

Which of the heroes of the Iliad best embodies the 'heroic code'? Give reasons for your choice.

Author: N. De Carteret, Elizabeth College, Guernsey.

One hero in the *Iliad* stands out in particular as the epitome of the 'heroic code'. It is Achilles, the one hero only who is fighting for pure heroics, so to our minds he is a cruel selfish and even hateful young man, but there is no doubt that he is a hero. Diomedes and Hector prove good contrasts.

Heroic work in Homer's day was measured in fighting, pure and simple. Prowess on the battlefield was ranked supreme, high above any considerations of morality. Nestor, for example, tells Agamemnon and Achilles that he has known much "better" men than them - meaning men who are better at fighting. Achilles refuses Lycaon clemency because Patroclus, who is dead, was a much "better" man than he is by far - i.e. a much better fighter. Achilles urges Hector to show his "worth" and fight like a man - "worth" means simply ability to fight.

By this criterion Achilles ranks second to none. He is an immensely talented fighter, and he considers himself a "prince among men". It is a reflection of his ability that the action speeds up rapidly on his return to the battle after Book 16 and Patroclus' death. Two thirds of the epic are slow and tedious; on Achilles' return the last third is fast and moves most speedily. Achilles' unstoppable battle madness surpasses without doubt that of the other heroes in the *Iliad*. He is brave vicious and powerful. He splits the Trojans and drives them back without difficulty at all.

Moreover his bravery is not restricted to humans. He is angry with Apollo for deceiving him, and his battle with the river god Xanthus ends in more success than Diomedes' attempts against the gods in Book 5 (although he admittedly has much divine support).

The heroic code was recognised as a desire to excel. For the heroes 'excellent' was the norm. It was not enough to do **well**, or simply to assist other to excellence; one had to shine. Thus Nestor tells of how Peleus instructed Achilles to **excel**, to aim to outshine all other fighters. Diomedes suggests to Sthenelus that they should attack Aeneas with the hope of 'covering ourselves in glory'; they want to eclipse all of their companions in arms.

This desire is more apparent in Achilles than in anyone else. He will not let even Patroclus, his loved friend, diminish his glory - he warns Patroclus not to be **too** successful while wearing his armour. In the *York Notes* there is a useful description of how Achilles' motivation for fighting is a pure and simple embodiment of the heroic code. In all of the other heroes it is complicated or diminished by their characters in some way; in Agamemnon for example it is inseparably linked to a desire for revenge and to reclaim what is his; in Diomedes it is moderated and restrained; in Odysseus and Nestor it is amenable to practical and political considerations; in Aias it is largely unconscious to the extent that it is comic brute force; in Paris it is set aside for a desire for pleasure; and in Hector it is complicated by the needs of others.

Thus Achilles is the only character with a **great** love of battle and glory. He is just about the only great hero who is on the trip for heroics.

His decision to return and fight and accept early death, moreover, is most admirable, rather than stay out of the battle and live long. In the heroic world life expectancy was much shorter than it is today, of course, especially in the world of fighting ("death waits in many forms", says Homer). There was no real afterlife except the gloomy existence of Hades, and there was no reward of Heaven to look forward to. Thus a hero's attitude was that he should make the most of his life while he had it! Since it was not really worth attempting to preserve his life, the hero tried to secure everlasting fame and glory, and thus reputation was all important. Hector says that he wants to secure his fame forever; Glaucus and Sarpedon want to bring glory and honour on their name to the Lycians. Thus Achilles' decision is most admirable and worthy of the heroic code.

Surely, however, it could be argued, Hector is altogether a more heroic man than Achilles. Achilles, it could be claimed is a cruel and vicious man; he is motivated by hate, not love, and he is proud and arrogant and selfish. Hector, on the other hand, is a good and caring man, he loves his wife and son (one could not imagine Achilles participating in the tender, emotional scene in Book Six). He loves his father as much as Achilles hates his. He is not at all hostile to his brother, and there is clearly great brotherly love and comradeship between them. He forgives Paris and praises him as often as he rebukes him. Helen comments that Hector was the one Trojan who was kind to her and who did not make her feel guilty. Achilles is bitter and unforgiving towards Agamemnon and Menelaus. We note that Hector cares about his men very much: it is Sarpedon's death which motivates him to kill Patroclus - the latter is indeed the only person for whom Achilles shows any real love, apart from himself. He is uncaring for Thetis and is unnecessarily hostile to Aias, Odysseus and Phoenix in their embassy. Moreover, he regards Briseis as a possession (although he claims to love her). Hector is thus a complete antithesis of Achilles and perhaps the more admirable man of the *Iliad*.

All of this is true, and indeed to **our** eyes Hector is the more heroic noble man, but to the Greeks it would have been a different matter. Hector is less of an embodiment of the heroic ideal than Achilles because he is fighting not primarily for honour but to protect his family. He is worried that Andromache will become a slave if Troy is captured. His name 'hektor' means 'mainstay', and this is what he is, but this had no bearing on the Greek heroic code.

It is important to note that he is equally as brave as Achilles; he knows, deep down, that he is going to die. His pitiful flight from Achilles in Book 22 serves only to highlight his bravery, not to denounce it; he puts up a good fight in the end, and does not die shamefully. He is **almost** as good a fighter as Achilles - he is an excellent swordsman with skillful dexterity, he is calm, equable, a good tactician, good to his men and a brilliant leader. But Achilles is the more determined.

If Hector's subsidising of desire for glory to desire to protect his loved ones is to denounce his worth, then perhaps **Diomedes** is a more reasonable alternative to Achilles as an embodiment of heroic worth, if Achilles morality is off-putting. We shall now investigate him.

Nobody could accuse Diomedes of being without desire for glory. His excitement and jubilation for battle is clear, and indeed he is the only hero who serves to make war look glorious, in Book Five. There is a far more sombre note to the later *aristeiai* of the other heroes. Diomedes is young and happy and loves seeking glory very much.

Ultimately though perhaps Diomedes is too uncomplicated and trivial to be considered as an embodiment of the heroic worth. Most of the other heroes have strong character traits, but Diomedes is a little flat in his characterisation; he has no really strong emotions.

Besides, in considerations of morality and heroic worth, I feel that Achilles is the one hero who emerges ultimately as morally and heroically noble, ahead of Diomedes. Diomedes' heroic and moral worths are tainted by the Dolon episode; in a cool and cruel piece of treachery, Diomedes neatly chops off Dolon's head while Dolon is begging for mercy. To our minds this is a most sadistic piece of work, and even in the Greek heroic code the killing of an unarmed suppliant was usually considered beneath the dignity of a hero.

Achilles however (who previously we have seen as 'immoral') is the one hero who is associated with taking slaves and saving lives. Agamemnon, Menelaus, Odysseus, Diomedes and others all kill unarmed suppliants; Achilles is the only one we hear of who saves any lives (he claims that he often felt disposed towards saving Trojan lives before Patroclus' death). This gives him a greater nobility than all of the others, he alone understands the heroic code.

Therefore Achilles best embodies the 'heroic code'. He is a greater fighter than everyone else and, despite his selfishness, emerges as the most admirable hero, at least to the Greek mind.

*Examiner's comment: "An epic answer - strong argument and knowledge of the text. A+, 22/25"*

What have the following comic heroes in common: Dikaiopolis, Strepsiades, Philocleon (Procleon)?

Author: N. De Carteret, Elizabeth College, Guernsey.

The characters Dikaiopolis, Strepsiades and Procleon are the central characters of *The Acharnians*, *The Clouds* and *The Wasps* respectively. When examined, their characters, it becomes clear, are remarkably similar. They all make for good comedy - each is outspoken, egotistic, eccentric, vulgar - with similar moral weaknesses (and strengths, too).

The main feature of each seems to be egoism. They are all very big-headed. Dikaiopolis is very full of himself; he is totally outspoken, and the word 'mouthy' is an understatement to describe him. He is a born heckler (he says that if anyone disagrees with him he'll "heckle him like fury until he shuts his cakehole tight." He is sneering and self-indulgent in his attitude to Euripides (who is *helping* him - he does not feel he has to show him any gratitude). He humbles himself at the trial sarcastically, calling himself "little me".

Similarly Strepsiades is completely egotistic. His vanity is clear in his visit to the Thinkery. He talks like the complete big-head he is, and instead of trying to learn anything, mouths off about how much he knows. He tries to teach the Sophists things; as soon as they tell him how to study roots, he mouths off proudly about what he thinks they should do. He big-headedly mocks their study of "intestinology" and corrects them in his 'know-all' way. When they show him a map and point out Athens, he says, arrogantly "Can't be; if it's Athens, where are the jurymen? He has no respect for anyone whatsoever, and is a braggart; he boasts about how he "and Pericles" together had great war victories (the veracity of which is dubious).

Procleon similarly has a great opinion of himself. He loves the power and feeling of tyranny that comes with judging, and it is no surprise that he hates humbling himself, because he is such a big-head. He will not apologise to the baking woman; he believes that he can sort it all out with a joke. He is ungrateful and insensitive to his son, Anticleon, whom he clearly takes for granted. Like Dikaiopolis who loves being waited on hand and foot in Act Two of *The Acharnians*, so does he - with his bowl of soup.

Since all three are so big-headed and self important, it is no surprise that they are all also completely selfish and self-indulgent. Dikaiopolis for example is completely self-centred. His attitude to others is best summed up in his answer to a man who claims to be rejected "by fate". "Then don't sneeze on me" is Dikaiopolis' instinctive reply.

