GCE

Classics: Ancient History

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Overview

Yet again the pleasing aspect of the work presented by candidates has been the noticeable enthusiasm and interest shown in the responses. Examiners found the majority of the responses to be interesting and informed at all levels. There were often thoughtful and perceptive insights into the material and the issues. Teachers should be congratulated for their preparation of the candidates and their continued support and efforts to encourage students to study this subject. The support for the subject in centres is perhaps the most pleasing aspect of the situation at present.

Candidates continue to focus on the evidence, both literary and material in constructing their responses. There were still some which engaged in a narrative with little use of evidence, although thankfully fewer each year. Candidates do not generally lack knowledge, but are not always successful in applying it to the specific question. Clearly understanding the focus of specific question is vital if the response is to be highly rewarded. Too often responses answered a slightly different question from the one set in the examination.

Candidates are improving in their evaluation of the evidence, and are integrating this into their argument more frequently. However, there is still a tendency towards the general overview of an author's value, even in these cases. It is the specific evidence which matters at all levels. It is also true that the context in which a piece of evidence was created – the author's background, experience, agenda, the situation of material evidence and so on – is not always known or properly developed as part of the discussion.

At AS, it is worth reminding candidates that evaluation is not expected in the (a) and (b) sub-questions.

There are still responses not engaging with the question set. This is true at all levels and in all options. Responses to questions which make an issue of the evidence should be arguing and analyzing the evidence throughout for higher levels. A failure to deal fully with the terms of the question might be due to an effort to reproduce a previously studied answer.

Examiners wish to re-iterate the benefit of a short plan to establish in candidates' minds the range of material needed and the focus to be taken. This may prevent candidates from starting a question for which they do not have sufficient knowledge.

Occasionally candidates appeared to answer an option they were not prepared for by using material from a different option. At AS some candidates start the wrong option and waste valuable time as a result. However, it is clear that teachers have prepared their candidates well to deal with the new layout of the papers.

Examiners must stress the importance of a good knowledge of dates and chronology, especially if dates appear in the wording of a question (even when this identifies a whole century). Errors in this area can seriously damage an argument if events are in the wrong order and an argument developed around this. Errors, especially details about authors, but also about material evidence, continue to worry examiners. Candidates need to be reminded of the requirement for detail at the higher levels both of the prescribed material and the factual content.

Examiners continue to be concerned about legibility and the effectiveness of communication. Writing on alternate lines where the writing is large or elaborate can help to clarify it for the examiner. Leaving spaces between questions or starting each question on a new sheet helps to avoid the attempt to add new thoughts between lines of writing. If a term or name is on the question paper it is to be expected that the candidates will at least spell and use the terms correctly. In the case of typed responses, a larger font and double spaces again help examiners in their marking.

There is a wide variety of centres now offering the subject to their students and there is an enthusiasm for Ancient History at all levels. The credit for this is due entirely to the efforts and skills of the teachers in these centres.

As always the Examining Board continues to need examiners for Classics subjects and we would welcome applications for next year.

F391 Greek History from Original Sources

General Comments

Once again, candidates showed that they have gained a great deal from their study of Greek history. Across the three options, candidates were able to demonstrate a very pleasing grasp of what they have studied over the course of the year, and they were able to deploy what they had learned effectively under exam conditions. The majority of candidates had clearly received a very good grounding in the sources specified for their option and there was plenty of evidence of skilful interpretation and clear understanding of context. Weaker responses suggested that some candidates were challenged by the requirement to evaluate the sources they used, however, which often led to generalised comment on an author which bore little relation to the question. Some candidates appear to have been taught to produce general evaluative paragraphs, which are often added at the end of the essay without any reference to the particular question asked; such paragraphs contribute very little to the essay as a whole, and in some cases seem to divert the candidate from more promising approaches.

This year the paper was marked for the first time through the online marking system. While this impacted on examiners rather than candidates, it is important that candidates realise what this means for the marking (and rewarding) of their work. On a paper script it is relatively easy to flick through and find additional material: this can be more challenging when marking online. Most candidates clearly marked where they wanted to add extra material and labelled it clearly; but a few made this very difficult.

