverage the loyalty of his veterans as a tool to apply political pressure, he had not been able to control the consequences of their involvement in political processes.
• When the command against Mithridates was removed from Sulla and awarded to Marius in 88, Sulla was able to employ his own client army to regain political ground. The ensuing civil war between Marius/Sulpicius against Sulla, who was backed by his own client army at Nola, led to the capital being ransacked in what is probably the most blatant use of the army as a political tool throughout the period.

And/or

Sulla
• Sulla's use of the military was designed to regain his political status and his command against Mithridates. He approached the army at Nola that was preparing for this command and convinced them to do two things:
• follow him and thereby reject Marius as commander
• march on Rome to restore 'law and order'.
• It is a significant testimony to the strength of the relationship between general and troops that only one officer refused to back him. The march on Rome was an act of great significance. It was the first time an army had marched on Rome to re-establish the political position of an individual, in this case a consul. It is doubtful that the army was motivated by altruism.
• It is at this point that the army became an instrument to be used for political ends. Sulla clearly used the army to achieve his political ambitions (or to defend/protect his political standing/status).
• Although it was Marius who had opened recruitment in the army to the *proletarii*, it was Sulla who was the first to understand the possible implications of this change. Responses should not focus on Marius' reforms at length.

- Interestingly, Sulla did not receive the reception from the people that he might have expected – his army was pelted with roof tiles as it marched into the city, which only stopped when Sulla threatened to burn their houses
- Over time Marius' recruitment of landless free men meant that the troops gave loyalty to their commanders rather than the state – in this case while Sulla and Marius were at odds they saw that they would have more to gain under the command of Sulla rather than Marius.
- In 83, Sulla invaded Italy with a massive army which had sworn an oath to remain loyal to him, a significant step in the transformation of the army from being a loyal servant of the state into being an instrument to be used by a powerful individual.
- Another interesting development emerged – powerful men such as Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, M. Licinius Crassus, M. Lucullus and the very young and audacious Gn. Pompeius (Pompey) joined Sulla.
- The establishment of the so called 'military monarchy' was well underway.
- Complete military domination over Rome by Sulla was re-enforced by the massive program of violence unleashed by Sulla's proscriptions. His real and imagined enemies were destroyed, and his closest allies were rewarded. It was an appalling and at times indiscriminate reign of terror which left an indelible stain on Roman society, all of which had been facilitated through manipulation of the loyalty of an army.

Marius and Sulla used their armies to attack their political opponents and take control of Rome.

And/or

Pompey
- From the very beginning of his career Pompey pursued a completely unorthodox path. His first significant appearance at the age of 23 was his command of three legions of his father's veteran clients to support Sulla at Picenum in 83. Pompey's command was technically illegal - the circumstances were extraordinary and more significantly, it served Sulla's interests to overlook the 'illegitimate' nature of Pompey's position at the time. Throughout his career Pompey completely ignored the traditional political process (the *cursus honorum*) and use the threat of the army that backed him to get his own way and achieve the highest office.
- As a result of this support for Sulla, Pompey had his first triumph (possibly in 81 or 80). The significance of this is that Pompey enjoyed extraordinary military success and public recognition by his mid-twenties. He had clearly, and very successfully, attached himself to the supreme military and political power in the Roman world through the clever employment of a much-needed military in a time of crisis. Significantly, Pompey was rarely far from the command of loyal troops.
- Over the next few years Pompey was given several important military commands, receiving a proconsular imperium in 77 against Sertorius in Spain and after that, he helped finish the Servile War in 71. Again he celebrated a triumph. None of these commands followed traditional career progression. What is significant is that Pompey was given several important military commands without ever holding office. He never put a foot on the *cursus honorum*, demonstrating the political power of a military command.
- Thus, by 71, Pompey had enjoyed considerable military success and a number of triumphs that technically should only have been granted to those who had held the office of praetor or consul - Pompey had held neither. His career gains were all a result of his control over, and connection to, his army.
- For Pompey to be granted his consulship in 70, the Senate passed a decree that exempted him from the provisions of the *lex annalis*, the laws that regulated qualifications for the various magistracies of the *cursus honorum*. Clearly, though Pompey did not meet the orthodox requirements for consular office, he had successfully commanded a proconsular army for seven years and was about to celebrate his second triumph. Thus, political ascension for Pompey was a direct result of his military successes. It is more than likely his candidature received widespread approval. However, as Plutarch points out in *Pompey, 21* '(it was) said he would not disband his army but would make his way

