

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

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

S

93404A



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

☐

+

TOP SCHOLAR



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Scholarship 2024 Classical Studies

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

ANSWER BOOKLET

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

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

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

Do not write in the margins (XXXX). This area will be cut off when the booklet is marked.

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

Planning

Piecemeal Union

- 3 Context e.g. reactive planning necessary, dressing, proskynesis - but hints at long term planning. ^{no centre.} ^{link to Term} Practical
 - 2 Alexander more focused on his image. Where that suited, Union helped e.g. deification, proskynesis,
 - 1 Alexander acted in ways that suited e.g. not risking an uprising after Darius died e.g. satrap of Babylon, had not outright won Persia. But also burnt Persepolis and sold war of revenge ideas
- Alexander was a conqueror, not a governor

Context A, Question 1: To ~~what~~ assess the validity of Bosworth's claim that there was no systematic policy of Union

Alexander the Great is ~~referred~~ as a acted primarily as a conqueror not a governor. ~~While Bosworth~~ While he famously implemented a policy of Union ~~with~~ between the Macedonians and the Persians, this seems to ~~be~~ not have been carefully and meticulously planned, but rather a connected series of actions that helped Alexander conquer, benefited his image and were ultimately reactionary

measures rather than a carefully planned policy.

Alexander's "policy of fusion" was first and foremost practical rather than ideological. The ^{"fusion policy"} term was coined by the historian, Tarn, who suggested Alexander was trying to form a "brotherhood of man" but this view seems restricted and contradictory to Alexander's more significant ~~driving~~ motive which seemed to be conquest. Indeed, when analysing fusion through the lens of conquest, ~~this~~ a more plausible narrative emerges. When Alexander declared himself King of Persia, he hadn't defeated the empire per se. He had won a decisive victory at Gaugamela ~~but~~ and defeated Darius twice in battle but he hadn't brought the empire to its knees. Instead, through his military prowess and destruction of Gaza and Tyre, he'd shown he could. With Darius still alive (at the time) and ~~divided~~ satrapes dispersed through the empire, Alexander ^{different} needed to prove himself as a Persian King of Kings and that he had the right to rule. This ~~seemed~~ idea can be connected to many ~~idea~~ actions from Persian such as dressing in the robe, sack and diadem and ~~the~~ letting the Persians maintain much of their prior status, including Megasthenes as satrap of Babylon. While ~~Plutarch~~ suggested this was because, "Alexander knew the sharing of race and custom was a way to softening men's hearts." this creates the sense of a benevolent King

which was in stark opposition to the figure who, just before dressing as a Persian King, burnt the Palace of Xerxes in Eretria to the ground, an action Arrian described as intended as revenge for the burning of the Acropolis. Therefore, this alternate view that the actions classed as *homon* served to ensure Alexander held on to what he conquered more than anything else. That being said, Alexander did show a genuine interest in other peoples and cultures such as when he sacrificed to the Egyptian gods in Memphis and in respecting Persian customs around the burial of Darius and the Lysa Weddings, however this can be explained again as part of Alexander's appeals to conquered people so it is therefore more likely that *homon* suited Alexander's aim to conquer rather than as a piece of ideology.

Another way *homon* suited Alexander was in the benefit it gave his image. Alexander was famously competitive and glory-driven, believing that his father ~~the~~ "the more he received from his father, the less he would ^{win} receive himself." (Plutarch), emphasising such an attitude from a young age. Throughout his campaign Alexander bettered former Persian leaders by going further into India and "showing a route through Gedrosia because he heard 'no one had successfully marched an army through it besides Semiramis' (Arrian). This attitude is significant in understanding Alexander's motives because it highlights his conquests.

as a way to be "better than the rest" and differentiate himself from Philip who had used social policy to make Macedonia powerful. ~~It was~~ This idea also fed directly into some of Alexander's actions under hision which he used to sell his own image. ~~One way this was done was through him using propaganda to sell himself as a son of Ammon (a title the Egyptians happily bestowed on him). Associating himself more with the mystique and power of Persian and Egyptian Kings. He did this by regaining a more autocratic leader than the Ma. An example of this is again, Alexander's uptake of the luxury and opulence of eastern Kings to sell his own image. In addition to this, actions such as introducing proskynesis, clearly appealed to this image of a great King. While this had practical reasons for aligning the Persian and Macedonian courts over a shared practice (Alexander may have not been widely accepted as King of Persia without the practice), to the Greeks the action implied worship which was blasphemous for any mortal who is still alive. This is shown in how Plutarch described Callisthenes' Motu to protest this as "saving" the Greeks from great disgrace and Alexander from greater.~~ While Alexander never is recorded as directly asking for worship, the Macedonians seemed concerned about Alexander's status as "son of Ammon" after being made Egyptian pharaoh, so ~~it~~ Alexander did