Similarly Strepsiades is completely selfish. He is personally rude and insulting to his son, Pheidippides, and it is clear that he does not care at all about his feelings. He is personally rude about "frigid" Theognis, and he shows utter heartlessness in sending away the man who has been injured in the chariot race. He has no sympathy for anyone whatsoever. His one motivation throughout *The Clouds* is selfishness; he seeks to avoid paying his debts. His dishonesty and total uncaring are all part of his selfishness. Moreover he does not learn his lesson in the play. Although he admits he was wrong, he still blames the Sophists, and is vengeful and hateful towards them at the end - he wants to burn down their Thinkery. He is a very selfish old man indeed.

So is Procleon. He is totally ungrateful to Anticleon, who is trying to help him and who is willing to pay him to stay at home. He is corrupt and it is a mark of his selfishness that he likes taking bribes. His jurying is done to protect himself from the results predicted by an oath which said that he would die if he ever decreed anyone innocent and acquitted them. Thus through his selfish fear innocent men must suffer,

In their arrogance, all three men are completely right-wing in their outlook on life. Totally (*sic*) they would be regarded as over-the-top conservatives who took their beliefs to a ridiculous extent. Dikaiopolis is an extremist traditionalist, as is Strepsiades (who at least appears admirable in his defence of old ideas and traditional views). Procleon's right wing views are more selfishly motivated, to exalt himself. He is a chauvinist, as we have seen, and a complete racist too - he calls the slaves "barbarians" (that is Sosias and Xanthias). He is an arrant snob with a notable contempt for the 'underdogs' whom he likes to see oppressed. It is his selfishness to which Anticleon appeals to win him over at the *agon*.

All three are funny in that they are dedicated to, completely devoted to and immersed in their views. They are all radicals.

They are also all eccentric. Dikaiopolis is a total eccentric - he talks to the leather thongs, and he feels the need to go to Euripides for clothes for his trial, just to be dramatic and silly! Strepsiades too is completely obsessed with getting out of his debt. It is foremost in his mind to a ridiculous extent. Similarly Procleon is a ridiculous case because he is addicted to jurying! He simply cannot get enough of it - he keeps a pile of pebbles (for casting into the voting urns) and his eccentric obsession is such that he says things such as 'O urn, how I long for your slit!' The extent he goes to to get to do his jurying are ludicrous and most amusing. His staunch defence of Procleon at the argument contest (the *agon*) is typical.

But for all their right-wing, high-and-mighty beliefs, all three are essentially low and vulgar people. Dikaiopolis is completely crude. Right from his first speech we learn that he is a drinker, and his bad language is appalling. He brings the assembly debate down to a crude, vulgar level with his references to farting and other such vulgarities. He is even crude about his daughter.

Strepsiades is also a low and vulgar man. Like Dikaiopolis who is also an old farmer he too represents the worst of the vulgarity of such stereotypes. A key to the way his mind works is given when we see his response to telling a joke: "And the lizard shitted in his face", he says.

Procleon is crude, too. He is initially a sober "gentleman" - he has to be to be a juryman - but in the end we discover his true character when he is drunk. He abducts a flute-girl and offends everyone. Even **before** he has any drink, a clue to his character is given when Anticleon tries to teach him how to sing drinking songs. His immediate response is to **insult** people, to use it as an opportunity to be rude. When he is shown dancing in an embarrassing and vulgar way at the end, his low instincts are fully revealed.

To match that vulgarity each of the men is essentially stupid. It is less easy to argue this of Dikaiopolis, admittedly, but he is of no great intellect: his arguments for the Peloponnesian War's outbreak are wrong (though Aristophanes is deliberately trivialising the causes).

Strepsiades is the most stupid person that Socrates has ever met. Socrates claims in *The Clouds* he has great difficulty teaching him anything, and gives him up as a hopeless case. We have further evidence of

Strepsiades stupidity in that he has neither the respect of his son nor of his slaves, who all know him for what he is and treat him as a complete fool.

Procleon too is ultimately stupid. He does not realise that Cleon is conning him, and Anticleon is more sharp-sighted than his than his father in this respect. He is a gullible and foolish young man.

All three men have the same moral faults, too. It is interesting to note how the pride of each leads each to be of a violent nature. We see each of them resort to violence because they do not know of any higher ways of resolving the disputes, it seems.

This is most true of Strepsiades. His only way of dealing with Pseudartabas is by threatening him. He produces a belt and threatens to paint the Persian chief's face "purple". Elsewhere in *The Acharnians* such behaviour is evident. Strepsiades is guilty of violence, too. His methods of dealing with the creditors are most unorthodox! Despite his old age Procleon will resort to violence given half a chance. It is he who initiates the violence at the start of the play, urging the juryment to attack his son. It is his son and the "barbarous" slaves who propose to sort the matter out sensibly! Later the only thanks that Anticleon gets for his help is that he finds himself on the floor, punched in the face by an angry Procleon!

Thus far the only character traits that we have seen have been **negative** ones. It is important to point out at this point that none of the characters are complete villains; they are all rather figures of **fun**. Dikaiopolis, for all his unorthodox methods, is ultimately a hero: (the chorus refer to him as "our hero"; whether or not this includes the audience is debatable). But he is good in some ways: he recognises the genuine grievances that Sparta has against Athens, and he is kind to the Megarian and the Boeotian, buying some pigs "out of pity", we are told, which is good of him. Ultimately he is preferable to the vicious aggression of the chorus of *The Acharnians*

Similarly Strpsiades is not terribly evil and wicked, jus a comic figure. He is more *incorrigible* than *irredeemable*. To be harsh we must conclude that he is an unpleasant, inadmirable man, but *The Clouds* is an attack on Sophism not Stepsiades, and in the cases of both him and Procleon. although they are both unpleasant old men, there is an element in their characters which draws sympathy and makes us want to side with them. They are child-like and naive and almost have "magnetic personalities" - not that this exonerates their wrongs, far from it, but it cannot be denied that it makes them a little endearing. There is nothing devious about them - Strepsiades is straightforward (he is too stupid to be harmful!) and Procleon is so honest and simple he blatantly admits his sheer sadism in wanting to condemn others! Procleon is admirable - he is a man of his word, he remains true to his oath in the debate, and tries to kill himself at the end, but he is a clumsy old man and the sword becomes entangled in his clothes and he falls down! He is a figure of fun. One critic said that despite his gullibilty he is a better man than his son. This is debatable, but he is certainly no wicked man, as is the case with Dikaiopolis and Strepsiades too.

Therefore these three men are remarkably similar. In their egoism, eccentricity and vulgarity they make for excellent comic heroes. If they were **too** selfish and cruel they would cease to be comic heroes, but as we have seen, none of them are **completely** wicked.

Examiner's comment: "Most impressive in every way: A+." (22/25)

Question 1(b)

Author: Emily Kramers, St Mary's Convent, Cambridge.

a) Aegisthus did not go to the wars at Troy which Agamemnon led. Whilst Agamemnon was away Aegisthus became the lover of Agamemnon's wife Clytemnestra, and he killed Agamemnon on his return from the wars. However Aegisthus' crime was part of the curse that had befallen the house of Atreus, ever since Thyestes had been served his children to eat by Agamemnon's father. Aegisthus' crime was part of that blood feud.

(mark for a - 4)

b) The term 'that nobleman' was probably inserted because even though he had committed a hideous murder, he still was descended from kings. Aegisthus was in fact the cousin of Agamemnon and therefore belonged to and stemmed from the same royal lineage. Agamemnon's own status would have been diminished if Aegisthus had not been called a 'nobleman'. In the *Odyssey* the suitors, whilst being terrible people and selfish and grasping, are still (some of them) 'nobles', as it would detract from Penelope's, and therefore Odysseus', status for them to be less than nobles. Therefore Aegisthus, whilst being a vile murderer still fulfils some of the necessary requirements to be called 'noble', wealth and ancestry.

However the statement could be a sarcastic one; but I think instead it is intended to uphold the good name of Orestes. Orestes' act would lose its honour if the opponent was not noble. A hero was only supposed to fight a man of his own status and standing, otherwise it was not heroic.

(mark for b - 3)

c) On Agamemnon's return he was cruelly murdered. Odysseus however did not return for a long time, and when he did it was to face the suitors, whom he overcame heroically. Agamemnon's return was not late like Odysseus'. In this there is a contrast for Odysseus had to travel far and suffer many hardships before he could return. In fact In Book 1 of the *Odyssey* from which the extract is taken, it is stated that Odysseus had not returned home even after the time which the gods had appointed for his homecoming. This statement is immediate in the *Odyssey* and suggests an injustice exacted upon Odysseus. However Agamemnon also suffers the injustice on the return from the wars by being killed.

The story of Agamemnon is also related in Book 4 by Menelaus who tells Telemachus what has happened to Odysseus. The main contrast that appears here is in the behaviour of their wives. Odysseus' wife Penelope is seen as the paragon of wifely virtue, fit for the hero. She waits at home for nineteen years, and will not accept the entreaties of the suitors. She is often seen spinning or weeping for her beloved husband so long gone. This is in direct contrast to Agamemnon's wife Clytemnestra who not only has a lover, but also exiles her own only son, whereas Penelope is a support to Telemachus. Also, on Odysseus' return home he is welcomed by an

overjoyed Penelope. She has been in every way the perfect wife for the returning conquering hero. By direct contrast, Agamemnon's wife murders him on his return.

When Agamemnon returns his wife has taken a lover who lives in his house; his son is sent to exile and he returns to a murdering household. All these aspects are vital in contrast to Odysseus who returns admittedly to a household full of suitors, but at least his family have remained loyal. Indeed we repeatedly see Penelope asking travellers for any news of her husband; a devotion that adds to his own status and contrasts with Agamemnon's treacherous household. Even Agamemnon's cousin is disloyal, Aegisthus, whereas Odysseus is constantly seen in a good light by all who speak of him. Odysseus' family trust in the gods and fate, although Aegisthus obviously didn't.

