Part 3: Individual study

It is appropriate for the teacher to encourage students to reflect upon which aspects of classical study are of most interest to them, combining this with a consideration of students’ personal strengths. They can then decide together whether research, speaking or writing would be the best option to demonstrate each student’s knowledge and abilities. The teacher will also need to ensure that each student is familiar with the information given for the individual study under “Syllabus content” in this subject guide. The sample topics in particular are designed to suggest the range of suitable topics and to act as a guide for the suitability of the student’s own ideas.

Option A, the research dossier, is by design very broad in its possibilities, since it is intended to allow the student wide latitude in topic and format options. Students may annotate just about anything relevant to their personal interest in classical language, history or civilization. Examples may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a collection of pictures or drawings
- programme notes for a play or musical performance
- a collection of architectural designs
- medical terms.

It is very important, however, that the guidelines for presenting the dossier are strictly adhered to.

Option B, the oral presentation, has quite strict guidelines for the recording of the piece (or pieces) read aloud (see the Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme), but the selections to be read in Latin or Classical Greek may be very broad in scope, as long as they are within the 7-minute limit for SL or the 10-minute limit for HL. Students should prepare poetry to be read with the metre in mind, and that prose should reflect the tone of the piece as the author may have intended it. There is no one correct form of pronunciation but the choice must be consistent and the student should aim to give the listener a clear sense of what is being said.

Option C, the composition, is open in regard to the student’s choice of material for translation. It is important to note, however, that any poetry must scan and that, whatever the student chooses, the finished product should be in the style of the classical author. The commentary that is handed in with the translation should point out which stylistic points are included in the student’s translation.

The teacher should copy the assessment criteria for internal assessment that are found in this guide and give them to the students. Students at the start of the course must be aware of the standard they will be expected to reach at the end of the two-year Diploma Programme course.

Help w/ first draft
Leave 2nd draft to student
Composition hardest

Extended Essay is exclusively Classical topic
Research Dossier can be done on Classical influence
Suggested preparation
The texts should be read closely. Students will be expected to develop a close and accurate understanding of the meaning of the language and the style and genre represented by each author. Some background knowledge of each author is expected (for example, dates, milieu, major works, most distinctive characteristics).

The most important preparation must be the reading of the texts, and here a good commentary is the most useful aid. Some modern works of criticism may also be helpful in developing the students' understanding of the texts.

The use of dictionaries is not permitted for paper 2.

Part 3: Individual study
The aim of this part of the course is to allow the student to examine in some depth an aspect of classical language, literature or civilization that is of particular interest. In the case of Latin, periods after the classical period may also be studied. Students prepare one of the following options for internal assessment by the teacher. Further information is given in "Internal assessment details—SL and HL" in this guide.

- Option A—Research dossier
- Option B—Oral presentation
- Option C—Composition

Role of the teacher
Teachers should guide students in their choice of option and support them appropriately throughout their individual studies. However, written drafts, which will form part of the material for final assessment, should not be corrected by the teacher.

The teacher is required to verify that the individual study is the student's own work.

Option A—Research dossier
A research dossier is an annotated collection of primary source materials relating to a topic in Roman or Classical Greek history, literature, language, religion, mythology, art, archeology or their later influence. These may be, but are not required to be, related to an aspect of part 2 of the syllabus. A dossier may combine a variety of sources but it must focus on one topic, issue or question.

The dossier should consist of:
- an introduction that justifies and explains the choice of question or topic
- source material interspersed with annotations that justify and explain the choice of sources
- a conclusion
- a bibliography giving details for all the source materials included.

Footnotes (or endnotes) may be used to cite references or to provide additional explanatory information.

Students should establish clear and realistic limits for the research dossier. It is an annotated collection of source materials, not an essay.
The dossier should show:
- a clear statement of aims
- considerable factual information
- presentation in a logical, coherent fashion
- critical use of a variety of primary and secondary sources
- analysis and interpretation
- personal response.

The suggested number of sources is 7–12 at SL and 10–15 at HL.

The total length of the annotations (that includes the introduction and the conclusion) must be a maximum of 800 words at SL and 1,200 words at HL. Source material, footnotes and bibliography are not included in the word count.

It must be made absolutely clear which parts of the dossier are primary source materials and which are the student's own annotations.

The primary source materials may include quotations from the works of Latin or Classical Greek authors and/or visual material such as maps, pictures, diagrams and photographs. Extracts from texts, either in the original Latin or Classical Greek, or in a modern language, should each be no longer than 10 lines of verse or 150 words of prose. Students should not rely on a small number of lengthy quotations. Secondary source material such as published historical works and commentaries does not count as primary source material but may be used as part of the annotation.

Where it is appropriate to include translations of passages or inscriptions, for example from the original Latin/Classical Greek, these should be provided as footnotes or appendices and not included in the word count. Translations may be taken from standard sources or may be the student's own. No credit is given for translation in this component of the examination, as it is already assessed elsewhere.

The chosen topic should deal with literary, artistic, archeological, historical, religious, social or economic aspects of the Roman or Greek world, and may include the influence of the classical world in later times. Students should be encouraged, where appropriate, to make maximum use of locally available resources. A selection of literary sources could illustrate, for example, character, sets of values, metrical devices, rhetorical devices and sentence structure.

The collection of data or passages should normally be undertaken on an individual basis (except where group work is essential, for example, in archeological fieldwork). The presentation, analysis and annotation of data must always be undertaken on an individual basis. If two or more students choose the same aspect for the research dossier, they are required to work independently of each other.

