

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

☐

+

OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Scholarship 2025 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 (///). 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.

Section A

Context A: Alexander the Great

Question Two:

To what extent did Alexander's lack of concern for the future of his empire reflect his reign?

Plan:

TS: Alexander's lack of concern for the future reflected the ephemeral nature of his reign heavily.

- Alexander did not leave any plans for a successor
 - His marriages were purely diplomatic and he died too young
 - "formed a liaison with Barsine" — Bosworth
 - "to the strongest" — Diodorus
 - Was unable to use Greek democracy — as Macedonia was a monarchy (Demosthenes in his Olynthiaes in 349 BCE stated this through the line "scarcely considered Greeks")
- Alexander was constantly moving and his vision was constantly changing
 - Panhellenic revenge becomes a fusion policy
 - "Alexander inherited his father's panhellenic project" — Heckel
 - "concord and community in empire" — Arrian
 - Despite the "last plans" (which were likely invented by sources after his death)
 - It is very easy to project the sheer magnitude of Alexander's achievements and forget that his entire life was over in the span of thirty-two years: he simply did not have time to stop and plan things out
- Alexander did not set into stone any imperial systems
 - Whilst he did have good administration much of this was repurposing the Persians' systems
 - "we know of fifty-two satraps... only five Greeks held satraps"
 - "ephemeral conqueror" — Bosworth
 - "mutually suspicious" — Bosworth
 - "Alexander made the Persians sit at the table with him"

Essay:

Alexander the Great was in a constant battle against time during his conquests. It is very easy to project the sheer magnitude of Alexander's achievements and perceive his life as being incredibly long, however we often forget that the vast territory he conquered and most of the events we know from his life occurred in just twelve years. As such, during his reign over not only Macedonia but Persia, Alexander simply lacked the time to set into stone a system for what would happen to his "kingdom" following his death. As such Alexander's lack of concern for the future reflected the ephemeral nature of his reign heavily.

Crucial to the termination of his empire following his death was his lack of a suitable successor. His reign revolved around an unending push towards going further to such an extent that he did not have the time to foster a son in the same way that his father Philip had. Despite the pretense that his marriage to Roxana was out of love, we see that he had "formed a liaison with Barsine" as Bosworth states, who was a notable Persian princess to whom Alexander also left a son. This suggests that love did not entail marriage to Alexander and thus that Roxana's marriage was purely diplomatic. Alexander's son with Roxana thus had little significance to the peers of Alexander,

and as such did not hold a definitive position as a legitimate heir to the empire. As Diodorus stated in the header quote, his attitude towards the future of his empire had not been thought out, as he left the decision-making to the Diadochi to decide who was "*the strongest*". Regardless of whether the Diadochi had found a suitable heir or not, Macedonia was a monarchy, and many of his countrymen were used to filial inheritance. This created tension between the Macedonians and the Greeks, who by this point had been proud democracies for over a century. Demosthenes preyed upon this point in his 349 BCE Olynthiacs to Philip, when he considered the Macedonians "*scarcely Greeks*". As such, the Greeks would be unlikely to support a filial Macedonian heir following Alexander's death. Regardless, Alexander having only an infant son would have needed a close Macedonian to take the role of heir, a role which came with the charismatic shoes of Alexander to fill, as well as to emulate Alexander as the unifying figure between Greeks, Macedonians and Persians. Alexander had unfortunately kept the Greco-Macedonians and Persians "*mutually suspicious*" of each other (according to Bosworth) to minimize the chance of unified uprising against him, which placed him as a central figure gluing his empire together. Any heir would need to be able to fill this role. These factors all point towards the improbability that an heir would have been suitable without the endorsement of Alexander prior to his death. This lack of foresight for the future of his empire clearly reflected the nature of his reign.