(mark for c - 6)

d) In the *Odyssey* Odysseus is compelled to travel far and suffer many hardships before he can return home. According to the first book of the *Odyssey* it is in fact after that time which the gods had allotted him. This does not seem acceptable divine justice. Indeed it seems to be almost going against fate. It is the purpose of the council of the gods in Book 1 to begin the journey home for Odysseus. It also if necessary, because at this council Zeus talks of justice. (sic) As he says they shouldn't blame the gods 'when it is their own wickedness that brings them sufferings worse than any which Destiny allotted them'. From this statement it seems that in fact it is left to the individual to decide his own sufferings, and that fate is not totally responsible. The theology here seems to be that whilst fate decreed the important framework of a life the individual is free to make his life good or bad within that framework. The gods, seen as the agents of fate, especially Zeus, do not therefore have the omnipotent status, but in fact as seen with Aegisthus, only warn sometimes.

However it does seem that they do not always uphold justice. Odysseus is shown as a pious man. He often prays and, for example when he went to the underworld, he is always keen to carry out the proper rites and rituals. This piety however did not seem to help him. He still suffered because of the anger of Poseidon, and here as in the *Iliad* the gods seem to follow their own whims. Poseidon is willing to succumb to the fate that Odysseus will eventually return home, but makes it a terrible journey.

The council of the gods suggests that they have not been just to Odysseus as Athene was to persuade them to eventually set him on course for home. However there is a certain justice upheld in the final book as Odysseus defeats the suitors, which only succeeded with the help of Athene, and becomes triumphant in his own house.

(Mark for d - 7)

Total mark - 20/25



Virgil *Aeneid* VI lines 801 - 816

Author: Emily Kramers, St Mary's Convent, Cambridge.

a) When Virgil compares Augustus with Hercules and Bacchus he is glorifying Augustus. This was his aim. Virgil saw Rome and her empire under Augustus as capable of regaining the golden age. He saw it as a new dawn and a new opportunity. The civil wars had ended with the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C. and the doors in the temple of Janus were finally closed denoting peace within all the territories of Rome. Augustus was seen as being the cause of this new state of affairs and accordingly Virgil would wish to glorify him. Virgil is very patriotic. Throughout the *Aeneid* he refers to the mighty empire to come, and the extract here is from one of the most patriotic sections of the poem, that of Anchises speech and the pageant of Roman heroes. Therefore Virgil wants to glorify the man most responsible for the new state of affairs in his beloved Rome. By comparing Augustus to Hercules and Bacchus he is trying to imply that like Hercules and Bacchus Augustus too will join the ranks of the immortals.

The comparisons here seem fairly apt as they refer to some of the achievements of Augustus. The mighty Hercules who 'roved so far and wide over the earth' is renowned for his travels and courageous deeds. There is a hint here that the dominions of Augustus cover extensive areas, and it is true that the empire of Augustus was indeed extensive. Also here Virgil singles out Hercules' action that brought peace to the woods. Augustus' main achievement was the acquisition of peace to Rome's dominions for the first time in 200 years. However also here Hercules is said to have subdued by force, or 'with the bow'. This is apt as Augustus was also a renowned warrior most remembered for his victory over the eastern elements of Antony and Cleopatra. It is for this reason that Virgil compares him to Bacchus, because Bacchus was also a great traveller but also very courageous. Therefore by comparing Augustus to Hercules and Bacchus Virgil is trying to establish Augustus' divine status. He implies that it is possible that mortals can join the gods, and that therefore if Augustus possesses the same necessary qualities as these other gods, why shouldn't he too be immortal? This was a popular sentiment at the time, shown by Horace's line in his *Odes* that Augustus would join the men who had become immortals and sit on Olympus and 'sip nectar with empurpled lips'.

(mark for a - 10)

b) The three kings mentioned here are Numa, Tullus Hostilius and Ancus. Both Livy and Virgil agree that Numa came from outside Rome. he is said to have come from 'humble Cures' and Livy also says that came from a Sabine town. However Virgil and Livy seem to differ on the main point and distinguishing feature of Numa's reign. Here it is said to have been the founding of law, and while Livy agrees that Numa's reign saw this he emphasises Numa's religious work more. Numa was said by Livy to have claimed to meet Egeria in a grove. He is said to have seen Rome's need for a sturdy religious foundation following the militarily successful reign of Romulus. He established orders of priests and the Vestal Virgins. He also made Rome so famously

religious that opposing forces saw it as sacrilege to invade. Although Livy does mention the introduction of law that Numa brought, it implied more the law of religious customs and observance. Thus Livy agrees with Virgil but places the emphasis not on law but on his religious works. Livy did regard Numa's reign as one of indolence.

*(mark for this paragraph - 5)*

Livy and Virgil's treatment of Tullus seem to be very similar. Tullus regarded Numa's works as important but considered that Rome's fame for military prowess was suffering as a result, according to Livy. Livy also records the opinion that due to there being a new king and not the priestly Numa, neighbouring peoples saw it as a possible opportunity for hostilities. Livy did not regard Numa's reign as one of indolence, and Virgil therefore seems to be emphasising the military aspects as more important. Also Virgil here shows Tullus's work as one of transformation of the people to hardworking, adventurous people, but Livy does not regard Tullus in quite the same light. He instead suggests that Tullus looked for a fight, perhaps however in order to achieve what Virgil writes of. Livy considers Tullus's reign to be one of exceptionally good military prowess.

*(mark for this paragraph - 5)*

Ancus is here mentioned as being too boastful. However Livy does not emphasise this point at all. Livy sees Ancus as incorporating the qualities both of Numa and Tullus. In fact Livy considers Ancus a good and successful king and yet Virgil considers him as 'too fond of the breath of popular favour'. Virgil sees him as denoting the beginning of the downfall of the kings, and this Livy does too. He sees the reign as the beginning. Livy often drew on Virgil for sources it seems, so they do not differ too much in opinion, just in emphasis.

*(mark for this paragraph - 4)*

Would the first book of Livy be acceptable as the first chapter of a modern history of Ancient Rome?

Author: Emily Kramers, St Mary's Convent, Cambridge.

Livy calls himself a historian attempting to write down the history of the 'mightiest empire the world has known next to Gods'. However despite the fact that he calls himself a historian he often does not conform to modern ideas of a historian. In modern days the word 'historian' suggests a certain responsibility to the subject by attempting to be accurate and reliable and by conforming to practices such as referring to the sources used. However Livy shows a disregard for such methods and therefore his history would not, I think, be acceptable as a modern history. However Livy cannot be criticised for not doing what he did not intend to do; and as his preface shows accuracy and truth was not necessarily his aim.

The very early history of Rome which Livy attempts to cover in his first book is chiefly hidden in the mists of time. There is little evidence now for these events and it seems that there was little evidence even in Livy's day. He recognises this failing but does not lament the fact. He says in his preface that he realises that much of the evidence must come from stories more with the charm of poetry than the accuracy of history. However he does not mind this as he says he will 'neither affirm nor refute' such stories as he considers Rome worthy of such stories. This opinion is important for although he expresses the hope that his love for Rome has not impaired his judgement it seems that in fact it has. The glorification of Rome, because of his absolute belief in its superiority, seems more his aim than an accurate history, and if that includes including stories and tales, it does not matter.

Livy often hints that the version of the story of a certain event that he is offering may not be much more than a tale. When he talks about the competition between Romulus and Remus he writes 'There is another version of the story, a commoner one'. This in itself is sufficient for him. He does not attempt to argue or to analyse the stories, simply to present them both for the reader. This may seem an unhistoric attitude, however it would be a realistic attitude to the severely legendary nature of the sources which prohibits any firm conclusion being reached. He does in fact show occasionally an attitude that attempts to analyse. When he tells the story of the wolf suckling Romulus and Remus he suggests that it may be a cover for the fact that the woman was a whore. Also later when he talks of the qualities of Numa he suggests that Numa could not have obtained his wisdom from Pythagoras. He submits acceptable historical analysis on this point but it may only be to show that such wisdom could never have come from a foreigner. He also shows good historical analysis when talking of the building of the temple of Jupiter and how the historians Fabius and Picus disagree about sums of money. The reasoning at this point is sound and coherent and reveals true historical practices.

However these occasions are few. More commonly he presents two versions and offers no opinion, for instance about the death of Romulus. In fact the way he says a few dissidents disagreed showed that he wanted the divinity of Romulus to be true. Also if he does mention an opinion he sides with the commoner

view or the older authority preferring to trust antiquity rather than ask his own questions. This would not be at all acceptable to a modern historian.

However if Livy often shows that he is not a true historian in the modern sense, it may simply be because it was not wholly what he was aiming at. He often writes 'it is recorded' or 'it is said' but never says where he obtained his information, nor why this may have been thought. This is because often a story has been related not for its historical quality but for what it can teach. In his Preface Livy expresses the didactic element he wanted his history to have. He sees history as enabling the writer to give examples 'of fine things to take as models, base things, rotten through and through, to avoid. A modern historian would try to be unbiased in his history, but Livy is not unbiased at all and makes no secret of it. He often says 'heaven itself intervened' or that it was destiny because he wanted to glorify Rome's origins and emphasise its good elements in the old days. However he considered his contemporary society to have grown evil and therefore in need of teaching. Therefore he doesn't question Romulus' divinity very much as he saw it as showing young Romans what noble people they had degenerated from. Also he relates stories such as the rape of Lucretia with dialogue and vividness. A modern historian would not relate dialogue if he had no source but myth, but Livy saw it as acceptable and it shown what he thought people should have said. He saw it as acceptable if it taught people good things.