**Option B—Oral presentation**

The student is required to read aloud one or more passages in Latin or Classical Greek, totalling no more than 7 minutes for SL and 10 minutes for HL, and to supply a written commentary. The total length of the written commentary must be a maximum of 800 words at SL and 1,200 words at HL.

A recording of the reading is made for moderation purposes.

The piece or pieces to be read should be carefully chosen to allow the student to display an understanding of language and context through the accuracy and expressivity of the presentation.
**Written commentary**
Each reading must be accompanied by a written commentary that:

- highlights reasons for the choice of passage(s)
- describes any difficulties encountered, and how they were tackled
- gives a line-by-line explanation of the interpretation informing the student’s reading.

**Option C—Composition**
The student is required to translate a single, short piece of verse or prose, written in English, French or Spanish, into Latin or Classical Greek in the style of a classical author, and to supply a written commentary. The total length of the written commentary must be a maximum of **800 words** at SL and **1,200 words** at HL.

Great care should be taken in the selection of the passage to be translated and in the choice of the classical author to be imitated: this is not an exercise in creative writing.

The maximum length of the piece is either:

- **15 lines** of verse (in any metre), or
- **200 words** of prose.

**Written commentary**
Each composition must be accompanied by a written commentary that:

- explains the choice of passage and classical author
- describes any difficulties encountered and how they were tackled
- gives a detailed explanation of the student’s reasons for choosing particular words or phrases in the composition.

**Examples**

**Option A—Research dossier**
Examples of acceptable topics and formats for the research dossier include the following.

- A comparison of the portrayal of Hector in the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*
  - A selection of quotations from the *Iliad* compared with quotations from the *Aeneid* (quotations may be in the original language or in translation)
- The influence of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* on later art
  - Quotations from the *Metamorphoses* supported by a collection of visual materials (copies of paintings and/or sculptures) that depict scenes from the *Metamorphoses*
- Panem et circenses: The Colosseum and its political significance
  - Quotations from a collection of Latin texts that illustrate a variety of attitudes to the Colosseum and the way it was used
- Director’s notes for a production of a Latin play, considering the differences in modes of production and context of performance between the ancient and modern worlds
  - *Like an astonished shepherd*: A comparison of Virgil’s similes demonstrating the power of nature.
Option B—Oral presentation
Examples of acceptable formats for the oral presentation include the following.

- A selection of passages from a single poet (for example, Catullus, Horace) showing their metrical virtuosity
- The opening chapters to the first oration against Catiline with a commentary examining the tone, pace and other relevant aspects of their oral interpretation
- A passage from each of Caesar, Livy and Tacitus with a commentary examining the development between them
- Speeches from Virgil’s *Dido (Aeneid IV)* and Catullus’ *Ariadne (Catullus 64)* with a commentary highlighting the similarities/differences

Option C—Composition
Examples of acceptable formats for the composition include the following.

- A passage of historical prose translated in the style of Tacitus
- A portion of a political speech translated in the style of Cicero
- Ten lines of love poetry translated into elegiacs in the style of Ovid

It is important to note that the student’s work must show an understanding of the style of the chosen author; poetry must scan and the style should be clearly recognizable as being characteristic of that author.
Purpose of internal assessment

Internal assessment is an integral part of the course and is compulsory for both SL and HL students. It enables students to demonstrate the application of their skills and knowledge, and to pursue their personal interests, without the time limitations and other constraints that are associated with written examinations. The internal assessment should, as far as possible, be woven into normal classroom teaching and not be a separate activity conducted after a course has been taught.

The internal assessment requirements at SL and at HL are the same. Students select one of three options, which is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB.

Guidance and authenticity

The individual study submitted for internal assessment must be the student’s own work. However, it is not the intention that students should decide upon a title or topic and be left to work on the internal assessment component without any further support from the teacher. The teacher should play an important role during both the planning stage and the period when the student is working on the internally assessed work. It is the responsibility of the teacher to ensure that students are familiar with:

- the requirements of the type of work to be internally assessed
- the assessment criteria; students must understand that the work submitted for assessment must address these criteria effectively.

Teachers and students must discuss the internally assessed work. Students should be encouraged to initiate discussions with the teacher to obtain advice and information, and students must not be penalized for seeking guidance. However, if a student could not have completed the work without substantial support from the teacher, this should be recorded on the appropriate form from the Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme.

It is the responsibility of teachers to ensure that all students understand the basic meaning and significance of concepts that relate to academic honesty, especially authenticity and intellectual property. Teachers must ensure that all student work for assessment is prepared according to the requirements and must explain clearly to students that the internally assessed work must be entirely their own.

As part of the learning process, teachers can give advice to students on a first draft of the internally assessed work. This advice should be in terms of the way the work could be improved, but this first draft must not be heavily annotated or edited by the teacher. The next version handed to the teacher after the first draft must be the final one.

All work submitted to the IB for moderation or assessment must be authenticated by a teacher, and must not include any known instances of suspected or confirmed malpractice. Each student must sign the coversheet for internal assessment to confirm that the work is his or her authentic work and constitutes the final version of that work. Once a student has officially submitted the final version of the work to a teacher (or the coordinator) for internal assessment, together with the signed coversheet, it cannot be retracted.
Authenticity may be checked by discussion with the student on the content of the work, and scrutiny of one or more of the following:

- the student's initial proposal
- the first draft of the written work
- the references cited
- the style of writing compared with work known to be that of the student.