A key aspect of the nature of Alexander's reign is the constant motion he induced. Alexander was not only constantly moving, but the vision he had for the future of his empire was constantly shifting. He began by "*inheriting his father's Panhellenic project*" as Heckel states, opting to phrase his conquest as a war to get revenge against the Persians for the Graeco-Persian wars of 150 years prior. His perceived priorities were ensuring that Graeco-Macedonians were compensated for the Persian invasion of Greece. Whether or not he truly believed in this vision or whether it was simply utilizing the mechanisms his father had put into place to keep support and unity within the Greek military forces he relied on is unimportant. What is important is that, especially following his encounter at Gordium in 333 BCE, where he "*cut right through the knot*" according to Plutarch, and with that was prophesized to become the King of Asia, and especially after his victory at the Battle of Gaugamela in 331 BCE and taking on a vision of himself as the rightful King of Asia, Alexander began to view himself as a unifier. He proclaimed that the work his father had done to set up his conquest as a crusade was simply a platform from which Alexander could make real change in the world, putting the differences of Europe and Asia aside to bring about greater, lasting peace. In a speech following the sacrificial rites after the Mutiny at Hyphasis in 326 BCE, Alexander prayed for "*concord and community in empire*" between Greco-Macedonians and Persians, according to Arrian. However, he simply did not have time to realize these prayers. The fact that Alexander's vision shifted so starkly during what was just a couple of years that it would have been immensely difficult for him to plan ahead more than a couple years, as his vision may have shifted further. Despite the "*last plans*" which were clearly exaggerated and elaborated on by Diodorus Siculus, Alexander had put minimal thought into what his goals were beyond a potential Arabian campaign. This momentum and the dynamic nature of his reign goes to emphasize that the nature of Alexander's time in power was reflected in his lack of thinking ahead.

Despite his lack of thinking ahead in military terms, Alexander did give the impression that, as an administrator, he was consolidating structure. Within the Persian empire, he famously maintained many of the existing systems, such as the Satrap system, and allowed many former nobles to retain their titles. He took the "*utmost care*" of Darius' family, according to Curtius, and Darius' brother Oxyathres was a close friend of and openly endorsed Alexander. Many Satraps prior to Alexander's conquest retained their power, a move by Alexander which clearly indicated to those under him that he was a righteous leader, here to respect what was working. Borza states that, of 52 known satraps in Alexander's empire, "*only five Greeks held satraps*", indicating that Alexander allowed the majority of

former Persian Satraps to hold onto their pre-existing power. However, Alexander was ruthless with any Satraps that dared disobey him, stripping many of their roles and replacing them with Macedonians. By the end of his reign, only 3 Persian Satraps remained. Alexander had taken the working Persian system and used it to serve his interests, whilst giving his subjects the sense that he was maintaining structure in the empire for a long time to come. Furthermore, Alexander gave the Persians many ceremonial roles within his court and gave them the sense that he was embracing their culture through his changing court dress to traditional Persian clothing and through his infamous adoption of Proskynesis. Despite this façade of acceptance, Alexander took the time to replace the Zoroastrian religion with the Greek Pantheon of Gods. The destruction of Zoroastrian temples was "*nothing short of a calamity*" to the Magi (Zoroastrian Priests), according to Ali Ansari. Alexander did this to ensure that Greek culture would prevail, contrary to what he tried to make his immediate Persian subjects believe. This allowed Alexander to give the sense that he was bringing about stability whilst still serving his own interests. These examples further demonstrate that whilst Alexander worked to give the impression that he was not simply an ephemeral conqueror, the outcomes of his actions told a different story. As such Alexander's administrative behaviors during his time as the Great King of Persia are reflected in his lack of concern for the future.

Alexander's lack of concern for the future drew clear parallels to the ephemeral nature of the way he ruled. The ways in which he did not set aside time to plan ahead for an heir, or account for the eventual changes in his vision or administration all point towards the idea that he was not concerned about whom to "*leave the kingdom*". In his defense, he was incredibly young and naïve and likely did not think of death so soon. The way he ruled his empire throughout his reign demonstrated clear lack of concern for the future and as such he should not be portrayed as a ruler but as a conqueror. Alexander's reign is a clear example of the consequences of pursuing greatness for the sake of greatness, without considering who will pick up the pieces.

4/10/10

Section A

Context D: Homer's Iliad

Question Seven:

How does the *Iliad* balance the reality of death in battle with the heroic ideal of the noble death?

Plan:

TS: The *Iliad* uses different characters to balance different perspectives of death.