A modern historian's account of early Rome would, no doubt, be very different as the sense of responsibility would be entirely different. When Livy at the end recounts the speeches of his beloved Brutus he says no 'mere historian' could recount them honourably - and this shows his view towards his history, to glorify and show, and not necessarily be truthful.

*Examiner's comment: A+. An excellent answer, very thorough knowledge, mature analysis of preface and understanding of demands of modern history. Good comments on Livy's motives for 'unhistorical' practice.*

*Mark <sup>22</sup>/<sub>25</sub>.*

Section B No 1. Aristophanes Wasps lines 230-244

Author: Helen Brannigan, Shena Simon College, Manchester

*a) Describe the role of the chorus in this play.*

The chorus usually contained 24 members. In the *Wasps* the chorus represents the old citizens of Athens, those who are eager to serve as the jurymen. Their purpose is to support the views and feelings of Procleon as citizens who support Cleon and his policies. They are also seen as possessing those qualities which were necessary to win the war at Marathon in 490 and are therefore supporters of the traditional standards and morals.

The chorus first appear when Xanthias and Socias are sleeping thinking they have successfully secured Procleon, Anticleon's father. They are waiting to take Procleon to court with them. Having encouraged him to escape from the house by a rope Xanthias and Socias awake, and the chorus try to prevent one of the slaves from grabbing Procleon. They show that they are supporters of traditional values by their horror that a slave should treat his master in such a way. They threaten to sting the slave with their sting. They therefore defend Procleon and support his love for the courts. When Anticleon seeks to show him that he is wrong they still support Procleon, agreeing with him that his son has a strong argument. In the parabasis that follows Aristophanes uses the chorus to voice his own criticism of Cleon with a reference to the fact that Cleon took him to court for writing the play *The Babylonians* in 426 B.C. in which Aristophanes was accused of slandering the city in front of foreigners. In the chorus Cleon is said to have spewed forth a torrent of lies. The parabasis is also used to emphasise the chorus' role as supporters of Cleon by reference to their success at Marathon.

(mark for a - 7)

*b) Why is Cleon called the 'Great Protector'?*

For the jurymen like Procleon, Cleon was a "protector" since he (*underlined by examiner*) paid them a 3 obols fee for taking part in a jury. This was in fact a small amount but it acted as a kind of pension for older people. Its importance is emphasised by the leader of the chorus when his son asks if he may have figs to eat. His father answers that these are far too much of a luxury and that his fee will only just pay for a meal that day. When his son asks what would happen if there were no jury sitting, his father shudders at the idea. From a financial point of view therefore Cleon helped these old men. Cleon was the leading citizen at the time, and the jurymen, as Procleon points out, feel secure because Cleon looks upon them as supporters and allies.

(mark for b - 2, examiner's comment - political role?)

*c) How is the prosecution of Laches by Cleon parodied later in the play?*

Laches was sent to Sicily with a fleet of 20 ships in 427. He was accused of taking bribes from the Sicilian people, and when he returned to Athens in 422 he was given a trial. The prosecution is parodied later in the play. Anticleon having persuaded his father to stop going to court and hold trials and court cases in his own home instead, uses a domestic argument as his father's first trial. Labes is the defendant who is accused by the Dog of "siciliating" a Sicilian cheese and being an "eat-it-all-yourselfist" since he did not share the cheese with the Dog. Labes is representing Laches, and 'The Dog' was a nickname for Cleon. The cheese is representing the bribes Laches was supposed to have taken. In the trial various props are used to represent a court. Ladles are used for voting urns, a kneading trough is used for a shrine to Lycus, a pig-pen is used as the bar, wooden plates are used as notice-boards.

The Dog says that he should have been given some of the cheese. This is a suggestion that Cleon might have been quite satisfied with the activities of Laches had he also been given a share of the money. Anticleon's defence of Labes when he says that the Dog is lazy and stays at home is a suggestion that Cleon does not take an active part in the affairs of the city. The result of this trial is that Procleon, after weakening, is still determined to find Labes guilty, his son however leads his father, who is now in a distressed state, to the wrong ladle so that Procleon places his pebble in the 'not guilty' urn.

*(mark for c - 6, examiner's comment - very good)*

*d) Does Aristophanes seem to approve or disapprove of the jury system?*

Aristophanes seems to disapprove of the Athenian jury system. He illustrates the views of a man such as Procleon which show how the jury members believe that they are honoured people. Procleon tells of how tough men fawn to him, begging him for a less severe sentence, and how he is entertained by people telling jokes, legends and funny tales from Aesop. He says how often they bring their children into court to try to gain sympathy, and how some after gaining a light sentence play the flute for the jurymen. He says, and indeed believes that they have the 'real power' and that this power makes mere wealth look silly.

We however see the pathos in this view as Aristophanes reveals through the views of his son Anticleon that the old men are being duped. Anticleon tells his father that he is being bamboozled by these men he almost worships and is a slave without knowing it. He tells him how out of the twelve million drachmas of Athens' national income only 900,000 are taken up by jurymen's fees - less than 10% of the national income, without including the bribes received by threats and intimidation. Anticleon points to the hypocrisy of the system where the prosecutor will accept bribes and the defence will share this. He says that the jurymen who are "men of Marathon" would be richer if it were not for this "gang of demagogues". Here Anticleon is referring to those orators who use rhetoric to convince the jurymen. He says that the state wants the jurymen to be poor so that, like dogs, they will know the hand that feeds them so that they will give their support to people such as Cleon.

The argument adopted by Anticleon is very powerful and illustrates how the older people who believe they are performing a service to the community and that they are respected, are in fact being exploited. Although this view of Aristophanes is clearly expressed, he does not necessarily agree with the lifestyle of Anticleon. Although Procleon is seen to be rather naive, Aristophanes supports the old values and traditions which such a man as he represents.

*(mark for d - 6, comment - good)*

*Overall mark on this question 21/25.*

*Does the play Acharnians contain a serious political message for Athens?*

Author: Helen Brannigan, Shena Simon College, Manchester.

The *Acharnians* was written and produced in 425. It is a comedy and was evidently well received by his audiences at the Lenaea festival, winning first prize. However, underlying the humour there is a serious message for Athens.

The Peloponnesian War had begun in 431. This play is a plea, on behalf of Aristophanes, for a peace settlement. For six years the Spartans had been crossing the Isthmus at Corinth and destroying vines and olive trees particularly in Acharnae, 26 miles from Athens. Athens in response had been destroying crops in Megara. Dikaiopolis is a man from the country, frustrated because he and others have been forced to leave their homes and live in the city, leaving their land to be ravaged by the Spartans. The opening scene in itself shows Dikaiopolis sitting in the assembly place on the Pnyx waiting for the others to arrive. He is complaining about the attitude of other citizens to the assembly and the way they stay talking in the market place and when they arrive have a thought only for getting the best place in the assembly area. The indication is that the majority have no care for discussing peace.

Dikaiopolis is not a typical citizen at the assembly since normally people from the country would not be able to attend assembly meetings because of the distance they would have to travel. This distinguishes him from the others present and Aristophanes portrays him as the only figure who is able to see how the assembly is being manipulated. This is depicted by Amphytheus, a demi-god; he wishes to speak at the assembly but because he begins to talk about peace he is hauled away. There is a suggestion therefore that the assembly does not allow free speech and does not behave in a democratic way. This is an important point, but Aristophanes does not neglect his comedy and the fact that Amphytheus is a demigod and gives an account of all his ancestors provides the entertainment.

A second point which Aristophanes conveys through this opening scene is the way certain individuals are abusing their office. This is illustrated by the two ambassadors. The first is from Persia. He had been sent there to acquire gold, and he returns with the 'King's Eye' Pseudartabus. The ambassador, having been paid two drachmas a day while on his mission, complains about the fact that he and his retinue were forced to drink wine without water and also had to feast with the king himself. Dikaiopolis ridicules the whole mission pointing first to the fact that there is no gold, and then that the 'King's Eye' and his eunuchs are being impersonated by Athenian citizens.

The second embassy led by Theorus to Thrace is also revealed by Dikaiopolis to have been a waste of money. After complaints about the weather, in an endeavour to excuse the length of time the whole mission had taken, Theorus produces the army he was sent to acquire. It is called the Odomantian Army and is seen to be pathetic and quite unsuitable. Dikaiopolis views these embassies as excuses for people to gain money from the war, and therefore benefit themselves and wasting the city's resources.

This point is further emphasised by the appearance of Lamachus. Although there are suggestions that he was a cheat and a coward, he did die a brave death in Sicily in 415. However Aristophanes uses Lamachus to



represent those from the pro-war party. Dikaiopolis mocks Lamachus' fine battle adornments which provides the comedy in this particular episode. He also questions why men of 60 years old should be preparing to go into battle again and people such as him stay at home and are always in the pay queue. Lamachus uses the fact that he is democratically elected as his defence, but Dikaiopolis persists pointing out others who have also been democratically elected but still have to fight and still do not benefit financially. Although towards the end of the play Lamachus does prepare to go into battle, before he reaches the fighting he hurts his foot and head and is unable to go, thus stressing Lamachus' previous point.

Aristophanes also illustrates the abuse of Cleon in Dikaiopolis' speech when he is glad that Cleon coughed up his 30,000 drachs. Cleon was said to have accepted bribes from tribute-paying countries in order that he might lower their contribution. He was forced to give this back to the city.