The requirement for teachers and students to sign the coversheet for internal assessment applies to the work of all students, not just the sample work that will be submitted to an examiner for the purpose of moderation. If the teacher and student sign a coversheet, but there is a comment to the effect that the work may not be authentic, the student will not be eligible for a mark in that component and no grade will be awarded. For further details refer to the IB publication Academic honesty and the relevant articles in the General regulations: Diploma Programme.

The same piece of work cannot be submitted to meet the requirements of both the internal assessment and the extended essay.

**Time allocation**

Internal assessment is an integral part of the classical languages courses, contributing 20% to the final assessment in the SL and the HL courses. This weighting should be reflected in the time that is allocated to teaching the knowledge, skills and understanding required to undertake the work as well as the total time allocated to carry out the work.

The hours allocated to internal assessment work should include:

- time for the teacher to explain to students the requirements of the internal assessment
- class time for students to work on the internal assessment component
- time for consultation between the teacher and each student
- time to review and monitor progress, and to check authenticity.

**Requirements and recommendations**

**Individual study**

The individual study is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB. Students choose one of options A, B or C.

The assessment is based on the final research dossier, oral presentation or composition, using the descriptors provided. Students should have access to the descriptors throughout their course of study.

**Note:** A detailed explanation of each task can be found under "Syllabus content."
Supervision of the individual study
Each student is required to carry out an independent study under the supervision of the teacher.

- The type and title of the individual study should be chosen by the student, although this should be done in discussion with the teacher.
- If two or more students choose the same aspect of a theme for the individual study, they are required to work independently of each other.
- Teachers should discuss individual study themes with each student before the student starts work.
- Teachers should encourage students to establish clear and realistic objectives and help them prepare a scheme of work or other appropriate plan. Students can then choose their own particular study related to the theme.
- Teachers must not correct written drafts but should continue to support the student until the final version of the individual study is ready to be assessed.
- Teachers are required to sign the internal assessment coversheet to confirm that the work of each student is his or her own unaided work.
- The student is required to verify that the copy submitted for assessment is the final copy.

Using assessment criteria for internal assessment
For internal assessment, a number of assessment criteria have been identified. Each assessment criterion has level descriptors describing specific levels of achievement together with an appropriate range of marks. The level descriptors concentrate on positive achievement, although for the lower levels failure to achieve may be included in the description.

Teachers must judge the internally assessed work at SL and at HL against the criteria using the level descriptors.

- Different assessment criteria are provided for SL and HL.
- The aim is to find, for each criterion, the descriptor that conveys most accurately the level attained by the student, using the best-fit model. A best-fit approach means that compensation should be made when a piece of work matches different aspects of a criterion at different levels. The mark awarded should be one that most fairly reflects the balance of achievement against the criterion. It is not necessary for every single aspect of a level descriptor to be met for that mark to be awarded.
- When assessing a student's work, teachers should read the level descriptors for each criterion until they reach a descriptor that most appropriately describes the level of the work being assessed. If a piece of work seems to fall between two descriptors, both descriptors should be read again and the one that more appropriately describes the student's work should be chosen.
- Where there are two or more marks available within a level, teachers should award the upper marks if the student's work demonstrates the qualities described to a great extent. Teachers should award the lower marks if the student's work demonstrates the qualities described to a lesser extent.
- Only whole numbers should be recorded; partial marks, such as fractions and decimals, are not acceptable.
- Teachers should not think in terms of a pass or fail boundary, but should concentrate on identifying the appropriate descriptor for each assessment criterion.
- The highest level descriptors do not imply faultless performance but should be achievable by a student. Teachers should not hesitate to use the extremes if they are appropriate descriptions of the work being assessed.
A student who attains a high level of achievement in relation to one criterion will not necessarily attain high levels of achievement in relation to the other criteria. Similarly, a student who attains a low level of achievement for one criterion will not necessarily attain low achievement levels for the other criteria. Teachers should not assume that the overall assessment of the students will produce any particular distribution of marks.

It is recommended that the assessment criteria be made available to students.

Internal assessment details—SL and HL

Option A—Research dossier
The task offers students an opportunity to examine in some depth an aspect of classical language, literature or civilization that is of particular interest. The student is required to put together a research dossier of annotated primary source materials relating to a topic in Roman or Classical Greek history, literature, language, religion, mythology, art, archaeology or their later influence. These may be, but are not required to be, related to an aspect of part 2 of the syllabus. A dossier may combine a variety of sources but it must focus on one topic, issue or question.

Sources
The suggested number of sources is 7–12 at SL and 10–15 at HL.

Annotations
The total length of the annotations (that includes the introduction and the conclusion) must be a maximum of 800 words at SL and 1,200 words at HL. Source material, footnotes and bibliography are not included in the word count.

Option B—Oral presentation
The student is required to read aloud one or more passages in Latin or Classical Greek, totalling no more than 7 minutes for SL and 10 minutes for HL. The piece or pieces to be read should be carefully chosen to allow the student to display an understanding of language and context through the accuracy and expressivity of the presentation. The reading must be recorded and submitted with the written commentary for moderation purposes. Instructions for recording and sending of CDs are provided each year in the Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme.

Written commentary
Each student submits a written commentary giving a background to the reading. The total length of the written commentary must be a maximum of 800 words at SL and 1,200 words at HL.

Option C—Composition
The student is required to translate a single, short piece of verse or prose, written in English, French or Spanish, into Latin or Greek in the style of a classical author.

The maximum length of the piece is either:

- 15 lines in verse (in any metre), or
- 200 words in prose.

