**ANCIENT HISTORY PAST QUESTIONS BY TOPIC**

|  |
| --- |
| **Greek period study – relations between greek states and between greek and non-greek states, 492-404 BC** |
| **Topic** | **Interpretation Questions - (20 Marks)** | **Essay Questions - (30 Marks)** |
| 1. **The Challenge of the Persian Empire, 492-479 BC**
 | In immediate military terms, the value of Salamis was unambiguous. Had Xerxes won, then the Persians would have had the Peloponnese at the mercy of a naval assault; and, if it is still not quite a forgone conclusion that they would have won overall, by land as well as sea, their task would have been eased immensely. Victory at Salamis did not, on the other hand, inevitably mean victory for the resistant coalition Greeks in the Graeco-Persian Wars overall. From that perspective, it was not Salamis but Plataea that was the decisive battle. ‘It was Plataea, not at Salamis, that the new Satrapy was lost’, as George Cawkwell has crisply put it. Xerxes may have retired to Asia after Salamis, but Great Kings did not necessarily lead all major campaigns in person, and he left behind, under the command of the more than competent Mardonius, sufficient forces to complete the job by land as well as by sea. But Mardonius was decisively defeated on land in the summer of 479 at Plataea in southern Boeotia in central Greece, by the largest land army ever mustered by Greeks to that date (some forty thousand in all). Herodotus – even Herodotus…was forced to concede that Plataea was essentially a Spartan Victory.’*Thermopylae: The Battle that Changed the World*, Paul Cartledge, p.166**How convincing do you find Cartledge’s view that the Spartans deserve at least as much credit as the Athenians for the Greek victory over the Persians in 480-479 BC?** |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| It is easy to persuade ourselves that it was little short of a miracle that the allied Greeks emerged victorious. But we know the story only from the Greek side. The familiar picture that we in Europe have inherited, that of the King with half the East at heel repelled by a handful of resolute Greek patriots whom he expected to trample underfoot, is a heartening one for lovers of freedom. It is not entirely realistic. As regards sheer numbers, the fact that the population of the Persian Empire was many times that of Greece is balanced by the fact that there were far more Greeks in the world than Persians. What is more to the point is that a campaign at so great a distance from home in an ill-explored and difficult terrain was a very audacious enterpise. It involved risks that Xerxes did his best to insure against by such preparations as could be made in advance; and to that extent he deserved a moment of triumph when he sacked the city of those Athenians whom his father had long been at pains to punish. The Delphic priests expected him to win. But on the allied side there were leaders who calculated that a Persian conquest of Greece might be averted if the Athenians and the Spartan alliance united in resistance. The event proved them correct. It was bound to be a struggle in which chance could make or mar and generalship prove decisive. On the second count, if not also on the first, the allies were fortunate.  |
| J.M. Cook *The Persian Empire*  |

**How convincing do you find J. M. Cook’s interpretation of Xerxes’ expedition against the Greeks in 480–79 BC?**  |
| 1. **Greece in Conflict, 479-446 BC**
 | ***NA*** | * To what extent did relationships between Athens and members of the Delian League change during the period after 479 BC?
 |
| 1. **Peace and Conflict 446-431 BC**
 | The Megarians, being well aware of the Athenian sensitivities over the issue, may have been urged on by the Corinthians to cultivate the sacred land in order to provoke the Athenians into a hostile reaction, and thus give cause for complaint. For these reasons de Ste. Croix believes that the Athenians should be absolved from blame, but the Megarians (to a smaller extent) and the Spartans in particular should be blamed for exploiting the issue and making it a pretext for war.T. Buckley, *Aspects of Greek History 750-323 BC, p.323***How convincing do you find the interpretation of de Ste. Croix (as reported in Buckely) that the Spartans and Megarians exploited the Megarian decree in order to go to war?** | * How far did the Peace of 446 BC address the challenges of the First Peloponnesian War (462-446 BC)?
