

Candidate 1 evidence

Why was the Roman army so effective?

- full-time professional – compare same
- best recruits – compare same
- well-equipped
- well-trained – use Source 1 – swords/shields
- Source 1 – late on/not by soldier
- superior tactics – testudo – compare armoured cars same
- Source 2 – emperor Trajan's war – details must be right for Trajan – carver knows – weak spot
- good discipline – kill sleeping sentry – compare different – deserters
- conclusion – very effective
- move fast – carry stuff – baggage wagons slow
- engineers/builders – bridges/roads/forts – compare RE same

Source 1 - Vegetius 1.11 (4th century AD)

The early Romans made wicker shields twice as heavy as those used in battle and gave recruits wooden swords, again double the normal weight. They practise with these at stakes morning and afternoon. A stake is 6 feet high and is fixed in the ground firmly. The recruit practises with his wicker shield and wooden sword against this, just as if he was fighting a real enemy.

Source 2 - carving of a testudo from Trajan's Column in Rome (113 AD)



Why was the Roman army so effective?

The Roman army is well known for being very effective. It meant the Romans could conquer and control a great empire. I intend to show why it was so good.

One thing that made the army effective is that it was professional. The soldiers in it joined as a full-time job. This gave it an advantage when fighting enemies with part-time forces like the Gauls who only came together when there was a war and didn't train all the time. This is like the British army today where being a soldier is a full-time career where you are dedicated to the job.

The Romans also had strict rules about who could be a soldier. You had to be a certain height, have good eyesight, be physically fit and able to read and write. If you were joining the legions you had to be a citizen. Being selective like this meant you started out with the best men and so they would become effective soldiers. Soldiers joining the British army today also have to pass a medical and come up to standard.

Unlike many of their enemies the Roman army was also very well equipped. Each soldier had standard body armour and a helmet which gave protection, but also allowed him to move easily. Their javelins allowed them to weaken the enemy from a distance before attacking close up with short stabbing swords ideal for close action. Their well-designed equipment made them an effective fighting force.

Training also made the Roman army effective. In Source 1 Vegetius describes how recruits trained with a wooden sword and wicker shield which were twice as heavy as real ones. I think the explanation for this is that using heavy ones would build up your strength in training and then when you used a real sword and shield in battle it would be easy because they would seem light.

Source 1 is quite late (4th century AD) and speaks about "the early Romans", so it might not still be the same in his own day. I also found out that Vegetius was not a soldier, so is not writing from his own experience. He is getting his information from books which might be wrong.

Another thing that made the Roman army effective was superior tactics. One tactic was the testudo. This is when a unit of soldiers formed up with their shields held all round and above the formation so it was completely covered and could move close to the enemy without being

hit by arrows or spears. This was effective as it protected the men until it was time to break out and fight. The equivalent in the modern army would be moving men in armoured cars.

Source 2 is a Roman carving which shows a testudo attacking a fort. It is a reliable source as it comes from Trajan's Column in Rome which shows the emperor Trajan leading his army against Rome's enemies and he would want everything to be shown accurately. The man who carved it shows so much detail that he must have seen a testudo himself. For example, it shows the one weakness of a testudo – the legs. An enemy should aim at them. Maybe he travelled with the army to make sketches of what happened.

Good discipline made the Roman army effective too. If you didn't do your job properly you could be beaten or made to do extra work, like cleaning the baths. This meant that soldiers would want to perform well to avoid punishment. If you fell asleep on sentry duty you could even be killed. Nowadays the British army has strict rules and punishments, but they never kill a soldier, not even for deserting.

In conclusion, the Roman army was very effective for all the reasons I have given above. It was also effective because it could move fast. This was because all the men carried their own weapons, rations and cooking pot, so didn't have to wait for slow baggage wagons. It was also effective because the soldiers were trained to be engineers as well as fighters. The men built their own forts, bridges and roads and didn't have to rely on civilian engineers to do it for them. This is like the Royal Engineers in the British army today.

Candidate 2 evidence

Women in classical Athens

- girls – not valued – no school – housework - mothers – Afghanistan
- married at 12 – Scotland 16 – Source 1 – woman speaks - written by man
- run house – Source 2 – jobs – depends on status – not typical
- dinner parties - reputation
- conclusion
- not same rights – no politics
- shorter lives – childbirth – today
- happy - used to it

Source 1. Euripides, Medea, lines 230 - 237 (5th century BC)

Of all living beings, we women are the most unlucky. First, we have a dowry which must buy a husband to control our bodies; not having a husband is worse. Secondly, there is the important question: is he a good or bad husband? Women have no easy way out of marriage and cannot say no to their husbands.

Source 2. Euripides, Hecuba (5th century BC)

My father was a king, but now I am a slave! Perhaps I might fall into the hands of some cruel master, one that would buy me for money – me, a princess. This man would force me to make bread for him, or sweep his house or he might set me working at the loom, leading a life of misery.

Women in classical Athens.

At least half the people in classical Athens would have been women. This essay looks at their lives.

When girls were born, they were not valued as much as boys. They didn't even get to go to school but had to stay at home and learn housework and childcare from their mothers. In some countries like Afghanistan it's the same today with education being considered as only suitable for boys.

When a girl was aged 12, she was considered ready to be married. This is much younger than in Scotland today where the minimum age for getting married is 16. It's the same for both boys and girls now. A useful source for telling us about girls getting married is from the play *Medea* by the Athenian playwright Euripides. It's useful because it gives us a woman's view of getting married – having to have a dowry and not knowing what your husband would be like because you would not get to know him before you married. However, although a woman says it in the play, the play was written by a man who would be giving a male opinion of what a woman might think.

After they were married, women were expected to run the house and do the cooking and cleaning and spin thread and weave it into cloth for clothes etc. They also had to make sure the slaves did their work properly.

In the play *Hecuba*, Euripides makes one of his characters who has been captured in war say "I might fall into the hands of some cruel master, one that would buy me for money – me, a princess. This man would force me to make bread for him, or sweep his house or he might set me working at the loom, leading a life of misery." This is a useful source because it tells us some of the jobs done by women in the house. It also reminds us that life was different for different kinds of women. They were not all exactly the same, but your life depended on whether you were free or a slave, rich or poor. However, you can't be sure if all women were miserable doing housework as it's an ex-princess speaking and she was used to telling the slaves what to do, not being told to do work herself.

One shocking thing I learned about women in classical Athens is that they couldn't join their husband and his guests at a dinner party in their own home even if they had cooked the meal and done all the work for it. This was because women were not supposed to mix with men

who were strangers in case they lost their good reputation, so her husband was not being unkind to her, just protecting her from being talked about.

Although women were not supposed to mix with men or leave the house without an escort, they did attend religious festivals and some even became priestesses.

So Athenian women did not have brilliant lives. The main reason was because they weren't given the same rights as men, for example they were not allowed to go to take part in politics like voting in the Assembly. Also because they had shorter lives than the average man because so many women died early in childbirth. This doesn't happen so much nowadays as medical care has got much better and women rarely die in childbirth. In fact, the average woman lives longer than the average man today. But although they weren't treated the same as men they were probably quite happy as girls were brought up to expect this kind of life and for them it was absolutely normal – just like their mothers and all the other women they knew.