Written commentary
Each student submits a written commentary giving a background to the composition. The total length of the written commentary must be a maximum of 800 words at SL and 1,200 words at HL.
Internal assessment criteria—SL

A Quality of ideas (SL)
Quality of ideas refers to the following.

- **Research dossier**: the selection of the topic and the sources
- **Oral presentation**: the reading and the choice of passage(s)
- **Composition**: the composition and the choice of author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Level descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Quality of ideas is barely existent. The assignment shows no personal engagement. <strong>Research dossier</strong>: The sources selected are not appropriate. <strong>Oral presentation</strong>: The reading is not appropriate for the chosen author and passage(s). <strong>Composition</strong>: The composition shows no understanding of the classical author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Quality of ideas is very limited. The assignment rarely shows any evidence of personal engagement. <strong>Research dossier</strong>: Few of the sources selected are appropriate. <strong>Oral presentation</strong>: The reading is occasionally appropriate for the chosen author and passage(s). <strong>Composition</strong>: The composition shows very limited understanding of the classical author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Quality of ideas is limited but generally adequate. The assignment shows some evidence of personal engagement, though this may be limited. <strong>Research dossier</strong>: The sources selected are sometimes appropriate. <strong>Oral presentation</strong>: The reading is sometimes appropriate for the chosen author and passage(s). <strong>Composition</strong>: The composition shows some understanding of the classical author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Quality of ideas is consistently satisfactory. The assignment shows some personal engagement. <strong>Research dossier</strong>: Some judgment has been shown in selecting a range of sources. <strong>Oral presentation</strong>: The reading is appropriate for the chosen author and passage(s). <strong>Composition</strong>: The composition shows understanding of the classical author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Level descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Quality of ideas is good. The assignment shows considerable personal engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research dossier:</strong> Considerable judgment has been shown in selecting a varied and interesting range of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oral presentation:</strong> The reading shows a degree of inventiveness, shows some sensitivity and is appropriate for the chosen author and passage(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Composition:</strong> The composition shows understanding of the classical author and displays a degree of inventiveness and judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B Knowledge and understanding (SL)

Knowledge and understanding refer to the following.

- **Research dossier**: the sources and the annotations
- **Oral presentation**: speaking and pronunciation and the commentary
- **Composition**: grammar and syntax, linguistic accuracy and the commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Level descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1–2   | Knowledge and understanding of the task are barely existent.  
  **Research dossier**: There are virtually no meaningful annotations, making it difficult to discern any knowledge of the topic or understanding of the relevance and importance of the chosen sources.  
  **Oral presentation**: There is virtually no knowledge of how to speak the language and no concern with accuracy or consistency in pronunciation, including metre (where appropriate). The commentary has made no meaningful argument for the presentation and choice of passage(s).  
  **Composition**: The composition displays virtually no knowledge of grammar and syntax, even at the most basic level, and shows no awareness of linguistic accuracy. The commentary has made no meaningful argument for the choice of passage and method of translation. |
| 3–4   | Knowledge and understanding of the task are very limited.  
  **Research dossier**: Annotations demonstrate poor knowledge of the topic and a very limited understanding of the relevance and importance of the chosen sources.  
  **Oral presentation**: The oral presentation demonstrates little knowledge of how to speak the language and very limited accuracy and consistency in pronunciation, including metre (where appropriate). The commentary makes a poor attempt to argue for the presentation and choice of passage(s).  
  **Composition**: The composition displays little knowledge or understanding of a very limited range of grammar and syntax and demonstrates very little linguistic accuracy. The commentary makes a poor attempt to argue for the choice of passage and method of translation. |
| 5–6   | Knowledge and understanding of the task are limited but generally adequate.  
  **Research dossier**: Annotations demonstrate some knowledge of the topic and limited understanding of the relevance and importance of the chosen sources.  
  **Oral presentation**: The oral presentation demonstrates some knowledge of how to speak the language and some accuracy and consistency in pronunciation, including metre (where appropriate). The commentary makes some arguments for the presentation and choice of passage(s).  
  **Composition**: The composition displays some knowledge and understanding of a limited range of grammar and syntax and demonstrates some linguistic accuracy. The commentary makes some arguments for the choice of passage and method of translation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Level descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7-8   | Knowledge and understanding of the task are consistently satisfactory.  
Research dossier: Annotations demonstrate knowledge of the topic and understanding of the relevance and importance of the chosen sources.  
Oral presentation: The oral presentation demonstrates knowledge of how to speak the language and reasonably good accuracy and consistency in pronunciation, including metre (where appropriate). The commentary makes a relevant argument for the presentation and choice of passage(s).  
Composition: The composition displays knowledge and understanding of a range of grammar and syntax and demonstrates a reasonably good level of linguistic accuracy. The commentary makes a relevant argument for the choice of passage and method of translation. |
| 9-10  | Knowledge and understanding of the task are good.  
Research dossier: Annotations demonstrate a wide knowledge of the topic and a good understanding of the relevance and importance of the chosen sources.  
Oral presentation: The oral presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of how to speak the language and a good level of accuracy and consistency in pronunciation, including metre (where appropriate). The commentary argues effectively for the presentation and choice of passage(s).  
Composition: The composition displays a good knowledge and understanding of a range of grammar and syntax and demonstrates a high level of linguistic accuracy. The commentary argues effectively for the choice of passage and method of translation. |
C Coherence and clarity of argument (SL)

Coherence and clarity refer to the following.