 |
| The success of Pericles’ policy in 432/1 relied in part on the Athenians’ recent inexperience in the field of hoplite warfare, on Athenian resentment over the terms of the peace treaty of 446/5, on a generational change that had removed many of Sparta’s old allies in Athens, and on a general Athenian enthusiasm and lust for power that had been unchecked in the last fifteen or so years. We must add to this the great wealth Athens had amassed over these years, a factor necessary for successful warfare, as Pericles himself emphasised in a speech just before the outbreak of war. The Athenians, Pericles must have seen by 432/1 were ripe for the renewal of open hostilities with Sparta and for the final rejection of an notion of joint rule of Greece. Pericles’ message of Athenian superiority and no concessions to Sparta thus found rich soil for growth, IN consequence, the Athenians voted to enter the greatest war in their history. LJ Samons II, *Perilces and the Conquest of History* **How convincing do you find LJ Samons’ interpretation of the Athenian attitude towards war with Sparta in 432/1?** |
| The Spartans had declared in their final ultimatum that if the Athenians let the Greeks go free there could be peace; but the allies had no grounds for confidence in their liberators. They knew that Sparta had ignored them in the Thirty Year’s Peace, that she had failed to support the Samian revolt, and discouraged Mytilene from coming out into the open. Nor could democratic parties relish liberation by Spartans who maintained their leadership of the Peloponnesian League by encouraging oligarchies. Even those who might have welcomed Spartan garrisons will have realised Sparta’s military helplessness. *The Old Oligarch was not the only one who understood the importance of sea power*. Without a strong fleet Sparta would find most of the Athenian allies inaccessible. R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire***How convincing do you find R. Meiggs’ interpretation of Sparta’s position at the start of the Peloponnesian War?** |
| 1. **The Archidamian War, 431-420 BC**
 | ***NA*** | * ‘Leadership was lacking at both Athens and Sparta during the Archidamian War.’ How far do you agree with this view?
 |
| 1. **The End of the Peloponnesian War and its Aftermath, 419-404 BC**
 | Deprived of Alcibiades’ services as a result of Notion and of the victors of Arginusae by the subsequent trial, the Athenians, who between 410 and 406 had looked like winning the war after all, could now hardly fail to lose it. Just before the final defeat, which was at Aegospotami on the Hellespont in 405, we glimpse Alcibiades for the last time, warning the Athenian generals against recklessly beaching their ships where they would be exposed to attack by Lysander … His help was rebuffed; the battle was won and the Athenians now faced starvation.S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479-323 BC* (2011) p.189**How convincing do you find Hornblower’s interpretation that it was the loss of competent leadership that lost Athens the Peloponnesian War?** | * ‘The consequences of the Sicilian Expedition for Athens and Sparta made Athens’ defeat in the Peloponnesian War inevitable’ How far do you agree with this view?
 |
| **General 30 mark essays**  | * Relations between Athens and Sparta were doomed from the moment that the Persians were defeated’. How far do you agree with this view?
* ‘Fighting was the only way for states to solve conflicts.’ To what extent do the sources support this view of the relationships between Greek states and between Greek and non-Greek states in this period?
* How far did the changes in relations between Greek and non-Greek states depend upon the strengths and abilities of the leaders of the states during this period?
* ‘It was Athens’ relationship with Corinth, rather than with any other state, which posed the greatest danger to peace in the Greek world during this period.’ To what extent do the sources support this view?
* Athens’ allies quickly learned that Athenians always tried to dominate the Greek world,’ To what extent do the sources support this view?
* ‘The Persians brought both a threat and an opportunity to Greek states during this period.’ To what extent do the sources support this view?