indeed want harmony, he should have avoided this to not risk disenfranchising the Macedonians. While this points to a wider image that the works of Alexander's contemporaries have been lost and we can't be certain of his intentions with any of his actions, given the fact that, like in proskynesis, the act of latria did not seem to be a systematic process of harmonising the races. This is where more knowledge of the Persian perspective would be helpful but evidence of this is scant. However, they did describe Alexander as "the destroyer", suggesting making the idea of harmony seem a less likely motive if he did not succeed at pleasing any party, especially when evidence better aligns with other motives.

Ultimately, the latria seemed to be a reactive series of actions to the problems against these two motives of Alexander's rather than a systematic social policy. This can be seen in contrasting Alexander's work with that of his father. Philip created a clearly centralised and mostly united empire by introducing the League of Corinth to align Macedonian Greek interests to a common purpose. As Alexander, on the other hand, created a much less stable empire, shown in the conflicts and breakup of the empire after his death. While Alexander did have more land and a larger empire, it seemed largely decentralised (especially given his ignorance of Greece), especially given he never returned to Macedonia. Moreover, because of the

two motives discussed, it seemed Alexander only implemented social policy to the benefit of those two points motives. This makes the overall policy seem disorganised and reactionary. An example of this is the successors which were 30,000 Persian boys trained in the Macedonian fashion in 324 BCE, with Alexander believing, "your obedience and willingness to follow orders far surpasses everyone else." (Curtius). ~~It seems rather~~ If Alexander had a clear and systematic plan, this would be a logical early step and something that would help build ties between Macedonians and Persians quickly (much like the League of Corinth). Instead, Alexander waited 7 years after the death of Darius and until after his exhausted army demanded to turn back at Hypharion. This therefore seems much more likely to be a reactionary measure to aid Alexander's conquest (by bolstering the army) than a measure to systematically implement fusion. Again, it is hard to know what Alexander intended because of the records available and his death so shortly after this - maybe if he'd lived longer, a more systematic approach would have been seen, but the evidence available points more against a systematic policy of fusion.

As more of a conqueror than a statesman, Alexander's policy of fusion therefore seems less of a systematic policy to create harmony, but rather a series of

measures to unsystematically support conquest and his own image.

Channing

Myths

Kleophrades - link to Persian wars of political peace?
BUT link to war

Euphronios - idea of Arete - what it means to be Greek

MaKron - Greek values,

Context B, Question 3: Discuss the ways in which vases depicting myths or vases reflected aspects of the Athenian life.

Athenian vase paintings had three key purposes, being their function, decoration and messaging. ~~Religious~~ Scenes depicting myths were crucial to the purpose of the third because they could be used to teach lessons relevant to the Athenian life, emphasise key values and show the idea of what it means to be Greek.

One way vase paintings of myths could reflect aspects of Athenian life is through connection to myths. A clear example of this was the Kleophrades Painter's Hydria which connected the sacking of Troy to events at the time in Athens. The vase is emotional and designed to trigger a response from the viewer. With

the breeze crowded onto the shoulder of the vase and with a full composition, the scene exuberates chaos. The emotion is then enhanced with the posing. Cassandra is seen clinging onto a statue of Athena and holding her hand out in a sign of mercy while Ajax tugs at her hair and Lian sits atop the altar of Zeus, dead grandson on his thigh and head bowed as he waits for Neoptolemos to deliver the blow that will end his life. All this in another scene, women crouch down, tugging at their hair (a sign of grief) and ducking, covering their ears as though some divine wrath is about to befall them. The strong emotions conjured by this image, and the sacrilege committed show the Mycenaean Greek as barbaric rather than heroic. At the time of the Persian Wars, this could be a response to one or two events. One would be the burning of the Acropolis where similarly horrific religious crimes were committed by the Persians, but the other could be a reference to the Athenians' own victory and ~~whether~~^{how} they should treat any captured Persians or seek revenge, as in that way the painting is a warning of what they could do. This shows the power of religious scenes to this purpose because all educated Athenians would be familiar with the Trojan war, it is the presentation of events in a certain way, in this case to create emotions of horror and shame that allow the painting to connect to these events. As a democratic population this was a way

for the artist to send a message about what they thought the *ekklesia* should decide on. However, the reach of the art would be limited and we don't know the exact intentions of the artist so it seems any impact would be small at best so vase paintings of myth could connect, to a small extent, to the politics of the time.