Dikaiopolis in his speech in which he tries to prove to the men of Acharnae that not everything is the fault of the Spartans, trivialises the cause of the war by saying that the kidnap of one of the Spartans' prostitutes and then the kidnap of two of Aspasia's women began the war. This perhaps illustrates the view of Aristophanes that the ensuing conflict after the declaration of war is not in proportion to its causes. Dikaiopolis dressed as Telephus, a ragged beggar from one of Euripides' plays, shows disdain at the Megarian Decree introduced by Pericles in 432 and seen as one of the major causes of the war. This decree banned the Megarians from Athenian markets.

This disdain is emphasised by his attempt to establish a market to which the Boeotians and Spartans can all trade. Here we see the pathos of the Megarian man selling his daughters as piglets in return for garlic and salt which were Megara's chief products before the war. The appearance of Nicharchus as an informer declaring the Boeotians' products including lamp-wicks as "contraband of war", illustrates Aristophanes' view that the suffering caused by the war is unnecessary and that peace should be sought.

Although Dikaiopolis' solution to the problem is fantastical we all can see Aristophanes' hope for the future through the three peaces which are brought to Dikaiopolis by Amphytheus. The first is for five years and "stinks of shipyards and turpentine". The second is for ten years but smells like further embassies. The third is for thirty years and tastes like ambrosia and nectar, the foods of the gods. Aristophanes is therefore hoping for a long period of peace although the second peace is nearer to reality since although in 421 B.C. a temporary peace was settled the war continued after this until 404 B.C.

There is a suggestion that Dikaiopolis was played by Aristophanes in the actual production which would emphasise that Aristophanes felt strongly about the points that he was making. It is important also to appreciate the comedy in which these more serious assertions are contained.

Examiner's comment: excellent. Mark <sup>22</sup>/<sub>25</sub>

Section D Q.3

*If you had to choose one outstanding quality of Virgil in the Aeneid what would it be? Give examples and reasons for your choice.*

Author: Helen Brannigan, Shena Simon College, Manchester.

Virgil's ability to convey interesting if not always realistic characters is portrayed throughout the *Aeneid*. Book 2 is significant in relating the character of Priam. During this book Aeneas is relating his travels and experiences to Dido. He mentions Priam only briefly until he introduces his story of Priam with words:

"Perhaps you would like to know the destiny of Priam".

In reason of increasing importance Aeneas tells how when Priam saw his city being destroyed, the enemy within his home, he was anxious to take an active part in defending his city. He describes how he pulled onto his shoulders, trembling with age, armour long unused. His spear is described as being useless not only because of Priam's lack of strength but also because of the fated destruction of the city. It reflects the frailty of his physical condition but this contrasts with his determined mental attitude. He is persuaded at first by his wife Hecuba to stay with her and their daughters at the altar, but his feeling of loyalty towards his city and family is evident in his confrontations with Pyrrhus.

Virgil uses parallel narrative to tell the tale of the death of Polites, Priam's son as Pyrrhus kills him in the sight of his parents. It's when Priam sees this that he rises and ridicules Pyrrhus for not showing the decency shown by his supposed father Achilles to those who are defeated. He throws his spear which has no effect and merely hangs at the centre of Pyrrhus' shield. Pyrrhus scorns the old man and dragging him to the altar drives his sword into his body. Virgil adds to the effectiveness of this tale by his comment that Priam's body lay on the shore headless, without dignity. Although it is now a few years since the fall of Troy it is as though Priam's body would still be lying on that shore.

This character portrayal is excellent in its detail and in the feelings it arouses in the reader of pity for this man. It is effective because the events stand on their own as a story.

Although Virgil does not give as many details concerning the other two kings which appear in the *Aeneid*, he is able to arouse our feelings of sympathy for them also. Latinus king of Latium is seen as a man destined to allow his land to suffer war. When Turnus, having been incited by Allecto, is forced to demand war, Latinus shrinks from having to open the gates of the temple of Janus as a symbol that the land is at war. he is unable to do so and it is Juno who forces these gates open. His inability to do this reflects his own physical weakness also.

Evander, king of Pallanteum, gives help to Aeneas. He is a man destined to lose his son, Pallas, in the war which is to result in Aeneas being able to found his new city. His physical weakness is emphasised when he

wishes that he could accompany his son and Aeneas and fight a battle as he had done in his youth, when three times he had disarmed his opponent. It is also seen when he prays to the gods that if he is never to see his son return that he may die, as following this prayer he falls in a faint and is taken by his attendants inside his palace. Evander is also characterised by his poverty which is portrayed by Virgil as being an admirable quality. This was part of the Augustan ideology that excessive wealth was not desirable.

Both these kings only serve a purpose in the story in that the war follows both these episodes but Virgil gives enough description to enable us to appreciate them as characters and therefore as people.

Book 4 of the *Aeneid* tells of Aeneas' stay with Dido at Carthage. This is a story by itself and the characterisation of Dido is interesting because Virgil leaves the reader to contemplate how much of her character is genuinely Dido and how much appears because of the intervention of the gods.

Venus in an effort to anticipate any action by Juno, sends one of her Cupids disguised as Ascanius to breathe the flame of love and passion into Dido. Before this act she is seen to be a very generous person, accepting the Trojans into her city and even offering them joint leadership. After experiencing the effect of the Cupid we see a woman obsessed with love for Aeneas and who even forsakes the further development of her city in order to be with this man. Considering her story that she had led her people to build Carthage having abandoned her city since the murder of her husband Sychaeus by his brother Pygmalion, one would have thought her to be a determined woman with qualities of leadership. This view however is totally obscured by her violent and emotional reaction when she sees that Aeneas is preparing to leave her city. She accuses him of being a traitor and immediately suggests that if he goes there is only one destiny for her, by this she is referring to her death.

She is seen as being irrational, in her passion thinking that she could possibly leave her city and accompany Aeneas. She swears a curse when she sees his ships leaving and abandoning all her sense of reasoning kills herself. It is necessary for Aeneas to leave Carthage in order to fulfil his destiny and I believe that it is only because of the interference of Juno that Dido acted in such a way.

Virgil can be seen therefore to give effective character portrayals. His technique of introducing characters is also effective since he often introduces them in passing - for instance in the case of Palinurus and then later in his tale gives more detail to the character. Palinurus' death is described at the end of book 5.

(Examiner's comment - 'very good again'. Mark <sup>21</sup>/<sub>25</sub>)

Section A Q.2Homer *Odyssey* 10 lines 275-296

Author: Samantha Hawes, Sion Senior School, Worthing.

a) *Why is Odysseus going alone to visit Circe?*

Odysseus is going alone to visit Circe in order to find out what has happened to his men. He had a report of what happened from one of the men - Eurylochus - who had led the search party to Circe's castle. Eurylochus had described how he had remained outside when Circe invited the men into her castle, and how they hadn't returned. Odysseus, having previously divided his party into two groups, he being the leader of the group which was elected by lot to remain on the beach, therefore feels it his responsibility to find his men.

(Mark for a - 4)

b) *What did people i) hear and ii) see as they approached Circe's house?*

On arrival at Circe's house one could hear the goddess herself singing as she wove at her loom. (2 marks)  
People could also see the wolves, lions and other animals which could be heard whimpering and whining. These animals lay around the courtyard and the porch of Circe's castle and far from being very fierce they came up and licked the men with their tails wagging. These animals were in fact the men whom Circe had changed. (2 marks)

c) *Describe the 'medicine' which Hermes gives Odysseus as an antidote.*

Hermes had given Odysseus the herb moly which was what acted as an antidote. It was a small white flower whose roots grew deep in the earth. Odysseus describes how it was difficult for men to dig up. He goes on however to say that Hermes could obtain it because he was a god, 'and after all the gods can do anything'. (3 marks)

d) *Compare and contrast the two goddesses, Circe and Calypso, in their relations with Odysseus and their role in the story.*

Homer is keen to emphasise both the beauty and the talents of the two goddesses Calypso and Circe; thereby he increases the importance and strength of character of Odysseus. When Odysseus is talking to the Phaeacians he refers to how both Circe and Calypso wanted to make him their husband. Both goddesses obviously loved Odysseus and were reluctant for him to leave them. This is shown by Calypso's outrage when Hermes tells her that she must let him go, Odysseus having remained on Calypso's island of Ogygia for seven years by now, a "cold lover with an ardent dame". Calypso has even offered Odysseus the gift of immortality if he remains with her.

Circe too loves Odysseus and is reluctant to let him leave her. This is shown by the fact that Odysseus mentions that the men talk of leaving Aeaea when Circe is not there. When Odysseus returns from the

underworld Homer describes how Circe rushed down to the beach to meet him. When Odysseus finally leaves them both goddesses deck themselves in their finery to see Odysseus off their islands.

Both goddesses present an obstacle to Odysseus. Calypso has kept him a virtual prisoner for seven years. The gods of Olympus mention how even the day the gods ordained for Odysseus to return to his homeland has passed. Circe's treatment of Odysseus men is also a problem in that Odysseus must defeat Circe in order to keep his manhood and rescue his men. In both situations Odysseus is helped by a god. With Calypso it is Athene then Hermes who intervene. With Circe it is again Hermes who helps Odysseus. This emphasises Odysseus' importance in his relation with the gods.

Both Calypso and Circe seem to have little contact with the outside world or other kings, and Odysseus comes to them and changes this. Circe's dislike of men and people is shown by the fact she turns them into wild animals. However, Odysseus arrives, defeats her, and then he and his men are entertained very hospitably for a whole year. When Odysseus is talking to the Phaeacians he refers to the fact that neither god nor man will voluntarily encounter the goddess Calypso. However Odysseus is washed up on Ogygia and stays there for seven years. When we meet the goddesses both are singing and weaving at their looms. They are both accomplished and beautiful. Calypso lives in a cave which is exquisite, surrounded by copses of alders and aspens. Circe lives in a castle which is also beautiful. Both goddesses are hospitable in that Circe eventually provides Odysseus and his men with food and clothes. Calypso is also hospitable to Hermes.