* To what extent were the Spartans considered reliable allies during this period?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Roman Period Study – The Julio-Claudians, 31 BC-AD 68** |
| **Topic** | **Interpretation Questions - (20 Marks)** | **Essay Questions - (30 Marks)** |
| **1: Augustus, 31 BC-AD 14** |

|  |
| --- |
| [Augustus] resigned his consulship in the summer of that year (23 BC), a post to which he had been elected for nine years running. And he was not to hold it again, except on rare, honorific occasions. The senate, in turn, gave him the right to retain his *imperium* (his military authority). … More significantly still, the compliant senators increased the force of Augustus’ *imperium* abroad by making it superior to that of governors in any subject territory, even those outside his own extensive provincial commands … – an extraordinary authority conventionally known as *maius imperium* (“greater power”). … The Roman senate [also] accorded Augustus the right to wield the responsibilities of a tribune for life. … What does all this mean? Common interpretation has it that the settlement of 23 BC represents a retreat on Augustus’ part, that resignation of the consulship diminished powers that he previously wielded … . All of that is speculation, unfounded and implausible. … Augustus may have technically relinquished the specific privileges that attached to the consulship. But this entailed no lapse in authority.  |
| Erich S. Gruen, ‘Augustus and the Making of the Principate’  |

**How convincing do you find Gruen’s interpretation that Augustus suffered “no lapse in authority”?** |  |
| Whether people liked (Augustus) or loathed him, he was in many ways a puzzling contradictory revolutionary. He was one of the most radical innovators Rome ever saw. …Yet Augustus appears to have abolished nothing. The governing class remained the same (this was no revolution in the struct sense of the word), the privileges of the sente were in many ways enhanced, not removed, and the old offices of state, consulships and praetorships and son on, continued to be coveted and filled. Much of the legislation that is usually ascribed to Augustus was formally introduced, or at least fronted, by those regular officials…Most of his formal powers were officially voted to him by the senate and cast almost entirely in traditional Republican format, his continued use of the title ‘son of a god’ being the only important exception. And he lived in no grand palace, but in the sort of house on the Palatine Hill where you would expect to find a senator, and where his wife Livia could occasionally be spotted working her wool. The word that Romans most often used to describe his position was *princeps*, meaning ‘first citizen’ rather than ‘emperor’ as we choose to call him, and one of his most famous watchwords was *civilitas* – ‘we’re all citizens together’.  M. Beard, *SPQR A History of Ancient Rome***How convincing do you find Beard’s interpretation that ‘Augustus appears to have abolished nothing’?** |
| **2: Tiberius, 14-37** | Sometime before Sejanus’ fall, but when Tiberius already suspected him, Agrippina’s eldest son had been put to death. Not until 33 was is elder brother Drusus killed. Their mother committed suicide. The next years saw more trials and executions with Macro proving as ruthless in eliminating opposition as Sejanus had been. Attempts have been made to exonerate Tiberius, or at least to suggest that Tacitus exaggerates. Perhaps he does. And it is easy to forget when reading him that the circle affected by the executions and suicides was relatively limited. But two things are clear and indisputable: the demoralisation of the senatorial class, collectively and for the most part individually: and the fact that whenever Tiberius made his wishes clear, for leniency or the reverse, he was obeyed. In theory he could have stopped the denunciations and the useless deaths; in practice, of course, isolated, scared, increasingly cynical, he lacked the will to do so….His personality continues to puzzle historians, because Tacitus made it into an enigma.C. Wells, *The Roman Empire***How convincing do you find Wells’ interpretation of Tiberius’ character and actions?** | * To what extent do the sources help us understand Tiberius’ relationship with the Senate and ordinary people of Rome?
 |
| **3: Gaius, 37-41** | Gaius’ assumption of divinity was an extreme reaction to his problems, but it was not, in itself, the act of a madman. His religious representation may be seen as a means of displaying authority. We must remember that Gaius numbered among his ancestors Venus, Mars, Romulus, Divus Julius and Divus Augustus. When interpreted in the context of contemporary religious practice and attitudes towards imperial position, Gaius’ policy may have been misconceived, but it was not revolutionary.Richard Alston, *Aspects of Roman History, 31BC-AD 117***How convincing do you find Alston’s interpretation of Gaius’ divine pretensions?**  | * How far do the sources show that Gaius was universally unpopular during his reign?
 |
| **4: Claudius, 41-54** | As to [Claudius’] conscious aims and achievements, the material…yields the portrait of an emperor who began his usurping reign with a heroic double effort, in conciliating the nobility, above all in invading Britain, to secure his position. Both proved inadequate against the resentment that his usurpation caused, and in 48 fissures developing amongst his own supporters weakened his political position still further. At no stage did Claudius dare to give up manipulation as his main political weapon or to assume the full weight of the Principate as he had helped to make itB. Levick, *Claudius***How convincing do you find Levick’s interpretation of Claudius’ reign?**  | * How important a role did imperial women play during the reigns of Claudius and Nero?
 |
| **5: Nero, 54-68** |  | * ‘The failings of Nero’s principate were the result of bad advice, rather than his own mistakes.’ To what extent do you agree with this statement?
 |
| **General 30 mark essays** | * To what extent was there discontent with the emperors during this period?