- Heroes are convinced that their ideals are worth it
 - Homer shows shifting perceptions throughout the poem
 - Driven by a need for "social validation" Clarke
 - Hector is defending Troy—believes that his patriotism justifies his reward with a glorious death
 - "a grave mound over him by the broad Hellespont"
 - "Hector is defending a cause which he knows is doomed" Farron
- Homer uses certain characters to balance the brutality with logic
 - Andromache sees clearly—"Have you no pity on your son or luckless wife?"
 - Achilles sees that life is worth more than glory—"cattle and fat sheep can be lifted"
 - "Achilles is not simply an unfeeling thing" Higgins
- Homer portrays the loss of men and the effects it has on others
 - Young beautiful men are taken
 - Iphidamas of Thrace—"young bride"
 - Theon's father—"possessions shared among remoter kinsmen"
 - Cullhed—"marching towards extinction"

Essay:

It is difficult to picture the *Iliad* as a poem of anything other than death. Sparse moments of glory and *aristeia* are surrounded by a sea of death. Homer uses death as a twofold mechanism in the epic, both as a reason to and not to fight. Heroes are driven on by a lust for *kleos* via a glorious, visible death, whilst mothers, fathers and wives pray that their sons and husbands do not meet it. As such Homer uses different characters to balance different perspectives of death.

Homeric Heroes within the epic are convinced that death is worth it for their ideals. The Trojans in particular, see their role within the war as defenders of Troy to be a worthy reason to risk their lives. Their wives and children are on the sidelines, and their lives and futures are riding on the line. In Book VI, Hector's encounters with Andromache and other Trojan woman fulfils the opposite purpose to what the women hope: it reminds him of his duty as defender of Troy, instead of convincing him to stop fighting for the sake of his son Astyanax to grow up with a father. "Hector is defending a cause which he knows is doomed", according to Farron. He knows that Troy will fall. Despite this impending knowledge, Hector continues to fight for his shot at glory, as he shares the heroic mindset of *kleos* as the ultimate purpose in life. The other Trojans similarly see attaining *kleos* through a glorious death the ultimate reward for their patriotism and courage. For Hector and the other Trojans, death is viewed as both noble, in the defense of their country and towards their goal of everlasting fame, and something to be fearful

5/10

of, for the sake of their wives and children. They do not think of "*death in battle*" for its suffering or brutality. Prior to his duel with Ajax, Hector announces that the loser shall have "*a grave-mound built over him by the broad Hellespont*" for all to see for all time. This eternal fame is reason enough for many heroes to dare fight such a talented warrior as Hector, and the resulting lottery demonstrates the shared pursuit of *kleos*. Clarke states that Homeric Heroes are driven by a need for "*social validation*". The Greek's only motivation for sailing to Troy for this battle is to have their shot at *kleos*. As such they will take any chance they can get to attain it. Homer uses the heroes on the Greek side to portray the perspective of those who view death as noble and something to strive for. The Trojans by contrast are aware of the pain of death and the effects it will have but fight anyway as they believe they can both die gloriously and fulfil their purpose of defending Troy. In this way Homer uses the Greeks and Trojans to portray different perspectives of death.

Whilst the Heroes share the belief that at least some aspect of death is glorious, certain characters see only the pain it will bring. Achilles' withdrawal from battle following Agamemnon's public disgrace of him is a key example of an epiphany had by a hero which changes the clouded mindset of attaining *kleos*. Achilles realizes that death in war is not glorious, that "*cattle and fat sheep can be lifted*" but a man's life cannot be bought back. Unlike many of his peers, he forgoes seeing death as purely glorious and instead sees it for what it is – and ending to a "*pitiful mortal's*" glorious life. His time spent away from battle allows him to view the time he has alive as more glorious than any death. Higgins states that "*Achilles is not simply an unfeeling thing*". His time fighting was not to bring about suffering, but a product of a society which places all emphasis on self-worth through public deeds. His rage-induced withdrawal allows him to see his society from the outside, bringing him to this unclouded conclusion. His logic balances the brutality of his comrades, including Patroclus. Andromache similarly balances Hector's mindset with her logic. She questions him whether he has "*pity on [his] son or luckless wife?*". He registers her statements but still regards his duty to Troy as more pressing than his duty as a husband and father. Andromache believes that Hector's judgement is clouded too thick by his lust for *kleos* to convince him to withdraw. Achilles and herself see death in battle for not only the effects it will have on others, but for the brutality which "*comes painfully*" and causes suffering. These characters balance the portrayal of death as noble by helping us understand the reality of it through their eyes.