The majority of candidates appeared to be able to complete the paper in the time allowed, and there were fewer over long answers to questions (a) and (b). It is clear that centres have done an excellent job in ensuring that candidates are familiar with the layout of the paper and what they need to do in the exam itself.

As last year, Option 3 on Sparta was the most popular option. Athenian Democracy was next in popularity, while Option 2 (the Athenian Empire) was taken by the smallest contingent.

Only a very small number of candidates attempted to answer the essay question first: while there is no regulation against doing this, such an approach does not always work in the candidates' favour, in the opinion of the examiners. The paper has been designed so that the (a) question allows candidates a straightforward introduction to the exam, based on the selection of details from the passage on the paper. For the majority of candidates this worked as intended, and they were able to draw out of the passage a good range of relevant points; the best answers also communicated the context effectively. The (b) and (c) question then develop further aspects of the passage and other passages dealing with related themes. Where more than one passage is set, it is important for candidates to comment on both (in Question 5 and Question 10).

The (b) question continues to pose something of a challenge. A small number of candidates continue to use the passage, even though the question is designed to get them to draw further relevant material from memory. In some cases candidates select some appropriate detail but do not support what they say with sources. However the majority of candidates show a good understanding of what we are looking for. Where candidates choose to evaluate the sources they select, examiners are still able to reward this; but the expectation is that (b) answers should be relatively short and focused on interpretation of relevant examples drawn from the sources.

The (c) question is designed as a stepping stone to a full essay. The best answers selected a range of material, which was then interpreted and (where appropriate) evaluated. Candidates should be reminded that they can make use of the passage in the (c) question: in Question 9(c), for example, many candidates did not comment on the passage even though the quotation which formed the basis of the question was taken from the passage.

Examiners are always pleased to see the work of candidates who engage meaningfully with the evaluation of the sources they use. It is a requirement for the (c) question and for the essay, and can prove one of the significant discriminators between answers. As in previous years, the strongest answers incorporated evaluation into their discussion of the evidence, and developed this discussion as an answer to the question. Many weaker responses include generalised 'evaluation' at the end of their answers, something which often undermines the effectiveness of an essay. In some cases such general paragraphs cover authors not otherwise discussed and contribute very little to the essay as a whole.

The best responses covered an excellent range of sources, not only from those specified but also ranging more widely. Some candidates were able to make good use of direct quotation or close paraphrase; weaker answers were often rather vague and unclear. The spelling of some proper names can prove challenging (Tyrtaeus in Option 3 suffered particularly badly). There are some 'difficult' sources on the specification: examiners found that many candidates struggled with the Old Oligarch, for example (Options 1 and 2), as the meaning is often open to a range of interpretations. There were fewer citations of modern scholarship than in some previous years: there is clearly no harm in using the available authorities, but candidates would often produce a more effective answer if they focused on the primary evidence.

There were many very good, and some outstanding, essays across all the options where candidates were able to make very well judged use of what they had covered during the year. The better answers were clearly organised, using the bullet points as a guide for what to cover rather than as an essay plan (which they are not); in very many cases the quality of classroom discussion shone through in what was written.

Producing handwritten work under exam conditions is increasingly a challenge for candidates, and there were a very few cases where examiners were seriously challenged to reward what was produced. Where candidates are using a computer, they should remember that poor typing can also impact the clarity of their argument, and that a larger font, preferably with double spacing, can enable their work to be marked more straightforwardly. In some cases candidates (whether relying on pen or keyboard) would be well advised to spend more time planning and organising their thoughts before committing them to paper, rather than relying on the sheer quantity of answer produced. Examiners urge candidates to consider the value of proper paragraphing; not only does this make it easier for work to be rewarded appropriately, but it makes it easier for the candidate to check that they have covered the points they want to make.