Circe and Calypso's role is such that they both delay Odysseus at a time when it is necessary for him to return to Ithaca. It is emphasised that Calypso wants Odysseus because he is forbidden as a mortal. Circe has been warned that a man called Odysseus will arrive at her castle. Despite this both goddesses help Odysseus. Calypso has told him that the reason for his delay in returning home is due to Poseidon. When instructed to allow him to leave she helps him build the boat, providing him with the necessary tools and rations for his journey. Calypso also advises him how to sail by the stars. Circe too helps Odysseus in his journey home. She advises him carefully about the journey to Hades giving him detailed instructions concerning directions and what to do on arrival. She provides him with a favourable wind - on two occasions. On his return Circe warns him about the cattle of Hyperion as well as the dangers of Scylla and Charybdis.

Therefore these two beautiful and accomplished goddesses who love Odysseus as a mortal, both help and hinder him in his struggles to return to Ithaca.

(Examiner's comment 'add witch/woman contrast'. Mark for d - 12)

Overall mark -  $\frac{23}{25}$

Section B Q.1 Aristophanes *Wasps* Lines 230 - 244

Author: Samantha Hawes, Sion Senior School, Worthing.

a) *Describe the role of the chorus in this play.*

The chorus in Aristophanes' *Wasps* are in fact the Wasps referred to in the title of the play. They consist of the fellow jurymen of Procleon and are quite old, "sweet, shaky and antique". Aristophanes has disguised them as wasps because of the relation between a wasp's sting and the harsh penalties imposed with glee on their fellow-countrymen. "I'd like to come to court with you, Some solid lasting harm to do."

The chorus begin as old men/wasps who come to collect Procleon for his jury service. They are therefore colleagues of Procleon. They represent Athenian jurymen, their abuses "we snitched the old girl's kneading trough ..." and how they are "bamboozled by those men you worship". When they find that Procleon is being held prisoner by his son they form themselves into a battalion or swarm and try and help him escape. Thus their idea of stinging people is no longer a metaphor, they are literally attacking the slaves with their stings - "quick march stings right!" The chorus of wasps then preside over the debate between Procleon and Anticleon. They express the hope that Procleon will win the debate. However when Anticleon has spoken they agree with him - "We don't want to be slaves!" In a sense the chorus also represent Aristophanes' hope that the Athenian people will see the defects in their jury system. Aristophanes also uses the chorus in his parabasis to point out that his play *Wasps* is a "little fable with a moral"; he also uses them to express his idea that his comedy is at least original and hopes that it will win first prize.

(Mark for a - 7)

b) *Why is Cleon called the 'Great Protector'?*

Cleon is called the 'Great Protector' because of his self appointed role as guardian of the people and protector of democracy. However as one of the demagogues and therefore as Aristophanes implies only concerned with vested interests and personal gain he is often ridiculed. He is presented here as manipulating the Athenians, particularly the jurymen, with his skilful rhetoric. He is able to make them believe that he is their protector and thus the protector of democracy and all they stand for. The chorus of wasps worship him - "we lie in his arms and he keeps the flies off us" - and is referred to as the "Great Protector himself." The very name of the old man with juryitis proves that they feel Cleon is the guarantor of their power - Procleon. The Anti-Cleon faction however refer to him as a great fat whale figure with a voice "like a scalded cow".

(Mark for b - 4)

c) *How is the prosecution of Laches by Cleon parodied later in the play?*

Anticleon has finally arranged to prevent Procleon from attending the law court. However in order to keep him at home he has to set up his own law court. It is through this fictitious law court that Aristophanes ridicules

and parodies the trial of Laches by Cleon. The trial occurs when one dog called Labes (this is a pun on the name Laches) steals some Sicilian cheese from the kitchen. The real Laches has been accused of stealing money or receiving bribes from Sicily and is subsequently (*examiner's correction: 'was threatened with'*) brought to trial by Cleon. The second dog who brings the first dog to trial is simply called Dog or Kuon in Greek, a similar sound to Cleon.

Through this parody of the trial Aristophanes proves that Cleon is equally as guilty as Laches. First the prosecuting dog licks the face of Procleon the juryman, a parody of what the real Cleon does to the real jurymen. He then complains that the dog Labes has 'siciliated' the cheese and complains that there is "not room for more than one thief in the kitchen". A clue to the real reason for Cleon's trial of Laches? Anticleon defends the dog and tells Procleon how in effect this dog does all the work, while the other dog does nothing and complains. He produces various witnesses including 'citizen cheese grater' who claims the cheese was grated for the troops and then produces the children of the dog to persuade Procleon. Anticleon then guides Procleon the wrong way round the voting urns and so he acquits the dog Lakes.

(Mark for c - 5)

d) Does Aristophanes seem to approve or disapprove of the Athenian jury system?

Aristophanes does not intend to condemn totally the Athenian judicial system. He intends to point out the various abuses that occur within it. He condemns the vindictiveness of the jurymen, shown by the chorus of wasps and Procleon "he won't let me come to court with you Some solid lasting harm to do." He points out the Athenian love of sitting on a jury, "so used to clutching a voting pebble that his thumbs and forefinger are stuck together." (*Examiner's addition - 'over-zealous?'*) Aristophanes disapproves of the corruptions that are rife in the jury system. Because the jurymen have no legal guidance they are susceptible to influential speeches at the assembly or in the law courts. Especially by the fact that if harsh fines were not imposed on victims then the jury pay would be reduced. They are also susceptible to bribery outside the court, which is admitted by Procleon. The character of Procleon is itself a criticism of the jury system. This proves that Aristophanes feels that the election to a jury of anyone over thirty, regardless of character, is wrong. Procleon boasts of his past exploits e.g. pinching some vine props and "quick-footed and light-fingered". Aristophanes condemns the fact that the jurymen are being manipulated by the demagogues and wants to point out that the power they have is an illusion. One of the slaves has a dream about "sheep assembled on the Pnyx wearing little brown cloaks and carrying staves" the symbols of the juryman.

(Mark on d - 7)

Overall mark - 23/25

Section A Q.6 What conclusions about Euripides' views on women may be drawn from his *Medea* and *Hippolytus*?

Author: Ana Brandao, Queen's College Harley Street, London W1.

In Euripides' *Medea* and *Hippolytus* he shows two very different and contrasting pictures of a woman in a male dominated society, and what she has to resort to to survive, as well as the horrors, tortures and indignities that she is put through. In *Medea* the woman is strong. She has magical powers and the power of Hyperion to back her. She has done everything, even kin-murder, to stay with her husband and survive. Survival is her greatest aim. In *Hippolytus* Phaedra is almost a typical example of a woman in a male-dominated society. She is obsessed by the need for virtue and totally disregarded by the males. In this play Euripides brings out the human aspects of women and what happens if they are just normal with no superlative need for survival and merely want to be happy.

In *Medea* Euripides shows through the nurse that a woman should be obedient and compliant with her husband's wishes. In Medea's speeches there is a bitterness and sarcasm for the role of women and the indignities they have to suffer - men can abandon them and go off to another's bed, but **they** have to be good and chaste. There is a rejection by Medea through her magical powers and divine back-up of the role she should embrace. The nurse shows some fears for the indignities Jason has done to her, and Medea herself warns that she is not weak or passive, but bold and wilful, that she is loyal to her friends, but dangerous to her enemies. She takes on almost a man's role in the play, reacting against and winning through the traditional picture of the weak compliant wife who accepts her fate.

However Phaedra is stricken by a goddess - Aphrodite, and she is being used as a pawn to eliminate Hippolytus. She however does not know this but merely feels the terrible urge of her passions grow bigger until they become uncontrollable. She does accept though the role of women as faithful and chaste and complies with it. She rails against the falsely 'pure' women who betray their husbands, and resigns herself to dying for her love. She cannot fight her destiny even though it is just as unfair as Medea's; she has no divine support and her last note of defiance - the letter to Theseus - is merely another brick in the scheming wall of Aphrodite against Hippolytus.

It is perhaps in the men's speeches that it is clear what Euripides felt women were thought of as, and how he was trying to point out by his theories that they were not like that at all. Jason considers the sexual jealousy of the female, the terrible pride that is so hurt if "her" man decides to choose another one's bed, that is the woman's bane. He speaks of it disdainfully, never realising, and only really emphasising, the fact that it is not



that but the breaking of oaths, his carelessness, his thoughtlessness and self-centred attitude that hurt Medea. The fact that he abandoned her and their sons to marry a princess after all she had done for him including killing her own brother - this is what irks Medea.

As for Hippolytus, he shows his true revulsion of women. He wishes Zeus could have invented some other way for the creation of babies, and condemns their sexual urge as the most terrible of their curses.

It is by these speeches against women and by the fates of both Medea and Phaedra that Euripides shows us what he felt. He seems to show the utter callousness of the male-dominated society, how thoughtless and unknowledgeable of women they were. He shows us how, through the lack of communication between men and women, the ignorance of men about what women felt, resulting from it could cause such tragedy. He shows how for a woman it was very difficult to survive alone and unwanted if her husband left her, unless she had magical powers or divine assistance. He shows also the utter contempt that many males felt - considering the woman's feelings in situations of unwanted love or desertion, not at all relevant and expelling them from their thought and presence if they became too voluble - such as Creon did to Medea. He also shows how the tragedy of a woman - her suicide through rejection - was totally cast aside and forgotten if the tragedy of a man in any way came up at the same time. This is very clear in *Hippolytus* where Phaedra's body is just ignored except by Artemis' passing comments. Theseus laments and recognises his thoughtless rejection of Hippolytus, after Artemis points it out to him. Hippolytus has his mistake with Phaedra also reminded him by the constant presence of her body and by Artemis' words, and he shows not one sign of repentance or even recognition.