Another way vase paintings of myth could reflect aspects of Athenians' lives was in connecting to core values that would be expected of Greeks. This is perhaps a more concrete connection to show as it is more likely the painter and artist would connect to values than messages, if only subconsciously. An example of this is the Niobid Painter *Kalyx Krater* which shows the consequences of hubris. This is especially evident in Side B which depicts the slaughter of the Niobids (children of Niobe) at the hands of Artemis and Apollo (children of Leto) after *Nest* Niobe boasted to Leto about having more children. The calm expressions and easy going of Artemis and Apollo, with Artemis relaxedly reaching for an arrow and Apollo, in an open stance, appearing to pull the bow with little effort, contrasts the destruction they are causing in killing the Niobids. The depth created by having a 3d ground, means the dead or dying bodies of the Niobids appear to surround the twins, showing the power imbalance and the fact they have left

a sea of destruction around them. This, and the use of line to create a rocky terrain, that partially obscures the bodies, emphasise the twins are in control. This is fitting as the vase is showing how Nike is being punished for showing hubris, or arrogance in front of the gods. The fact that Apollo and Artemis are in control highlights the fact that gods are much more powerful than humans. Unlike the first example, this idea doesn't necessarily connect to a specific event, rather it is a core Greek value. ~~By~~ ^{As} ~~keeping it alive~~ there are the values of the painter, one would expect it naturally reflects in their works, just as hubris ^{was} a central theme in many tragic plays. These repeated depictions of scenes that highlight these values to Athenians in keeping them alive. That way, mythological scenes could connect to and reinforce aspects of everyday life, such as making sure to follow correct religious protocol to not be guilty of hubris. While these themes may only show through in the subconscious interpretation of the reader, that should not be understood because the showing of values can reinforce ideas they already have, reflecting aspects of their lives in terms of values.

Religious scenes on vases could also reflect the ideas behind how Athenians wanted, or thought it best, to live their lives, a central idea of what it means to be Greek. This can be seen in the Euphronios Kalyx Krater which depicts the battle between the

Greek hero Heracles and the foreign giant, Antaios. While the striking W composition draws the viewer in and emphasises the intensity of the fight, it is in the details where the idea of what it means to be Greek shines through. The contrast between Heracles and Antaios is clear, with Heracles' hair neatly kept and curled while Antaios' hair and beard are comparatively dishevelled. These ideas are mirrored in the Herakle supporter of the lighter, while Heracles' driving pose compared to Antaios' writhing position, head contorted in a choke-hold show Heracles' dominance. On the surface, these features point towards a message that Greeks are superior to foreigners, in being both more civilised and better fighters, but the connection goes deeper than that. The choice of this scene, one of the deeds of Heracles in his labour, ~~it~~ connects the viewer to the idea of Greek heroism. It is the idea that Greeks aren't just better than other races, they must constantly push to uphold that, to do actions that show arete (excellence) or that contribute to their time (honour). For that reason, religious scenes can help inspire Athenians towards this ideal by reflecting what should be one of their key motivations. While these scenes will have as many interpretations as there are viewers, Greek mythology, and especially heroic myths, centre on this idea of what it means to be Greek, so the idea is hard to

avoid in vase paintings, hence in another way they reflect Athenians' lives.

Therefore, there are a wide manner of ways in which depictions of religious scenes ~~can~~ could reflect aspects of Athenians' lives. This could be from the politics of the time, to core Greek values to what it meant to be Greek. As the vase painters would choose a subject that was important or relevant to them, it would ultimately suggest the subject would also be relevant to its viewers.

Classroom.

Relationship is transactional but power towards the gods.

A) Transactional relationship, fear of the gods.

2

(B) Support in war - in case of Trojan war, gods on both sides benefitted no one.

3

(C) Transactional, show how relief dedicated as thanks to god for the child.

1

Section C, Question 13: Discuss the insights the resources give into the benefit the gods give to mortals and/or receive from them.

The relationship between gods and mortals was ~~principally~~ in essence, a transactional one. The mortals would honour and feed the gods who would then ensure good fortune for the mortals. There was however a power imbalance in the transfer of benefit and there were complications when conflicting interests were at play.