- **Research dossier**: the annotations
- **Oral presentation**: the commentary
- **Composition**: the commentary

The total length of the annotations (that includes the introduction and the conclusion) or written commentary must be a maximum of 800 words. Deduct 2 marks for criterion C if the word limit is exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Level descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Coherence and clarity are barely existent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The material is not organized and there is no logical development of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments show no focus, development or relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Coherence and clarity are very limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a poor attempt to organize the material and to develop ideas in a logical manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very few arguments are focused, developed or relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Coherence and clarity are limited but generally adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an attempt to organize the material and to develop ideas in a logical manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some arguments are focused, developed and relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>Coherence and clarity are consistently satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The material is organized and ideas are developed in a logical manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments are mostly focused, developed and relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>Coherence and clarity are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The material is well organized and there is a logical flow of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments are well focused, developed and pertinent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of command terms

Command terms with definitions

Students should be familiar with the following key terms and phrases used in examination questions, which are to be understood as described below. Although these terms will be used frequently in examination questions, other terms may be used to direct students to present an argument in a specific way.

- **Analyse**
  - Break down in order to bring out the essential elements or structure.

- **Comment**
  - Give a judgment based on a given statement or result of a calculation.

- **Compare**
  - Give an account of the similarities between two (or more) items or situations, referring to both (all) of them throughout.

- **Compare and contrast**
  - Give an account of similarities and differences between two (or more) items or situations, referring to both (all) of them throughout.

- **Contrast**
  - Give an account of the differences between two (or more) items or situations, referring to both (all) of them throughout.

- **Demonstrate**
  - Make clear by reasoning or evidence, illustrating with examples or practical application.

- **Describe**
  - Give a detailed account.

- **Discuss**
  - Offer a considered and balanced review that includes a range of arguments, factors or hypotheses. Opinions or conclusions should be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

- **Distinguish**
  - Make clear the differences between two or more concepts or items.

- **Evaluate**
  - Make an appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations.

- **Examine**
  - Consider an argument or concept in a way that uncovers the assumptions and interrelationships of the issue.

- **Explain**
  - Give a detailed account including reasons or causes.

- **Explore**
  - Undertake a systematic process of discovery.

- **Identify**
  - Provide an answer from a number of possibilities.

- **Interpret**
  - Use knowledge and understanding to recognize trends and draw conclusions from given information.

- **Justify**
  - Give valid reasons or evidence to support an answer or conclusion.

- **List**
  - Give a sequence of brief answers with no explanation.

- **Outline**
  - Give a brief account or summary.

- **Present**
  - Offer for display, observation, examination or consideration.

- **Show**
  - Give the steps in a calculation or derivation.
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Teacher's signature: ________________________
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The modern popular interpretation of the Roman rower is that of a galley slave, chained to a bench and forced to row to the death. However, there is limited historical evidence to support this notion. This investigation focuses on the role and status of the Roman oarsmen and the transformation in the portrayal of Roman rowers from ancient to modern times.

CONTEMPORARY PORTRAYALS OF ROMAN ROWERS

Source A: Screenshot from the movie *Ben Hur*, portraying Charlton Heston as a galley-slave.

The movie *Ben Hur* is probably the most easily recognizable portrayal of a rower during Roman times. This 1959 version of the movie portrays a man condemned as a rower in the beginning of the first century A.D. Source A communicates cramped quarters, sparse attire, and endless work.

"Later, the Roman admiral Quintus Arrius orders a demonstration of the galley’s speed necessary for battle, attack, and ramming. He forces his rowers to perform at a faster and faster pace, set at a punishing rate by the sound of a pounding drum. Some of the galley oarsmen die of heart attacks, and all collapse following their ordeal. Except Judah, who sits erect, strong, noble, and defiant."

All the slaves are told: "You are all condemned men. We keep you alive to serve this ship. So row well and live."

"In one of the more spectacular scenes in the film, the Romans fight against Macedonian pirate war ships in an exciting sea galley battle. Arrius orders that Judah’s leg be unchained during the coming battle to give him a chance to survive. Their ship is rammed, oars are smashed, bodies are splintered, and their ship is boarded."

**Source B:** [http://www.filmsite.org/benh.html](http://www.filmsite.org/benh.html)
*Created in 1996-2007 © by Tim Dirks. All rights reserved.*

Source B describes the extreme suffering shown in the film, including work until exhaustion or death. The idea that all the rowers are condemned and expendable men adds to the portrayal of rowing being fatal and perpetuates the notion that rowers had the worst possible job in the ancient world.
The cartoons in source C and D reflect the popular culture of ancient rowing in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The identical, thug-like rowers in each cartoon mirror Ben Hur’s depiction of criminal rowers who have numbers rather than names. Like in Ben Hur, the slaves are underneath the deck in a cramped, dark space. Source C shows two men to an oar, but in source D the “spare” shows only one man and one oar, reflecting the modern debate about the number of rowers per oar. As cartoons published in major American newspapers, these sources are clearly not attempting historical accuracy, but rather using the image of galley slaves to make a humorous point; however, the fact that this image is so prevalent in popular
culture is a telling example of the way the portrayal of Roman rowers has evolved over time.

**POST-RENAISSANCE PORTRAYALS**

"Public slaves were either derived from the share of captives taken in war, which was reserved for the community or state, or were acquired by purchase and other civil process. Public slaves of an inferior description were engaged as rowers on board the fleet, or in the construction and repair of roads and national buildings. Those of a superior description were employed as keepers of public buildings, prisons, and other property of the state...."