* How consistent were the attitudes of the Julio-Claudian emperors towards the Imperial Cult?
* How successful were the Julio-Claudian emperors in securing the support of the ordinary people of Rome?
* How successful were the Julio-Claudians in gaining and maintaining the support of the upper classes?
* To what extent do the sources support the view that the emperors of this period provided effective administration of the city of Rome?
* To what extent and for what reasons did the emperors attempt to improve the lives of the inhabitants of the city of Rome?
* How useful is Suetonius for our understanding of the reigns of the emperors of this period? You must consider the accounts of at least two emperors in your answer.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Greek Depth Study – The politics and society of athens 460-399 BC** |
| **Topic** | **Source Utility Questions - (12 Marks)** | **Essay Questions - (36 Marks)** |
| 1. **Athenian Political and Social Culture**
 | The women of the Chorus speak in the Parabasis)Everyone has got lots of bad things to say about women, how we are a bad influence on men, and responsible for conflicts, quarrels, faction, trouble, anguish, war - the lot. Well, if we're a bad lot, really and truly, why do you marry us, and forbid us to leave the house, or even to be seen peeping outside? Do you really mean to keep such a close eye on a bad lot? ... And if we spend the night at someone else's house, having a bit of fun and wearing ourselves out everyone comes snooping round the couches looking for this bad lot. And if he peeps out of a window, you want to get a look at her; and if she retreats in shame, everyone is all the keener to see the bad lot peeping out again. Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 786-799  'Perhaps I should say a word or two on the duties of women to those among you who are now widowed. I can say all I have to say in a short word of advice. Your great glory is not to be inferior to what God has made you, and the greatest glory of a woman is to be least talked about by men, whether they are praising you or criticizing you. Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War 2.46* **How useful are these passages for understanding the position of women in Athens?**  | * To what extent did life in the fifth century provide opportunities for all the inhabitants of Attica?
* To what extent do the sources enable us to assess whether the democratic system in Athens enabled the population of Attica to participate in decision making?
* ‘So in what was in name a democracy, power was really in the hands of the first citizen.’ How far do you agree with this assessment of Pericles?
 |
| 1. **The influence of new thinking and ideas on Athenian society**
 | **Read Thucydides 3.38**38. As for me, I have not altered my opinion, and I am amazed at those who have proposed a reconsideration of the question of Mytilene, thus causing a delay which is all to the advantage of the guilty party. After a lapse of time the injured party will lose the edge of his anger when he comes to act against those who have wronged him; whereas the best punishment and the one most fitted to the crime is when reprisals follow immediately. I shall be amazed, too, if anyone contradicts me and attempts to prove that the harm done to us by Mytilene is really a good thing for us, or that when we suffer ourselves we are somehow doing harm to our allies. It is obvious that anyone who is going to say this must either have such confidence in his powers as an orator that he will struggle to persuade you that what has been finally settles was, on the contrary, not decided at all, or else he must have been bribed to put together some elaborate speech with which he will try to lead you out of the right track. But in competitions of this sort the prizes go to others and the state takes all the danger for herself. The blame is yours, for stupidly instituting these competitive displays. You have become regular speech-goers, and as for action, you merely listen to accounts of it; if something is to be done in the future you estimate the possibilities by hearing a good speech on the subject. And as for the past you rely not so much on the facts which you have seen with your own eyes as on what you have heard about them in some clever piece of verbal criticism. Any novelty in an argument deceives you at once, but when the argument is tried and proved you become unwilling to follow it; you look with suspicion on what is normal and are the slaves of every paradox that comes your way. The chief wish of each one of you is to be able to make a speech  himself, and, if you cannot do that, the next best thing is to compete with those who can make this sort of speech by not looking as though you were at all out of your depth while you listen to the views put forward, by applauding a good point before it is made, and by being as quick at seeing how an argument is going to be developed as you are slow at understanding in the end what it will lead to. What you are looking for all the time is something that is, I should say, outside the range of ordinary experience. And yet you cannot even think straight about the facts of life that are before you. You are simply victims of your own pleasure in listening, and are more like an audience sitting at the feet of a professional lecturer than a parliament discussing matters of state.  **How useful is this passage for our understanding of the influence of rhetoric on the Athenian assembly? [12]** | * To what extent do the sources enable us to assess whether Socrates differed from the Sophists?