In Resource D, the overall transactional aspect of the relationship is highlighted as both parties require benefits that only the other could provide. For mortals, they need want a good and fortunate life, while the gods want the glory and recognition from the humans.

they believe they are entitled to. This is shown in the relief, an artwork in the sanctuary of Artemis in Samia, so the artwork is itself a way of honouring and glorifying the goddess, Artemis. This was common throughout Greece as it was believed that the building of impressive temples and statues in honour of the gods would be a way to win their favour or thank them for an act of benevolence (a similar example would be the temple of Athena Nike on the Athenian Acropolis as a thanksgiving for Athens' victory in the Persian War to Athena). Within the relief, we see more evidence of this transactional relationship as it shows the sacrifice of a cow to the goddess which she watches over on the other side of the altar. Animal sacrifices were a common benefit from the gods ~~for their~~ from this relationship as they were said to "feed the god". Therefore, this artwork which both honours the god and shows what the ceremony of the dedication ~~was~~ was expected to look like must have ~~been~~ ~~for~~ had a benefit for the human. Indeed, this was in the child of the woman who dedicated the relief, which is sitting as Artemis was the goddess of childbirth. Therefore, the resource shows the transactional aspects of the relationship in that the goddess Artemis gifted the woman a child, so she returned the favour by sacrificing to Artemis and dedicating the relief in her honour.

While the benefits both parties received were part of a transactional relationship, there was also a strong

power imbalance towards the gods and thus a greater incentive for the mortals to pay up their end of the deal. This can be seen in Resource A, an extract from the *Anabasis* ~~which details~~ of Xenophon which details how Xenophon's string of bad luck was down to not continuing to sacrifice to Zeus Merichios. "Xenophon replied that since he had left home he had not sacrificed to that god. Eukleides, accordingly, advised ~~that~~ him to sacrifice just as he used to do, and said that it would be to his advantage." This shows ~~how~~ how humans failing to provide continuous benefits ~~to~~ to the gods would be costly for what benefits they would receive as Eukleides attributes the bad luck of Xenophon to the fact he has not been keeping up with the practice appropriately. In particular, Xenophon "would not have enough money to pay his travelling expenses unless he should sell his horse and what he had about his person." The reason why there is a power imbalance ~~in the face of the~~ is that humans are powerless in the face of the gods and that bad fortune, such as this, ^{was} the result of divine intervention. Eukleides suspected that this bad fortune was linked directly to Xenophon not paying his end to the bargain with the gods. Hence, there is a large incentive for Xenophon to ensure he provides the correct benefits to the ^{and Greeks} ~~in general~~ gods because it is much worse for mortals, arguably, if they don't pay up their side of the bargain, as the gods have the power to smite them. Therefore, as

much as the benefits exchanged between mortals and gods were a transaction, they were also one sided, a payment made from the mortal to the god so as to not be smited and so as to have good fortunes. Resource A therefore shows the exchange of benefits to have a strong power imbalance.

From Resources D and A, it is clear humans provide benefits of recognition, food and honour to the gods so that fortune would fall in their favour. However, what would happen if the benefits the gods provided to mortals were conflicting? This is a key idea in the Trojan War where gods took sides based on how the humans on either side treated them and the consequences of this can be seen in Resource C, two Kalyx paintings which show the support the gods gave to the mortals. On side A, Athena supports the Greek Ajax while Apollo supports Hector. While the fight is between Ajax and Hector, ~~it~~ with the gods merely motioning towards their champions and the spears and stone of the warrior interacting, both ~~would not~~ are empowered, or fight better with the support of the gods. As Homer said, his words were really a transcription of the gods, so in a similar way the fight is between the gods with the humans as vessels. This is also seen in side B where Artemis and Athena have taken sides with Menelaos and Paris respectively. There are different reasons for why the gods have taken sides, for example, ~~Athena~~ ^{aphrodite} sided with Paris who honoured her as the "loved"

in a competition of 3 goddesses while Athens, because of that decision, sided against the Trojans. Because different sides have to do better jobs of ~~these~~ benefitting different gods, the gods benefit the human here by taking sides which seemed to cause something of a stalemate. This is alluded to in the symmetry of the two vase paintings and the long and protracted 10 year duration of the Trojan War, showing how the effect of the gods has essentially cancelled out as both sides have the same support. In some ways, the conflicting benefits the gods provide benefit no one as it made the war highly costly on both sides:

From the 3 resources, it is clear that the ~~side~~ benefits exchanged between gods and mortals are a transaction, ~~the~~ but one weighed heavily towards the gods whose influence can be destructive. This destructive influence was on show during the Trojan War where by different sides honouring different gods better, the benefits of the gods acted against each other to ~~be~~ ~~less~~ make a long and costly war. Therefore, who is benefitting and how depends on how these transactions of benefits were undertaken.