Question 39 (continued)

•   by force of arms and take absolute power like that of Sulla.' Thus the Senate may have been bullied into allowing Pompey to stand for the consulship of 70. However, the consulship was one of many offices which Pompey gained but for which he had no qualification. •   The shadow of Sulla hung over Rome. While there is no evidence that Pompey or Crassus used the threat of force to gain this consulship, both men retained their armies at the time of the elections (because of their upcoming triumph and ovation), which is likely to have represented a somewhat menacing presence outside Rome at the time. •   Pompey's first consulship (70 BC) perhaps could be considered to be an extraordinary command to an extent, and as such this set a difficult precedent for the state which had failed to counter the rising influence of the military men who were enjoying increasing impact on the political landscape. However, Pompey's consulship was an act of defusing a potentially explosive situation and a pretence of re-affirming traditional procedure. The Senate The Senate's general disregard for orthodox promotion at times, i.e., during Marius' war with the Cimbri and Teutones, its disempowerment under Sulla and the nature of both military and political fallout from Sulla's actions in the 80s, plus its dismissal of tradition throughout Pompey's entire career had provided several destabilising precedents for Roman politics.
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 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
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)

Discuss the reasons for the creation of the First Triumvirate and assess the short- and long-term impacts the First Triumvirate had on Roman politics and government.

Background
The actions and ambitions of the members of the First Triumvirate, the pressures or incentives that pushed them together, what they had to gain, are important in the formation of this partnership, but the short-term nature of these goals was also influential on the decay of their affiliation over time.

Pompey: returned to Rome early in 61, celebrated a triumph later in the year and was prepared to wait until 60 before dealing with two significant things - ratification of the Eastern Settlement and providing land for his veterans.
- One of Pompey's commanders, Afranius, had become consul but was not able to introduce a land bill that would satisfy Pompey's needs for his veterans
- Pompey's problem was the ferocious opposition to him particularly from the Optimates, led by Lucullus. Pompey did not have enough power or influence to achieve his needs/demands.

Crassus: was extremely wealthy (particularly benefitting from the proscriptions of Sulla) and in 61 had given his support to a group of tax gatherers (*publicani*) who were demanding that the Senate approve a refund because they had failed to collect enough taxes in Asia and would not make a profit.
- Cato led the Senate's opposition to the tax collectors, causing frustration and embarrassment for Crassus whose proposal for the *publicani* was defeated in 60.

Caesar: Caesar had enjoyed a successful praetorship in Spain and expected a triumph on his return to Rome in preparation for renewing his political career by standing for the consulship of 59.
- His situation was complicated by the rule that he could not enter the city before celebrating the triumph and could not contest the consulship without entering the city.
- He had borrowed a considerable amount of money from Crassus before his trip to Spain and was severely in debt.
- Cato was the stumbling block. Caesar's request to be granted permission to enter Rome without giving up his triumph was not considered, so he decided to give up his triumph so that he could contest the consular election, a response that surprised the Optimates.

Pompey, Crassus and Caesar each faced the same hurdle - the Senate - and in order to achieve their separate ambitions it made sense to form an alliance.
- It was an *amicitia,* not a 'friendship' - an informal political alliance that was expedient and each agreed not to take political action against each other. They had a common enemy in the Optimates.
- There was a degree of friction between Pompey and Crassus, but it was in their interests to co-operate at this point and use Caesars' consulship to their advantage.
- Crassus had a massive network of clients and lots of political experience. Pompey was a national hero and as a result of his Eastern Campaigns was also immensely wealthy. Caesar was talented, ambitious, ruthless and had been a staunch opponent of the Optimates.

Short-term impact
- Caesar won the election to the consulship; he tried to show that he respected traditional political custom and procedure. His colleague was the Optimate Bibulus.
- He introduced a bill to provide land for Pompey's veterans. Except for the *ager Campania,* all state-owned land in Italy was to be made available for distribution to the veterans. The land had to be offered for sale at a set valuation. Pompey's veterans were strategically employed to ensure the desired outcome to the vote for the bill. This is reported to have embarrassed Pompey, and to have undermined his relationship with Caesar.
- The Senate took steps to thwart Caesar's plans by delaying the vote. Cato famously extended his speech until, out of frustration, Caesar ordered his imprisonment. The

Senate backed Cato by following him to prison, Caesar relented. When Caesar was offered the *Silvae Callesque*, 'woods and cattle tracks of Italy' for his proconsular appointment he and his colleagues in the First Triumvirate pushed through lucrative Proconsulships for each other after 58.