Homer as a lens also portrays the loss of men and the effects this has on others through his objective eyes. Many deaths in the Iliad are elaborated on clearly, with every detail pronounced and the families and stories of many characters brought forth. We hear of Meriones who "*struck [him] between the navel*" and the pain it caused a young man who had so much to live for. Homer starkly juxtaposes the beauty and youth of the boys who die with the pain and gore of how they die. This emphasizes the opportunities forsaken by their deaths. Iphidamas of Thrace set sail for Troy the day after his wedding day. He was killed there and left his poor wife "*a young bride*" in a far away land. She would never see her husband again. His case drives home the point that these mens' deaths had effects spanning far further and wider than themselves. Thoon's death left his father far away to have his "*possessions shared among remoter kinsmen*", as he had lost his sons at war. His bloodline died the moment Thoon did, and he would never get the chance to see his sons grow old. Thoon's case demonstrates that these mens' deaths had effects which would last far longer than their lifetimes. Cullhed uses this to back up the point that the Iliad is not a poem of glory or good triumphing over evil, but of the human race "*marching towards extinction*". There is little to suggest that the glorious deeds of the heroes compensates for the pain and suffering felt by those both within and far away from the war. As such Homer uses these pitiful distant characters to portray the reality of death as something which affects those far from it.

Homer has used a variety of characters to balance death in the *Iliad* as noble and brutal. It is shown to affect those not only at Troy, but many far away from it. It forsakes opportunities that many never had the chance to realize, whilst relinquishing the beauty of life from man. Despite these negatives, Homeric society placed such an emphasis on the pursuit of the "*mist of darkness*" of death as the ultimate goal in order to reach glory. The Heroes who are portrayed as the epitome of physical, mental and military strength have their minds utterly clouded by this delusion. Those living in Homer's time would thus have seen attaining glory through death as something egotistic and absurd, reminding them the true beauty of their lives.

Section B**Resources A to D: Ancient Greece****Question Thirteen:**

Discuss at least THREE of the resources and the insight they give into how the Greeks or Romans made use of the gods for political purposes.

Plan:

TS: ~~Mortals were able to wield the power of the gods to influence their contemporaries.~~

- ~~Gods decide the rules~~
 - ~~Gods make the kings~~
 - ~~Gods influence mortal decisions~~
 - ~~Gods pick favourite mortals → Diomedes and Athene~~
 - ~~As such the mortals who interpret the gods make the rules~~
- ~~Gods are always watching/keeping count~~
 - ~~Do not vote against the gods or the person they back~~
 - ~~Therefore the person who has the gods backing them is guaranteed votes~~
 - ~~Do not lie in the presence of the gods~~
- ~~Shared belief in the gods~~
 - ~~Everyone believes in the gods~~
 - ~~Loyalty to the gods~~
 - ~~Do as they say and vote as they vote~~

Essay:

In mythology the gods were portrayed as above mortals. They decided the rules and were always watching to make sure mortals followed them anytime or anywhere. The ancient Greeks had a common belief in the gods, allowing for consistent portrayals of the gods and thus shared loyalty to the gods from all the Greeks. Sources A, B and C demonstrate that aspects of the gods allowed certain mortals to wield the power of the gods to influence their contemporaries for political purposes.

The most pressing aspect of the gods' power was that they decided all the rules and determined what was right or wrong. Source A depicts the Athenians trusting in Athene's judgement that they should not "*make pacts with the perpetrator*", which they use not only to justify their stance regarding Xerxes' surrender requests, but to convince Sparta to join them. This demonstrates the political sway that the gods had over the Greeks. The god-fearing citizens of ancient Greece would submit to any case if it was the will of the gods. As Lanzilotta states, it "*endowed them with greater dignity*" and as such would increase the credibility of their political argument, regardless of the military consequences. Source B builds on this, using the Greeks' fear of the god's will against them for Pisistratus' political gain. By using the idea of Athene as wiser than any mortal, Pisistratus was able to use her endorsement as "*above all men*" to convince his contemporaries that he had been decided by the god to be the best candidate. The Greeks would unequivocally agree, as the gods knew far more than any mortal did. This is a motif seen in Homer's *Iliad*, where Athene picks Diomedes as a favorite mortal and possesses him with the power to do superhuman

deeds. Pisistratus' contemporaries may have believed his rule would yield similar results. Building from this, in Source C, the gods are depicted at the entrance to the temple, adjacent to many battles. This positioning allowed the gods to be portrayed as the deciders of each battle, willing the outcome into existence. This would allow any priests or oracles who interpreted the gods' messages to be taken for truth, granting them great political power. These sources demonstrate that the gods' perceived omnipotence allowed certain ancient Greeks to have political sway over their contemporaries.