Source E: *The Penny Cyclopaedia, Volume XXII*, p. 97, 1842

"In ancient times, and till recently, in some parts of the world, criminals were made to work vessels called "Galleys," propelled by long oars: in double tiers, or rows. Several galley slaves were chained to each huge oar, and overseers walked to and fro along a platform down the centre of the vessel, and, if any flagged in their exertions, used their heavy whips most unmercifully. Criminals sentenced to the galleys were called "Galley Slaves," and were often "condemned to the galleys for life." One day the Viceroy of Naples- a sagacious man- when passing through Barcelona- went on board one of the Government Convict Galleys, where malefactors condemned for life were, as usual, chained to the heavy oars."


These 19th-century descriptions of ancient rowers conform to the modern popular portrayals shown in the earlier cartoons. Rowing in the galleys was described as a form of either inferior status, as in source E, or torture, as in source F. Source E describes the lowest possible tier of slaves to be the "rowers on board the fleet," apparently not fit for even land-side construction work. Source E, unlike the primer in source F, contains citations (generally 17th century) for its claims. However, 17th century was also the period during which galley slavery existed in France, according to source G.
"...by 1671 then number had risen to 196 vessels, and by 1677 the figure had risen to 270. Colbert was passionately determined to build them up and equip them with the greatest possible rapidity. But the crews gave him endless trouble. The toil of the rowers was so terrible and their treatment so cruel that free men could not be induced in sufficient quantities to undertake the work. The galleys were a common form of punishment for the criminals of France; and the correspondence of Colbert shows him to have urged upon the judges the sentencing of as large a number as possible to the galleys. The vagrants of France were forced wholesale into this living death; and those condemned for a short period were often condemned for life. History has few more terrible chapters than that of the barbarous treatment of the French galley-slaves.


It is safe to assume that the 19th century documents drew their perceptions heavily on the documentation of the French galley-slaves. The similarities between the description in source G and those in source E and F are too striking to ignore. The fact that source F makes a direct link between the rowers in ancient times and the actions of the 'Viceroy of Naples' in its parable lends more credence to the concept that the idea of ancient galley-slaves evolved only after the introduction of 17th century French ones.

CLASSICAL SOURCES

ubi responderunt aquam dierum quinque et quadragesinta in nauibus csse, tum edixit militibus ut silentium quieti nautis sine certamine ad ministeria exsequenda bene obocientern praestarent.

Source H: Livy, Ab urbe condita, 29.25. ed. T.A. Buckney

Translation:

They assured him that there was water in the ships sufficient to last for forty-five days. He then impressed upon the soldiers the necessity of keeping quiet and maintaining discipline and not interfering with the sailors in the discharge of their duties.

The History of Rome, Vol. IV
Titus Livius Editor Ernest Rhys Translator Rev. Canon Roberts Everyman's Library E.P. Dutton and Co. New York 1912
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Clearly the link between the ancient and French galley-slaves is more than mere imagination or justification for modern evils. There is historical evidence that suggests that the life of Roman rowers was not unlike that of the galley-slaves in the Ancien

"Inter-service rivalry is clearly no new thing, and in Scipio’s force it would have been sharpened by the fact that the soldiers, who were mostly Roman citizens or Latins, would tend to look down on the sailors, who were drawn from the allied states."

Source I: T.A. Buckley, Scipio Africanus: The Conquerer of Hannibal. Selections from Livy: Books XXVI-XXX. Notes p. 68, Number 15

ANT. Lube, HAN. Ita dico. ANT. Ligula, i in malam crucem. 
tune hic amator audes esse, hallex viri, 1310 
aut contractare quod mares homines amant? 
deglupta mena, sarrapis, sementium, 
manstrucu, halagora, sampsa, tum autem plenior 
ali ulpicieque quam Romani remiges.

http://www.thclatinlibrary.com/plautus/poenulus.shtml

ANTHEMONIDES You choose?

HANNO I say so.

ANTHEMONIDES Away to utter perdition, you shoe-latchet! What, do you dare to be acting the lover here, you great toe of a man, or to be meddling with an object which masculine men are fond of, you skinnea pilchard, you deformed image of Serapis, you half-apron, you sheepskin-jacket*, you pot of stinking sea-salt; more crammed, too, to boot, with leeks and garlic than the Roman rowers?


"But the relationship between the Greek polis and the naval galley is not straightforward. When Athens was in its truly democratic phase and in its prime as a naval power, contemporaries argued that the two were connected. Aristotle noticed the same connection, writing more critically of how the development of large galleys had led to rule by “a mob of oarsmen”: Oarsmen “should not be an integral part of the citizen body” (Politics, V. iv. 8; vi, 6)."

Régime. Source H, describing the Second Punic War, shows the Roman leader's attitude to the rowers involved in the invasion of Africa. Livy clearly portrays the praeitor (in this case, M. Pomponius) speaking directly to the soldiers but not the sailors, and having to remind the military to "maintain discipline" in face of the rowers. Source I tells that the low status of rowers was due to national origin, not to "slave" status. Source K shows a similar attitude from Aristotle 400 years before Livy, which could explain some of the anti-sailor bias in Roman society.