- Caesar's co-consul Bibulus continued to frustrate Caesar: by declaring public holidays; watching the heavens; attempting to interrupt Caesar's speeches. Eventually after being attacked by Caesar's supporters, Bibulus, Cato and their supporters were forced to flee. Many were beaten and battered.
- Caesar's bill was passed.
- Other measures were dealt with much more easily - Crassus' tax agent colleagues were granted a remission; Pompey's Eastern Settlement was passed by the people by by-passing the Senate.
- Some of Caesar's enactments were considered by many to be illegal because he had ignored omens - a desperate ploy used by Bibulus and others to block Caesar.
- However, many of the actions of the Triumvirs to achieve their political ends and the reaction of their enemies were of dubious legality – for example Bibulus' omens and the massive bribery by the Triumvirs and the Optimates in the elections.

Long-term impact
- In the decades that followed, the political culture of Rome changed (or perhaps showed itself for what it was).
- Manipulation of elections became common; manipulation of political procedure also became more common. A blatant example of this was the patrician Clodius' adoption by a 20-year-old plebeian so he could be elected to the tribunate. Plutarch says that he was elected to silence Cicero.
- Clodius' tribunate (and the years that followed it) was also volatile; violence in politics increased considerably in this period.
- Caesar took up his proconsular command.
- Pompey suffered much public hostility in dealing with the land commission. He also seems to have feared the possibility of assassination by Clodius who was rumoured to be working for Caesar.
- The political divide between the Triumvirs and their enemies deepened in the years following Caesar's consulship, which had exposed the blatant culture of manipulation, violence and bribery that had been developing for some time.
- The dominant theme in the remaining years of the 50s was the opposition of two factions - Caesar and his Optimate enemies. In 56 the Triumvirs met at Luca to reaffirm their alliance; it was an obvious expediency that benefitted each. Rome was firmly dividing into two factions.
- The significance of the meeting at Luca was that the Triumvirs put aside their differences and determined the path and agenda of Roman politics over the next years. Caesar's Gallic command would be extended, Pompey and Crassus would be consuls in 55 with suitable important commands after that, Clodius would be restrained and Cicero controlled. Pompey was given dispensation to stay in Rome even though his proconsular appointment should have taken him to Spain. He also raised an army, some of which he kept close by. The Triumvirs' manipulation of the political system to further their own careers set precedents that left a mark on the rest of the century.
- By looking after their own interests, the Triumvirs were usurping the powers and functions of the Senate.
- In the longer term the Triumvirate established a mechanism that could and would be used to manipulate, control and eventually destroy the republican political power in Rome, since it led to the creation of the Second Triumvirate in 43.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 41   **(25 marks)**

Identify and evaluate the reasons for the failure of republican government in Rome during the period from 63 BC to AD 14.

Simple answers will likely attempt to provide a narrative of cause and effect, which may be challenging given the complicated nature of events, and the complex input and impact of various individuals at this time. Answers might evaluate key points of change using carefully chosen evidence to support a thesis that explores the major causes of the decay of the Republican system. Candidates may identify the features that failed, were flawed or inadequate and were under direct attack by various individuals or groups in the period studied. Despite being a government of the *res publicae*, the system was geared to favour the small and powerful elite that dominated Roman society, the *patricii* (the aristocrats)*,* the *nobiles*, the senatorial class made up of several hundred families, the *equites* or 'knights' who were the rich land holders, merchants and bankers. The important political offices of state were dominated by those Romans who belonged to these higher classes. Roman society was structured to benefit those of rank, and this created the conditions for competition and conflict between them.

Reasons for the failure of the Republic
Initially 300 men from the most noble families were able to become senators and power was shared between them through a system of offices (*cursus honorum*) which limited the period of office a man could hold. A political career was therefore restricted to a relatively small group of men.
- Rivalries among this group were increasingly widespread.
- Political violence and the rise of the client armies destabilised traditional political functions.
- In the period 133 to 63 BC Rome experienced much violent social and political turmoil - there was an almost continuous struggle between individuals from these classes, which increased in the period 63 BC–AD 14.
- The Senate became increasingly fractured: the Optimates and Populares were often bitterly opposed to each other, putting aside good governance in favour of (often) petty rivalries.
- The Senate failed to recognise the importance of developing a military that was loyal to the state rather than to individual/s. While strategically building the Principate, Augustus did not make the same mistake.
- A century after the death of Tiberius Gracchus (133 BC), Augustus' First Settlement (27 BC) codified the end of the struggle between various factions/individuals and culminated in the final redefinition - the Principate.