 |
| You have become regular speech-goers, and as for action, you merely listen to accounts of it; if something is to be done in the future you estimate the possibilities by hearing a good speech on the subject. And as for the past you rely not so much on the facts which you have seen with your own eyes as on what you have heard about them in some clever piece of verbal criticism. Any novelty in an argument deceives you at once, but when the argument is tried and proved you become unwilling to follow it; you look with suspicion on what is normal and are the slaves of every paradox that comes your way. The chief wish of each one of you is to be able to make a speech  himself, and, if you cannot do that, the next best thing is to compete with those who can make this sort of speech by not looking as though you were at all out of your depth while you listen to the views put forward, by applauding a good point before it is made, and by being as quick at seeing how an argument is going to be developed as you are slow at understanding in the end what it will lead to. Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War,* 3.38**DEMOSTHENES:** Easy as pie: do the same things you do already. Mix all their affairs together and stir them into a hash, and always try to win the people over with little touches of elegantly prepared rhetoric as sweeteners. The other demagogic qualities you possess: a repellent voice, low birth, and you’re a typical product of the Agora. You have everything that’s needed for public life, and oracles and the voice of Pytho are in agreement. Now crown yourself and pour libation to the god Blockhead, and then let’s see you pay the man out. Aristophanes, *Knights*, 213-221**How useful are these passages for understanding the importance of rhetoric for political leaders in Athens? [12]** |
| 1. **Art and Architecture and their significance in the culture of Athens**
 | **Read the passages below**12. But there was one measure above all which at once gave the greatest pleasure to the Athenians, adorned their city and created amazement among the rest of mankind, and which today is the sole testimony that the tales of the ancient power and glory of Greece are no mere fables. By this I mean his construction of temples and public buildings; and yet it was this, more than any other action of his, which his enemies slandered and misrepresented. They cried out in the Assembly that Athens had lost her good name and disgraced herself by transferring from Delos into her own keeping the funds that had been contributed by the rest of Greece, and that now the most plausible excuse for this action, namely, that the money had been moved for fear of the barbarians and was being guarded in a safe place, had been demolished by Pericles himself. ‘The Greeks must be outraged,’ they cried, ‘They must consider this an act of bare-faced tyranny, when they see that with their contributions, extorted from them by force for the war against the Persians, we are gilding and beautifying our city, as if it were some vain woman decking herself out with costly stones and statues and temples worth millions of money.’ Pericles’ answer to the people was that the Athenians were not obliged to give the allies any account of how their money was spent, provided that they carried on the war for them and kept the Persians away. ‘They do not give us a single horse, nor a soldier, nor a ship. All they supply is money,’ he told the Athenians, ‘and this belongs not to the people who give it but to those who receive it, so long as they provide the services they are paid for. It is no more than fair that after Athens has been equipped with all she needs to carry on the war, she should apply the surplus to public works, which, once completed will bring her glory for all time, and while they are being built will convert that surplus to immediate use. In this way all kinds of enterprises and demands will be created which will provide inspiration for every art, find employment for every hand, and transform the whole people into wage-earners, so that the city will decorate and maintain herself at the same time from her own resources.’ Plutarch, *Pericles*, 12Image result for parthenon lapiths and centaurs*Parthenon metope of a centaur fighting with a Lapith***How useful are these sources for our understanding of how the conflict with the Persians came to influence Athenian art and architecture? [12]** | * To what extent was the Athenian building programme a political statement?