Source J is a perfect summary of the attitude towards rowers in ancient times. The character ends a string of insults with the emphatic alliteration "Romani remiges", implying that the horrible smell of Roman rowers is the ultimate offense.

hic uiridem Aeneas frondenti ex ilicem metam
costituit signum nautis pater, unde reuerit
scirent et longos ubi circumflectere cursus.
tum loca sorte legunt ipsique in puppis auro
ductorces longe effulgent ostroque decorri;
cetera populea uelatur fronde iuuentus
nudatosque umeros oleo perfusa nitescit.
130
considunt transtrix, intentaquae bracchia remis;
intenti exspectant signum, exsultantiaque haurit
corda pauor pulsans laudumque arrecta cupido.

cord 135

Source L: Vergil's Aeneid, Book V, lines 129-139

And here/Father Aeneas hangs a leafy branch
of ilex as a signal for his crews,
the goal at which they are to turn around,
to wheel back on their long way. Then they choose
places by lot; above the sterns, far off,
the captains gleam in purple, gold; the oarsmen
are crowned with poplar leaves, their naked shoulders
are glistening, wet with oil. They man the benches;
their arms are tense upon the oars; they wait,
exspectant, for the start as throbbing fear
and eager love of praise drain their high hearts.

In source I., Vergil glorifies portrays ancient heroes who are holding a celebration, rather than the everyday life of a rower in a fleet. It is likely that Vergil’s attitude towards rowers does not reflect that of his contemporaries. Aeneas’s sailors were all equals in the defense of Troy and the quest for Italy, rather than hired hands. **Yes, it is epic poetry, an idealization of history**

**A ROVER’S JOB**

pitulus: time-beater? On Roman galleys, in addition to- or, at times, instead of- the piping of a flue, the measured beating of a mallet, the portisculus, gave the time to the rowers. Pitulus means literally the “plash” of the oars; it is the Latinized form of the Greek pitylos. I suggest that the rating hearing this name was a time-beater who kept the oars plashing in the proper rhythm.

Now, on galleys of the 16th and 17th centuries which were powered by four or five men to an oar, “the maximum effect of a single stroke with all oars was seven ‘bench-distances,’ that is, between one stroke and the next, the seventh oar came to rest on the very point in the water where the first oar had struck.”

**Source M: Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Casson, 1971 p. 311, note 53**

Source M supports the idea that the French galleys and the classical ships are mixed in the popular imagination, since the French borrowed heavily from Roman naval technique. It also shows that *Ben Hur*’s “time beater” is historically accurate.

elaiochreistes: literally “olive oil anointer”; probably in charge of issuing oil to the crew for rubbing down.
kopodetes: literally “oar binder”; judging from the title, his prime duty was to check the chafing gear and straps of the oars, but he very likely had responsibility for the oars in general.
intos: ship’s doctor; not an officer and generally a foreigner.
nautai or parakathemenoi: literally “the seated ones”
All of the above are attested as being part of the crew of a qudrriere. In addition, we may be almost certain that stroke oars (toicharchoi), the piper (auletes, trieraules), and various grades of guards were included.

**Source N: Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Casson, 1971 p. 308-309**
“Every crew was treated as a century of the Roman army: these naval centuries, in addition to the strictly naval officers, petty officers, and ratings listed above, had each a centurion (the commanding military officer), optio and suboptio (his sergeants), armorum custos (armorer-sergeant), bucinator (hugler), and the rank and file included not only the strictly fighting personnel-marines, archers, catapult operators—but also all the rowers.”

Source O: Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Casson, 1971 p. 312

Source N presents the job specialization among the ship’s personnel. This contradicts the concept that all the galley-workers were identical and untrained. Source O shows that rowers technically had the same rank as marines, implying that they were not considered simply a source of transportation.

THE SLAVE DEBATE

“The status of the sailors and marines of the Roman navy is somewhat unclear, though the fleet is generally regarded as the least prestigious branch of service. The fleet recruited freeborn citizens and peregrine as well as freedmen. Sailors that did not possess Roman citizenship received this privilege after a minimum of 25 years of service.”


Source P argues that no slaves were used in the fleet, despite the sailor’s poor status. The fact that non-citizens received citizenship after service implies that rowing was not a slave’s task.

“Corinth announced a policy of trying to buy off Athens’s oarsmen, who, it said, were mercenaries anyway. Pericles, replying for Athens, argued that the Athenians could offer more than mere wages to their oarsmen. He admitted that the mass of oarsmen were from other Greek states, unlike the helmsmen and petty officers, who were Athenians. Thus naval expansion introduced a hierarchy. The great city-states commanded the citizens of the lesser ones: The multistate system was faltering.”

Source Q illustrates the low status of the ancient Greek oarsmen, but also clearly states that they were paid wages. Although the non-citizen rowers held inferior status, they were not slaves.

“Contrary to what is often thought, ancient states did not man their warships with slave rowers, except in very unusual circumstances. Using state-owned slaves made no economic sense. The purchase of a crew would require a massive investment, since able-bodied slaves were by no means cheap, and the cost of any killed in action would have to be written off as a total loss; on top of that, all would have to be fed and housed every day of the year whether there was a war going on or not. The hired oarsmen were paid only when they actually rowed, and their death cost their employers nothing. Slaves were occasionally to be found in the rowing crews, but these were just another form of hired oarsmen, privately owned slaves who knew how to row and whose owners profited by renting them to the state and pocketing the wages they earned.”


“Though the work was arduous and could be dangerous, [Athenian] recruiters seem to have had little difficulty finding applicants. There were plenty of muscular young fellows in the fishing villages of Greece and the islands who knew how to handle an oar and for whom hiring out as a rower offered not only a good salary— a drachma a day, the same as any craftsman got— but also one of the very few avenues of escape from a monotonous life of grinding poverty.”