Individuals
- During this period several significant individuals contributed to the failure of republican government - Catiline, Cicero, Pompey, Crassus, Caesar, Clodius, Cato, Cassius, Brutus, Mark Antony, Octavian. Candidates may focus discussion on a few from this list or provide broader consideration of them all.
- Over the 60 years following the death of the Gracchi, violence characterised the political landscape of Rome - it was a struggle between factions and, increasingly, between individuals seeking political power - Marius, Saturninus, Sulla, Catiline, Cicero and Pompey.
- Catiline's conspiracy (63) developed because of his failure to win the consulship amid claims by Cicero and others that he was plotting to murder consular candidates. What this episode illustrates is that Roman politics was inherently vulnerable, seriously weakened and potentially unstable by 63 BC.
- In less than two decades after the failure of Catiline, traditional republican government had collapsed. There were several key factors which led to this - the emergence of ruthless individuals such as Pompey, Caesar and Crassus (the First Triumvirate) - disruptive individuals such as Clodius – ferociously intractable opponents such as Cato and Bibulus - massive bribery - the constant threat of civil war – the inability/unwillingness

of the senate to reassert the political processes that had controlled powerful individuals previously.
- The creation of the First Triumvirate marked the realisation that Roman politics could be totally manipulated. The Triumvirate dominated Rome but that was not destined to last. As the partnership fractured as a result of deaths and political realignment, great divisions developed between the surviving triumvirs (Pompey and Caesar) and opposition from the Optimates became more evident. Each side was intractable - neither would back away nor submit - civil war became difficult to avoid. A detailed discussion of the Civil War is not necessary.
- The rout of the Senate's army at Pharsalus and the ignominious death of Pompey in Egypt put an end to any serious threat to Caesar. One-man rule ensued and through the authority of a dictatorship which was supported by the Senate, Rome was governed by Caesar through a mix of official offices - proconsular imperium, the powers of the tribune, censor and consul.
- At this point republican Government ended. However, Caesar's assassination in March 44 began another phase of the civil war.

In the period from Caesar's assassination to the meeting at Bononia in November 43 a volatile situation existed in Rome between two dominant factions led by Antony and Octavian. These factions would decide the fate of the republic.
- Removing the Republicans allowed the establishment of the powers of the Triumvirs - Antony, Lepidus and Octavian. Violence was widespread, Italy was purged - bloody proscriptions saw the deaths of some 200 senators and 2000 equites and the confiscation of their estates. Eighteen Italian municipalities had land confiscated. The rout of the Republicans at Philippi in October 42 destroyed the last of the Republican cause.
- The next stage was the division of the Roman world into two. Antony controlled the Eastern half and Octavian the West – the dominance of two powerful individuals marked an important phase in the demise of the Republic.
- Octavian's defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at Actium left one individual with access to the core of all real power, the military. The introduction of the Principate was the ultimate manipulation of the failures of the republican system.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 42 **(25 marks)**

Identify and assess the reasons for Octavian's success and Antony's failure in the struggle between them that ended in Antony's and Cleopatra's deaths in August 30 BC.

Antony's relationship to Caesar had been at the core of his career success. Octavian was untried and unknown, arriving in Rome as the official heir to Ceasar's estate and political goodwill. The cool reception he received from the Senate and Antony put him at odds with all the political powerbrokers. His rivalry with key members of the senate and specifically with Antony never dissipated. After Caesar's assassination Antony became extremely manipulative, using Caesar's papers for his own benefit, recruiting armed followers and enacting a law which gave him command over Cisalpine Gaul and Gallia Comata for 5 years. In a reversal of fortune in 43 he found himself at odds with the Senate and faced an army led by Decimus Brutus, Hirtius, Pansa and Octavian (who was 20 years old and backed by the Senate).