* How far does Athenian art and architecture help us to understand changing ideas about the relationship between men and the divine?
 |
| 1. **Drama and Dramatic festivals and their significance in the culture of Athens**
 |  | * ‘The City Dionysia was more important to Athenians as a political event than a religious event.’ To what extend do you agree with this statement?
 |
| 1. **Religion and its significance in the culture of Athens**
 | **Read the passages below**As one enters the temple called the Parthenon everything on the pediment bears upon the birth of Athena; the other end is the quarrel of Poseidon with Athena over the country. The statue itself is made of ivory and gold. On the middle of the helmet is set a sphinx…and griffins worked on each side of it. The statue of Athena is upright in an ankle length tunic, and the head of Medusa is engraved in ivory on her breast, and she has a Victory about four cubits high, and a spear in her hand and a shield lying at her feet, and near the spear is a snake which might be Erichthonius. On the plinth of the statue is worked the birth of Pandora. **Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 1.24.5*** **The Temple of Sounion**

Image result for temple of sounion* **The West Pediment of the Parthenon**

Image result for west pediment of the parthenon**How useful are these sources for our understanding of the role and importance of the worship of Athena and Poseidon to Athenians of the late fifth century?** | * To what extent do the sources enable us to assess the role and significance of Athena and Poseidon in Athens in this period?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Roman Depth Study – Ruling Roman Britian AD 43 – c.128** |
| **Topic** | **Source Utility Questions - (12 Marks)** | **Essay Questions - (30 Marks)** |
| 1. **Roman Military Policy towards Britain: conquest and expansion**
 | Their strength in in their infantry. Some tribes also fight with chariots. The nobleman drives, his dependants fight in his defence. At one time they owed obedience to kings; now they are divided into factions and groups under rival leaders. Indeed, nothing has helped us more in war with their strongest nations than their inability to cooperate. It is but seldom that two or three sates unite to repel a common danger; fighting separately, they are conquered all together. …The soil is productive of crops, except for olives, grapes and other natives of warmer climes, and rich in cattle. Crops are slow to ripen, but quick to grow – both facts due to one and the same cause, the abundant moisture of land and sky. Britannia yields gold, silver and other metals, a reward for victory. The Ocean, too, produces pearls, but they are dusky and mottled. Some think that those who gather them lack skill. Whereas in the Red Sea they are torn alive and breathing from the rocks, in Britannia they are collected as the sea throws them up. I find more plausible a lack of quality in pearls than of greed in us.The Britanni themselves readily submit o the levy, the tribute and the other obligations of empire, provided that there is no abuse. That they bitterly resent, for they have been broken into obedience, not to slavery, Divius Julius, the first Roman to enter Britannia with an army, did indeed intimidate the natives by a victory and gain control of the coast, but he can be said to have pointed it out, not handed it over, to posterity.Tacitus, *Agricola*, 12-13**How useful is this passage for our understanding of the worth of Britain to the Romans?** | * ‘Agricola achieved more than other governors in Britain.’ How far do you agree with this statement?
 |
| 1. **Frontier Policy: consolidation and retrenchment AD 85-c.128**
 |  | * According to the evidence what was the purpose of Hadrian’s Wall?
* How far does the evidence help us understand the aims of the Romans in their construction of Hadrian’s Wall?