Sources R and S are both written by an expert on ancient seafaring. He uses logic and economics to debunk the “myth” of galley slaves. Source R concedes that slaves did row at times, but they were not condemned criminals.

“Lionel Casson has also published an article to the same effect, namely that slaves, prisoners, or condemned criminals were not used as rowers in ancient navies, with the possible exception of Ptolemaic Egypt.

“It is unfortunate that none of these studies treats the naval history of the Roman Republic in detail, for there is abundant evidence of the use of slave rowers by both sides during the Second Punic War. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss the use of slave rowers in the Roman navy and to show that even captives were forcibly impressed for service at the rowing benches, despite the modern assertions to the contrary.”

Source T counters Casson's argument, citing the Second Punic War as an example. This would contradict Livy's account, but it does prove that some modern historians still believe in the use of slaves in Roman galleys.

CONDITIONS AND EQUIPMENT


"The so-called Lenormant relief of about 400 B.C., showing the starboard side of a trireme. The uppermost level of rowers is clearly visible, their oars portrayed as slanting lines running from their hands to the water. The middle level is represented by the parallel slanting lines running from just under what appears to be the heaviest wale (but is actually the edge of an outrigger) down to the water. The lowest level is represented by the short parallel slanting lines that seem to emerge from the little bulges; these bulges are the artist's way of portraying the leather sleeves attached to and extending from the sides of the ports. There were securely wrapped about the loom of the oar to keep water from coming in through the port."


The relief in source U shows marines on the upper deck, while the rowers are unseen underneath. The enclosed space echoes *Ben Hur*, and the supremacy of the marine compliment supports Livy's account of inter-service rivalry.
The Lenormant relief in sources V and W has a striking similarity to the modern cartoons: the rowers are identical and enclosed with no marines accompanying them. The age of the relief shows the changing identity of the ancient rower.

"In all the multi-rower galleys of the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the oars were not worked over the gunwale but were housed in an oarbox which, instead of following the curve of the hull, had straight sides; in bird’s-eye view it looked like a long and narrow rectangular frame with the point of the vessel’s prow emerging at one end and the bulge of its stern at the other. A similar arrangement was used for housing the multi-ower oars of the Hellenistic galleys.


Source Y: Roman trireme, 1st B.C. to 1st A.D.
*Ancient Ships and Seamanship*, Lionel Casson, 1971
Source Z: Roman Galley with a full compliment of marines, mosaic, 1st Century A.D. 
Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Casson, 1971

Casson’s description of the more modern galley in source X has much more in common with the Ben Hur galley than with open-deck ship in source Y, supporting the idea that the popular notion of galleys comes from the modern centuries, not from ancient times.

Source Z’s mosaic, from approximately the same period as source Y, gives a different image. Like source U, the marines are on deck while the rowers are providing all the physical labor underneath the ship. Perhaps the disparity of imagery accounts for the differences in historians’ attitudes and modern portrayals.
Source AA: Olympias, a modern replica of a trireme, proceeding under oars. Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Cusson, 1971

The Olympias was constructed in 1987 based on historical documentation. This image shows the most likely form of an ancient trireme, and is structurally similar to the ship in source V. Source BB below shows, unlike Ben Hur, a three-level interior.
Source BB: The interior of Olympia, showing the three levels of rowers. Ancient Ships and Seamanship, Lionel Casson, 1971
POSSIBLE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE NAVY'S POOR STATUS

"Meanwhile, however, those who were charged with the shipbuilding were busied with the construction of the vessels; while others collected crews and were engaged in teaching them to row on dry land: which they contrived to do in the following manner. They made the men sit on rower's benches on dry land, in the same order as they would sit on the benches in actual vessels: in the midst of them they stationed the Celeustes, and trained them to get back and draw in their hands all together in time, and then to swing forward and throw them out again, and to begin and cease these movements at the word of the Celeustes. By the time these preparations were completed the ships were built. They therefore launched them, and, after a brief preliminary practice of real sea-rowing, started on their coasting voyage along the shore of Italy."


"The total number of men thus making up the naval force amounted to nearly one hundred and forty thousand, reckoning each ship as carrying three hundred rowers and one hundred and twenty soldiers. The Carthaginians, on the other hand, made their preparations almost exclusively with a view to a naval engagement. Their numbers, if we reckon by the number of their ships, were over one hundred and fifty thousand men."


"...in many things [the Romans] do succeed, while in some few they conspicuously fail, and especially at sea. On land it is against men only and their works that they have to direct their efforts; and as the forces against which they exert their strength do not differ intrinsically from their own, as a general rule they succeed; while their failures are exceptional and rare. But to contend with the sea and sky is to fight against a force immeasurably superior to their own: and when they trust to an exertion of sheer strength in such a contest the disasters which they meet with are signal. This is what they experienced on the present occasion: they have often experienced it since; and will continue to do so, as long as they maintain their headstrong and foolhardy notion that any season of the year admits of sailing as well as marching."

Source CC, DD, and EE from the Roman historian Polybius portray the makeshift origins of the Roman navy. Coupled with the fact that the first crews had little training, and, for the most part, little success, created a culture in which the army had all the glory and the navy served as a poor aquatic substitute.

Gathered evidence implies that the portrayals of Roman rowers shifted from merely “lower status” citizen to “galley-slave,” probably with the influence of modern slavery. Although historical sources do not show enslaved rowers, historical attitudes perpetuated this notion by emphasizing the conditions and labors that the rowers endured.
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