The Second Triumvirate
- Things changed rapidly. Caesar's heirs realised that the Senate would not support them, thus that they had better opportunities if they worked together. Under the terms of the *Lex Titia* (Nov. 43) Antony, Lepidus and Octavian were appointed *tresviri publicae constituendae* for 5 years - the Second Triumvirate was formed.
- Widespread proscriptions were carried out and Brutus and Cassius were defeated in 42 at Philippi
- Antony took over the task of reorganising the eastern Roman Empire and at Tarsus he met Cleopatra in 41.
- Relations between Antony and Octavian had been strained from the beginning and quickly deteriorated. War broke out between Lucius Antonius (Fulvia) and Octavian (Perusine War). Lucius was forced to surrender (March 40) but the situation brought the triumvirs into conflict with one another.
- Relations between Antony and Octavian were unsettled throughout this period, but they came to terms in several agreements:
    - Treaty of Brundisium (September 40), Antony retained control over the East and Octavian took over Transalpine Gaul and Narbonese Gaul. Their relationship was strengthened with a new marriage alliance - Antony married Octavia, Octavian's sister.
    - In 37 Antony returned from the East and met Octavian at Tarentum where a treaty was signed. Antony backed Octavian against Sextus Pompeius giving Octavian 140 ships. Octavian promised Anthony 20 000 men and 1000 elite troops but did not deliver. The victory over Sextus belonged to Agrippa, but Octavian was able to claim he had defeated the pirates. Most importantly, the Triumvirate was renewed to the end of 33.

Lepidus
- Played a secondary role throughout much of this, he also lacked the inclination and character to deal with Antony and Octavian and the power struggle that inevitably developed between them.
- Lepidus' withdrawal benefitted Octavian whose position in Rome was strengthened.

Octavian's success
- Peace between Antony and Octavian occurred largely because neither was confidant of a decisive victory.
- In the years 35 to 33 Octavian's focus was not on Antony but on securing the north-eastern frontier and dealing with pirates on the Adriatic.
- On his return to Rome, he focused on building programs, improving the water and food supply, expelling astrologers and Eastern religious rites and strengthening traditional Roman culture and institutions.
- Octavian had re-invented himself as the defender of Rome.

- Antony was transforming himself - he married Cleopatra, had three children with her and declared her son, Caesarion as the son of Julius Caesar. This directly challenged Octavian's claim to be the legitimate heir of Julius Caesar, his absence also allowed Octavian to build propaganda against Antony whose involvement with a powerful foreign queen was represented as a threat to Rome by Octavian.
- Octavian obtained a copy of Antony's will which he made public in the Senate - Antony's Donations of Alexandria effectively gave much of Rome's eastern empire to Cleopatra's children. The Senate and people were outraged. Antony appeared to be setting up an eastern empire to rival Rome (or so Octavian's propaganda stated).
- Octavian, on the other hand, redefined himself - successfully transforming himself from being one-third of a brutal dictatorship (the Triumvirate) which had abused the traditional power and authority of the Roman state, to being a champion protecting Rome and its interests against a foreign enemy.
- He made himself consul for 31 and all the inhabitants of the Western Empire were obliged to swear an oath of loyalty to him. Note, this was to him personally. The traditional system of electing magistrates in Rome had been replaced.
- He initially defined his own power and authority in the context of the traditional system of power in Rome.
- It was later that he redefined his role and powers which transformed Rome from a republican culture into an imperial culture.
- War was declared on Cleopatra, not Antony. It was not to be another civil war. Octavian was protecting Rome against a 'foreign power'. A *maius imperium* gave him 'world-wide' and unrestricted power to fight this war.
- The showdown between Antony and Octavian occurred at Actium on 2 September 31 with Agrippa's humiliating defeat of Antony's fleet - he and Cleopatra's escaped to Egypt.
- Their deaths left Octavian in complete command of a massive army and navy and in sole control of the Roman world - the Republic was dead. With the defeat of Antony only one commander survived - the army swore an oath of allegiance to Octavian, soon to become Augustus.

Antony's failures
- Several factors contributed to Antony's failure. He became alienated from Rome and was portrayed as a weak, drunken slave to Cleopatra who would betray Rome; the enemy was Cleopatra not Antony.
- Naval and military tactics aside, perhaps the most compelling reason for Antony's fate was that he challenged the power of Rome, not just the power of Octavian. His alliance with a foreign queen and power, taking territory Rome saw as its own, made him the enemy of Rome, not just Octavian.

Accept other relevant answers.

Question 40   Information from: Scullard, H.H. (1991). *From the Gracchi to Nero*. Routledge, pp. 112–118.

Information from: Swain, H., & Davies, M. E. (2010). *Aspects of Roman History 82 BC–AD 14*. Routledge, pp. 119–120.

Question 42   Information from: Swain, H., & Davies, M. E. (2010). Aspects of Roman History 82 BC–AD 14. Routledge, pp. 11–12.