 |
| 1. **Resistance to Roman Rule**
 | The Britanni on the hill-tops had so far taken no part in the action, and had the leisure to note with contempt the smallness of our numbers. They now began to make a slow descent and envelop our victorious rear. But Agricola, anticipating just such a move, threw in their path four squadrons of cavalry which he was keeping in hand for emergencies. He thus broke and scattered them in a rout as severe as their assault had been fierce. The tactics of the Britanni were now turned against themselves. On the orders of their general, our squadrons rode round from the front and fell upon the enemy in the rear. The spectacle that followed over the open country was awe-inspiring and grim. Our men kept pursuing and wounding, capturing some and then killing them as others appeared. On the enemy’s side each man now followed his bent. Some bands, though armed, fled before inferior numbers; some men, though unarmed, deliberately charged to their deaths. Everywhere were weapons, bodies, mangled limbs and soil soaked with blood, and even the vanquished now and then found their fury and their courage again. For when they reached the woods, they rallied and profited by their local knowledge to ambush the first rash pursuers. Our excess of confidence might have ked to disaster, but Agricola was everywhere at once. He strong cohorts of lightly armed troops to ring the woods like hunters; where the woods were denser, he sent in dismounted cavalry to scour them, and where they thinned out, the cavalry did the work. But the Britanni, when they saw that our ranks were re-formed and steady and beginning the pursuit again, simply turned and ran. They no longer kept formation or looked to see where their comrades were, but scattered and, avoiding each other, made for distant and trackless retreats. Only night and exhaustion ended the pursuit. Of the enemy some 10,000 fell, on our side, 360, among whom was Aulus Atticus, the prefect of the cohort, whose youthful enthusiasm and mettlesome horse took him deep into the ranks of the enemy. Tacitus*, Agricola*, 37**How useful is this passage for our understanding of the limitations of the Britons?** | * To what extent do the sources help us understand the causes of the Boudiccan Revolt?
* ‘Boudicca’s rebellion was a direct result of widespread mistreatment of the Britons by the Romans since the invasion of AD 43.’ How far do you agree with this view?
 |
| 1. **Roman Control**
 | The fighting began with exchange of missiles, and the Britanni showed both courage and skill in parrying our shots with their great swords or catching them on their little shields, while they in turn rained huge volleys on us. At last urged forward the four cohorts of Batavi and the two of Tungri to move in and fight it out at the sword’s point. The manoeuvre was familiar to those old soldiers, but awkward for the enemy with their small shields and unwieldy swords – for the swords of the Britanni lack a thrusting point, and so are unsuited to the clash of arms in close combat. The Batavi, striking blow after blow, pushing with the bosses of their shields and stabbing at their enemies’ faces, routed the men on the plain and began to push the battle uphill. This provoked the rest of the cohorts to drive in hard and butcher the enemy as they met them. Many Britanni were left behind half dead or even unwounded, owing to the very speed of our victory. Our cavalry squadrons, meanwhile, had routed the war-chariots, and now plunged into the infantry battle. Their first onslaught was terrifying, but the solid ranks of the enemy and the roughness of the ground soon brought them to a standstill. The battle looked nothing like a cavalry action, with our men precariously perched on the slope and jostled by the flanks of the horses. And often stray chariots or riderless horses, careering about wildly in their terror, came plunging in on the ranks from flank or front. Tacitus*, Agricola*, 36**How useful is this passage for our understanding of the effectiveness of the Roman army against British resistance?** | * ‘The Roman governors of Britain spent all their time fighting with the natives.’ To what extent do you agree with this statement?
 |
| As a result of this dissension and the frequent rumours of the civil wars, the Britons revived their ambitions. The leader in this was Venutius, a man of barbarous spirit who hated Roman power. IN addition he had motives of personal hostility against queen Cartimandua. Cartimandua’s rule over the Brigantes was based on her high birth. Her power had grown when she captured king Caratacus by treachery and handed him over to embellish the triumph of the emperor Claudius. The result was riches, and the self-indulgence which flowers in prosperity. Venutius had been her husband. Spurning him, she made his armour-bearer Vellocatus her husband, and her partner in government. The power of her house was immediately shaken to its foundations by this outrage. The people of the tribe declared for Venutius: only the passion and the savage temper of the queen supported the adulterer. Venutius therefore summoned his supporters. The Brigantes rallied to him, reducing Cartimandua to the last extremity. She besought Roman protection. Our *alae*, and cohorts fought indecisive battles, but at length rescued the queen from danger. The kingdom went to Venutius; we were left with a war to fight.Tacitus, *Histories* 3.45**How useful is this passage in helping us understand the benefits and dangers of using client rulers?** |
| 1. **Effects of Roman Rule**
 |  | * To what extent did the natives welcome a Roman way of life?
* How far does the evidence show that the British economy benefitted from the Roman occupation of Britain?
* ‘The Britons benefitted from the Roman occupation of Britain throughout the period.’ How far do you agree with this view?
 |