So throughout Euripides' two plays his views are very clearly shown, how they were treated and how difficult it was for them in his contemporary society. His views were mainly that the non-communication between sexes and the marked disinterest of men to women often caused many more tragedies than necessary, and should be noted and something done to improve the situation.

Examiner's comment - 'Excellent, very sensitive. Mark 22/25

Section A Q.1 Aeschylus *Agamemnon* lines 1212 - 1230.

Author: Felicity Steers, Bath High School.

a) *Briefly explain the situation on and off stage at this point in the play.*

This passage occurs about three-quarters of the way through *Agamemnon*, first play in Aeschylus' *Oresteian Trilogy*. At this point Agamemnon has returned from the Trojan War bringing with him a concubine, Cassandra, daughter of Priam of Troy and a prophetess of Apollo. He has committed *hubris* (an overpresumptuous act, bringing about divine wrath) by treading, at his wife Clytemnestra's insistence, on lovely tapestries as he enters the palace. Therefore the audience is awaiting his doom and at this point Agamemnon is being deceived off stage by Clytemnestra into having a bath in which she will trap him with a net and then murder him with the help of Aigisthos her lover and Agamemnon's cousin. Off stage therefore tension is mounting. Meanwhile on the stage Cassandra has been left in her chariot by Agamemnon. She is having terrible visions of horror in the palace, seeing past murders as well as those to come: her own and Agamemnon's. In stages she is quite coherent despite her terror and has engaged in conversation with the bewildered chorus. (Mark on a - 5)

b) *What was Cassandra's 'trespass' (line 1) and punishment?*

Cassandra's trespass occurred before she left Troy. She had been approached by the god Apollo and had agreed to sleep with him. He granted her the gift of prophecy. However she later refused him her chastity and in his anger he deemed that although she could see the future it would be her fate that no-one would believe or understand her. (Mark on b - 3)

d) *Tell the story behind Cassandra's visions (lines 6 - 11).*

Cassandra's visions refer to one of the stages in the bloodcurse on the house of Pelops. Pelops' family had been cursed by Oinomaos upon his death due to the acts of Pelops. Therefore trouble occurred when he had two sons, Atreus and Thyestes. The brothers were both lusting for the throne of Argos but upon Pelops' death it was Atreus who gained the crown leaving Thyestes dissatisfied. Thyestes tried to reclaim the throne, and also seduced the wife of Atreus. Atreus in fury banished his brother. However many years later Thyestes returned with his three children, the youngest being Aigisthos. Atreus pretended to welcome Thyestes and prepared a feast in his honour, but made the dishes from the murdered bodies of Thyestes' oldest children and fed them to Thyestes. Thyestes naturally was revolted when he heard about what he had done and pronounced a curse on the house of Atreus, which was inherited by Atreus' sons Agamemnon and Menelaos. Cassandra's visions refer to the murder of Thyestes' innocent children 'so small and young'. She sees Thyestes' curse as a 'shadow hovering above the house' (the house in the *Oresteia* was a symbol of the family unit, and she sees Thyestes' sin - 'the meat their father tasted of'. (mark on C - 5)

d) *Who is the 'strengthless lion' (line 13) and what is his role in the play?*

The term 'strengthless lion' refers to Aigisthos, who is the only remaining child of Thyestes. He

has an important role in the play as the lover of Clytemnestra whilst Agamemnon is in Troy; 'strengthless lion' refers to the fact that he is seeking revenge for his siblings' death and will aid Clytemnestra in her successful destruction of Agamemnon, and will rule like a regal lion in Agamemnon's place (yet still 'strengthlessly' dominated by Clytemnestra). His role in the play therefore is as a consort to Clytemnestra, a living embodiment of past murders, a reminder of the bloodcurse of Thyestes, a factor in the death of Agamemnon. (Mark on d - 4)

e) How are the visions of lines 6 - 11 and the reference to the 'strengthless lion' relevant to the poet's dramatic purpose?

The reference to 'strengthless lion' is relevant to the poet's purpose. It gives us an insight into Aigisthos that we would not otherwise have as he appears but briefly on the stage at the end of the *Agamemnon*. The image of Aigisthos as a 'strengthless lion' is particularly apt: he is a king with little power, an avenger who leaves the murder to a woman, a cowardly, dominated man in a position of lionly power. Therefore the phrase is relevant to the poet's dramatic purpose by giving the audience a neat character summary of Aigisthos.

It is also dramatically relevant as it fits in with the animal imagery which is used throughout the *Oresteia*. Imagery was very important in this form of drama because there was little visual imagery on stage with the exception of a few props (e.g. Agamemnon's chariot) and the tragic masks worn by the actors. Aeschylus makes much use of animal imagery - the chorus in the *Agamemnon* sing a long ode about a lion cub pampered by a household which eats its keepers. This horrific tale is another aspect of lion imagery, but snake imagery is also used as a symbol of death (e.g. Clytemnestra's dream in the *Libation Bearers*).

The phrase is also used to bias the audience's views on the character of Aigisthos. The idea here is to portray Aigisthos dishonourably and thus ennoble Agamemnon.

The visions are very relevant to Aeschylus' dramatic purpose. They too serve to bias an audience and direct sympathy. Here in fact they invoke horror at the past possibly giving us a foretaste of horror to come. These visions build up dramatic tension. The visions are also dramatically very relevant in that they build up a picture of past events whilst foreboding future ones. They therefore serve dramatically to extend the scope of time on the stage, detailing past and future events as well as present ones. Detailed and gory descriptions such as these are also used to replace action on the stage. Without props such action is difficult, and it was traditional in Greek drama to avoid violent action performed. Instead such events tend to be vividly often horrifically described and have the dramatic purpose of appealing to the audience's imagination. These particular visions also serve to keep the audience aware of the past horrors in order to explain and rationalise present ones (i.e. the deaths of Cassandra and Agamemnon at Clytemnestra's hand). They therefore are very dramatically relevant in all the ways explained above.

(Mark on e - 7)

Overall mark <sup>24</sup>/<sub>25</sub>.

Section D Q.1

Author: Felicity Steers, Bath High School.

a) *Give the shape, name the painter, and suggest an approximate date for this vase.*

This vase is an amphora, the shape being used for storing wine. It is a basic amphora and not a 'neck' amphora which has a separate neck, or a 'pelike' which has a more sagging belly.

**(illustration)**

The painter of the vase is Exekias, who reached the heights of blackfigure vase painting. An approximate date for the vase is 530 B.C.. The black figure painting here is at its height; careful, precise, accurate but lively, and after 530 the red figure technique developed probably introduced by the Andocides painter. The vase therefore is dated right at the end of the black figure period 550-530 B.C.

(Mark on a - 6)

b) The two central figures are Achilles and Ajax. They are both heroes in the Trojan War story, fighting on the side of the Greek forces under Agamemnon against Ilium or Troy to win back Helen of Troy., Agamemnon's sister-in-law who had been seduced and taken away by Paris prince of Troy. Achilles and Ajax are both important in the Trojan story. Ajax is a magnificent fighter who never needs any divine help and is a bulwark to the Greek army. Achilles is a Greek leader, Prince of the Myrmidons and son of Peleus and Thetis at whose wedding the Trojan War originated from a divine fight over a golden apple. They are both therefore not only connected but integrated into the story of the fall of Troy. Achilles in fact kills Hector, leader of the Trojans thus providing the Greeks with the first step towards victory.

(Mark on b - 6)

c) In this scene there is obviously a break in the fighting. Both men have paused to play a board game (traditionally draughts). They have hung up their shields, Ajax has removed his helmet, whilst Achilles' is pushed back on his head. The two men lean on their spears and sit bent forward over the game board in intent concentration.

(Mark on c - 3)

d) Exekias has obviously put much thought into the composition of the decoration of the vase. He has chosen to fill a red metope extending from the neck of the amphora to just past its mid-belly, and placed so that it does not quite fill the space between the handles. Exekias has therefore given himself a clearly defined area in

which to compose a design which will fit it satisfactorily. I believe that the artist has achieved a composition which is better than simply 'satisfying'.

Exekias has used much symmetry in his design. The composition is perfectly balanced across the space of the metope in the form of a double triangle which creates a rhythmic 'criss-cross' effect.

**(illustration)**

As can be seen here Achilles and Ajax form one triangle in front of another formed by the apexes of their spear heads and the box on which the draughts is being played. This composition is very simple but very effective, as it creates geometrical blocks of shape which lead the eyes round the space in the metope rather than detracting attention elsewhere. Even the band of decoration around the neck of the vase does not detract from the composition as it is an echo of the delicate patterns on the cloaks of the two heroes.

It could be argued that the intense symmetry of the composition creates a very severe effect. However it is noticeable that in Greek art at this time symmetry was popular. Even the male nude statues or *kouroi* of the period have vertical and horizontal symmetry. Also there are subtleties in the work of Exekias which soften the hardness of his composition. The extremely delicate patterns of the heroes cloaks add an intricacy to the composition breaking up the geometrical triangles of the design. The subtle differences in the poses of the two men also serve to make the composition less harsh. For instance Achilles wears his helmet whilst Ajax does not. Ajax holds his spears in his left arm, Achilles in his right. This also helps to add depth to the composition as Ajax' spears are drawn in front of the table whilst Achilles' are behind, thus creating three separate planes within the composition. A sense of depth is also created by the positioning of the metope on the vase - Achilles helmet curves gently with the shape of the vase giving a real sense of form. This may be accidental but is nonetheless effective.