Furthermore, the gods' omnipotence allowed the Greeks to portray them as always watching and always keeping count. Source B uses this to guilt Athenians into voting for Pisistratus. By creating an "*impressive spectacle*", Pisistratus was able to convince the Athenians that Athene herself was in their presence. A god in their presence watching over them would have kept the Athenians acting in accordance with Athene's message to vote for Pisistratus. The message would have been clear: vote for the candidate she endorsed or face her wrath, guaranteeing Pisistratus political power. Source C uses the presence of the gods in a similar way. At the entrance of the temple, upon seeing the gods, worshippers would have been put under their watchful gaze. This would invoke honesty and sanctity in the temple, so as not to disrespect the gods. Lying in the presence of the gods would be futile, as the gods are all knowing. This would have allowed the priests of the temple significant power over those who came to worship at the temple. Any betrayal to the gods would be known and would be remembered. In Source A, the Athenians use this fear of betraying the gods' will to provide them the political impetus to justify their manoeuvre. The Athenians are "*constrained to avenge*" their gods for the Persians' desecration of their temples and religious artefacts. They are forbidden by their gods from joining the Persian side as the gods will not forget if they Athenians betray them. By keeping count here, the Athenians were able to use the gods as political leverage over the Spartans.

The Spartans and Athenians would have also had a shared belief in the gods. This shared belief in the gods would have allowed Athens to take political advantage of not only Sparta, but all the Greek poleis which believed in the shared Pantheon. The Athenians justify their decision by quoting the "*kinship of all Greeks ... and the shrines of gods.. that we have in common*". The gods provided a sense of unity amongst the Greek peoples and as such would have been an extremely effective political tool in uniting the Greeks against the oncoming Persians. This would have supremely benefited the Athenians as it would have enabled them to form a much stronger alliance against the Persians (as they did with the Delian League), politically benefiting not only the Athenians but all of Greece and Greek culture. Source B analogously takes advantage of the Athenian's shared respect for Athene. All the people of Athens (or, at least, the vast majority) shared a belief in Athene as their patron god. As such, they shared a respect in her word. When Pisistratus was believed to be honored by "*Athene herself*", the Athenians' shared belief in Athene allowed his message to be taken by the majority of Athenians. This would have left little if any dissenting voices in Athens. In Source C, the shared belief in the gods by effectively all Greeks would have given the priests or oracles of the temple great power over all that came to worship. The frieze of the gods at the entrance would have reminded worshippers of their belief. This would have enabled the priests to take advantage of the worshippers' belief for their own benefit. These cases further demonstrate that the shared belief in a pantheon of gods by effectively all Greeks enabled those who could interpret or wield their influence great political power.

This political power which was able to be wielded using the gods' influence both benefited and harmed the Greek people. Athens in the Graeco-Persian wars was able to use this power to unify Greece and defend their home, allowing the Greeks to secure victory against Persia. However, it also enabled characters such as Pisistratus into

positions of power. These characters were not necessarily acting in the best interests of the people they tricked into believing in them. Similarly, it enabled oracles and priests to take advantage of worshippers and incentivize them to do things against their own interests, under the pretense that a god "*willed it*". Because of the nature of the gods as omnipotent and superior to all mortals, crafty ancient Greeks were able to take advantage for political purposes, going to show that some things never change.

Outstanding Scholarship

Subject: Classical Studies

Standard: 93404

Total score: 21

Q	Score	Marker commentary
1	07	The candidate produced a clear, convincing argument. They utilised a fluent and engaging writing style. The approach to the question favoured Alexander's concerns for the future of his empire but acknowledged arguments against any plans for the future. A wide range of knowledge, supported by primary sources, was clearly demonstrated. Appropriate reference was also made to relevant secondary sources. Overall, this was an analytical and sustained argument.
2	07	This response argued in a convincing and articulate fashion. The argument balanced the reality of death and the heroic ideal in a well-structured way. There is not only very good textual knowledge through the employment of a range of quotes but also integrated lesser-known figures into their argument to show wide-ranging knowledge. The argument was sophisticated.
3	07	The structure in this response was considered and hinged on identifying three concepts then synthesising evidence from the sources provided to develop a coherent argument. The integration of the sources allowed for useful and apt comparisons. The response also showed a broad awareness of the context from which the sources were drawn. A good, balanced conclusion was also included.