The angularity of the composition is broken by the introduction of flowing curves - the heroes arms meander gently from shoulder to hand, heads and helmets are highly domed, but delicacy is maintained by the use of tapering forms such as the hands and feet of the heroes and the plumes of their helmets. The spears in the background and foreground are a strong form but not as heavy as the forms of the heroes, giving the composition a nice balance between large and small forms, heaviness and delicacy, and also darkness and light (contrast between the black and the red of the paint work).

Generally the composition fits the space well. One's eyes flow along the diagonal rhythms of the metope, but attention is also drawn to the most important part of the vase, the board game, by the intent stares of the heroes, the flowing lines of arms and spears and by the fact that this is the centre of the composition.

Exekias may not have created an anatomically accurate drawing, but his design sense is infallible and his precise drawing and high quality incision render him a master of black figure art.

(Mark on d - 10)

Overall mark <sup>25</sup>/<sub>25</sub>.

Section A Q.5

a) Discuss the character of Oedipus as represented by Sophocles in the Oedipus Tyrannus.

b) Was his tragedy due to malignant fate or his own character?

Author: Felicity Steers, Bath High School.

a) Sophocles' character Oedipus in *Oedipus Tyrannus* is very complicated. He is a character who has intrigued audiences in the past 2500 years. The play with its dark plot and intense imagery and characterisation has been hailed as a masterpiece of Classical literature by many, including Aristotle who claimed that Oedipus was a true tragic hero, neither good nor bad, but commanding our sympathy. Oedipus' character embodies the three characteristics that Aristotle claims make a tragic hero. These are firstly *anagnorisis* - a recognition of the truth of the situation in the play by the character. Oedipus in this play develops as he learns the dreadful truth of his past - that he has been unable to avoid marrying his mother and murdering his father. In the light of this, the play is one long *anagnorisis* scene. *Peripeteia* or a reversal of fortune, another of Aristotle's stipulations, is also embodied in Oedipus as during the play we see his character's situation reversed from king to beggar, from ignorance to knowledge, from sighted to blind. Oedipus also has *hamartia* another Aristotelian aspect of tragedy, that being a conscious or unconscious moral flaw in the character which leads to its downfall. It has also been said that Oedipus' *hamartia* is his bad temper, but this aspect of his character (though predominant in such scenes as the long argument with Teiresias the prophet wherein Oedipus gets more and more frustrated) does not lead to his downfall. The flaw in his character which does is his background - the divine oracle which ties him to the fate of marrying Jocasta his mother and killing Laius his father. Therefore the character of Oedipus is the true tragic hero, embodying all Aristotle's values.

However this alone does not make him the powerful character which Sophocles has created. Phaedra of Euripides could be said to have all these qualities but is not as memorable. Oedipus' character is very honourable. He seeks truth at all times even when it becomes clear it will lead to his own downfall. This is an admirable trait. He also embodies the Athenian ideal of thought and action. This is clear at the beginning of the play, where we find Oedipus has already sent Creon to the Delphic oracle to gain advice on curing Thebes of its plague.

Oedipus' arrogance and charisma may be a reason why he is so convincing and memorable. He is a father figure, proud of it, calling his people 'my children'. His pride is reflected in his triumphant words 'I am Oedipus', but he is still 'Oedipus the ignorant' and his ignorance of that fact makes him intensely vulnerable as we are shown by in the dramatic irony of the play (for instance when Oedipus tells the wise Teiresias he is blind).

Yet despite his vulnerability Oedipus is also resilient. Brought down to the role of a beggar he maintains his dignity when he explains why he has blinded himself. He maintains an element of regality when he orders

Creon to 'take me inside' and even his blinding shows a kind of resilient independence and fighting back even in the face of such dire troubles.

*(Mark on a - 9; examiner's comment: 'Slightly more learning than judgement, but impressive.')*

b) Oedipus' tragedy can be defined on two levels. If his tragedy is his hamartia, the dreadful deed of being prophecied to kill your own father and marry your mother, then Oedipus is indeed a victim of malignant fate, in my opinion.

It had been preordained by prophecy when he was born to Jocasta that he would kill his father. Her attempts to prevent this (i.e. by exposing her child on Mnt. Cithaeron) were foiled by the kindness of the rescuing shepherds. Oedipus' own attempts to avoid the Delphic prophecy that he heard, were unsuccessful as he ironically returns home to the danger of Thebes, escaping from the safety of his foster-parents Polybus and Merope. He is thus unable to avoid malignant fate - unless you take the view that his independence of character and honourable wish to avoid fate were what actually led him home to Thebes.

Surely it cannot be denied that it is fate which leads Oedipus to meet and kill his father Laius on the road to Thebes? (Unless it is argued that it was Oedipus' renowned short-temper rather than fate which led to the murder. Maybe the short-temper is ironically inherited from Laius himself.)

On the other hand it could be said that Oedipus' tragedy is his discovery of the truth of his situation and the consequent death of Jocasta and blinding of Oedipus. If this is the case then it is easier to attribute the tragedy to the elements of Oedipus' own character.

Oedipus' combination of honour and quick wit lead him on the downward slope to discovery of his fate. It is his sense of honour and dignity which make him feel so shameful at the crimes he has unwillingly committed that he blinds himself. In fact it is his sense of honour that leads him to run away from Polybus and Merope to the dangers of Thebes in the first instance.

His determination in his search for truth, his singlemindedness, leads also to his discovery of the truth and the final tragedy. He refuses to be stopped by Teiresias' warnings, which he puts down to conspiracy, or Jocasta's pleading, which he thinks is caused by her fear of his low birth. This refusal to listen to others and sort of accusing self-persuasion are elements of Oedipus' own character which seal his doom.

In conclusion, the tragedy of Oedipus' situation is brought about by malignant fate. His attempts to avoid it are unsuccessful and strange coincidences lead to doom. But it is the nobleness of Oedipus, his search for sight, light, truth and his hatred of conspiracy and intrigue, combined with his insecure need for personal identity which leads to the fatal discovery of the truth. This however is not tragic in that Oedipus is no longer sinful or ignorant but a man who knows who and what he is.

*(Mark on b - 13)*

Overall mark - 22/25

Section D Q.2

Author: Felicity Steers, Bath High School.

*a) Suggest a possible date for this statue and give your reasons.*

I think a possible date for this statue is about 400 B.C. There are several reasons for this. Firstly it is anatomically convincing, the woman is well-rounded and her drapery is realistic. The sculptors of the fourth century were very adept at authentic portrayal of human figures. Another reason is that the statue has a gentleness about it which does not overawe an admirer. She has heavy eyelids and expressively sunken eyes, and holds her arm out welcomingly (she may have held something in her hand). This portrayal of a very human figure, although the statue represents a goddess, only occurs after the severe or early classical period of 500-450; this statue is clearly not severe, thus dating her later than this. Also she wears a peplos gown - a simple garment pinned at the shoulders. This only came back into fashion in the late fifth/early fourth century B.C. after the previous dominance of the more floating chiton (compare Nikes on balustrade of Temple of Athene Nike, Acropolis, 407 B.C.)

*(Mark on a - 4)*

*b) Give a brief account of how such a figure might have been made.*

The statue is bronze. She would therefore have been cast, probably hollow cast - the method which was discovered in Samos in the sixth century B.C. The process begins when the sculptor makes a basic model from a substance which is plastic, such as terracotta clay. This he shapes to perfection. Then the model is coated smoothly with wax and is placed in a container of more clay or some other pliable substance which can be packed firmly around the wax-covered model. This was then all heated, the outer mould will harden and the wax will melt and run out leaving a thin mould in which is poured molten bronze. The model may well be held in place in its mould by iron stakes. When the bronze has set the outer and inner moulds are removed leaving a hollow bronze cast. This process is called the 'lost wax' process.

**(illustration)**

*(Mark on b - 7)*



c) *How do we know whom the figure represents?*

This figure represents Athena, female warrior goddess and patron of Athens. This is evident from her helmet which she traditionally wears: the only other females in Greek art to wear helmets would be Amazons. The figure also wears an 'aegis'. This is the cloak round her shoulders which is tasselled with snakes and which bears on the front the shrunken head of the Gorgon Medusa. Athena always wears this magical cloak. The Gorgon was slain for her by Perseus and is clearly visible in this statue below Athena's breasts.

*(Mark on c - 4)*

d) *What effect do you think the figure is intended to create?*

I think this statue is intended to create religious awe, but not fearful awe. Pheidias, in the fifth century created fearful divine statues, designed to emit force and power. Here, I think, the statue is intended to awe us with its beauty - Athena is elegant, voluptuous and has a delicate face with large attractive eyes. The effect aimed at, I believe, is one of a divinely physical form, a human ideal. Athena as a patron of Athens would be a most popular goddess and her beauty would be expected.

She is not however fearful, and corresponds more to the 'humanised gods' such as Praxiteles' Apollo Suroktanos rather than the awesome figures of Pheidias and Polyklitos. If she is around 400 B.C. then she was made in a period of Athenian decline, and rejects the past sufferings of the Peloponnesian war in her expressive eyes, gentle curves and outstretched hands. However this statue is by no means intended to be anything but divine. Her aegis, helmet and exceptional beauty separate her from humanity, she is an ideal form. Her voluptuous figure suggests good health and plenty of food; therefore I think she is intended to embody thoughts of plenty, of beauty, but there is also an element of sadness in her eyes maybe because of the wisdom which Athena was thought to possess.

Her pose is relaxed and balanced and she embodies peace in this statue rather than war. She is intended to create an effect of the wise side to character, rather than the less feminine aggressive side.

*(Mark on d - 7)*

Overall mark <sup>22</sup>/<sub>25</sub>