Chronology and context remain key. There is no need for a list of dates, but in an historical subject it is very important to convey a clear grasp of events over time. When candidates move from one period to another, switching backwards and forwards in time, they can create uncertainty over what they are trying to say. Candidates also need to be alert to the thrust of particular questions. Question 11 asked how far did Athenians understand Spartan strengths and weaknesses: one way to approach this was to think about the evidence studied in this option (eg Aristophanes, Thucydides, Xenophon) and use that as the basis of answering the question. Question 3 asked about 'all the inhabitants of Athens': the best answers showed an excellent understanding of different groups in Athens and could relate them to the Athenian assembly.

The majority of candidates were able to use appropriate technical terms accurately and clearly, though some might be better advised to use English terms rather than transliterations of the Greek. While papers are likely to choose English terms in the questions where appropriate (*assembly* rather than *ekklesia*, for example, or perhaps both), there are some terms for which there is no commonly agreed substitute; a good example of this in this year's paper was *gerousia*.

As in previous years, the examiners were struck by the quality of work produced by individual candidates. It is a pleasure to see how this cohort of students has reacted to the material contained in each of these options.

Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5th century BC

In this option, Question 2 proved the more popular.

Q. 1(a) Most candidates were able to find appropriate points from this passage about ostracism, though not all noticed the selection of archons by lot. Better responses noted the changing focus of ostracism.

Q. 1(b) There were some excellent responses to this question. Many candidates made pleasing use of the ostracism of Hyperbolus, and there were some good discussions of the evidence provided by Aristophanes (and others). Many candidates also made reference to Thucydides' account of the fining of Pericles, and there were some good discussions of assembly meetings (such as the Pylos debate and the trial of the generals).

Q. 1(c) Some answers were weakened by a lack of clarity about 'aristocratic families', and not all brought in a range of suitable examples. Weaker answers confused being aristocratic with being wealthy and talked about Cleon, in a few cases at considerable length, and only the strongest answers were able to respond to the suggestion of a sense of change over time in 'became less powerful'. Some were able to contrast aristocratic leaders such as Cimon with later leaders; not all knew the backgrounds of Pericles and Alcibiades, and the leading figures of the last years of the 5th century were rarely mentioned.

Q. 2(a) Most candidates were able to draw a good range of points from the passage, though there were some misunderstandings of the sequence of events. There were some interesting comments on the 'laughter' mentioned towards the end of the passage, and good use made of the different perspectives Thucydides chooses to focus on.

Q. 2(b) Some candidates did not keep the focus on the 'nature of debate', which weakened their answer overall. Better responses drew on a range of examples, with some excellent use of Aristophanes (eg *Acharnians, Knights*) and Thucydides (eg Mytilene debate, debate about the Sicilian expedition).

Q. 2(c) 'Manipulation' was dealt with well by many candidates, who took a variety of approaches to the material they had studied. Some extended their discussion beyond the assembly to the law courts (and other aspects of the 'democratic system'); some used Xenophon's account of the trial of the generals in detail and were able to present contrasting arguments about the control achieved by a number of political leaders. Many were also able to refer to the effect of rhetoric in the second half of the fifth century backed up with good references to the sources.

Of the essays, Question 3 proved more popular than Question 4.

Q. 3 The word 'all' was dealt with in a variety of ways: some methodically excluded the various groups in society who were excluded, such as women and metics; others focused more on the role of ordinary citizens in decision-making in the assembly. Rather fewer discussed the difficulties that citizens might face to get to the assembly; some considered the size of Attica, and others noted the significance of army and navy deployment in the period. There were some good discussions of the significance of the *Boule* for the assembly and also the role of political leaders. Some candidates missed the point of 'all inhabitants' and this limited the focus of their essays.

Q. 4 Some candidates took a rather narrow view of the opportunities available to the poorest, concentrating on the assembly and the law-courts. Those familiar with the later section of Ath. Pol. were able to extend their discussion further. Better answers understood the limitations of our knowledge of state pay, and were also able to assess the opportunities that arose from the Athenian Empire, such as employment in the navy and land ownership through cleruchies. Many candidates were able to make good use of the Funeral Oration.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

This was the least popular option. Answers were evenly distributed between the two questions in Section A, in Section B Question 8 was more popular than Question 7. Some candidates continue to confuse Herodotus and Thucydides (and Thucydides and Xenophon). In some cases questions were phrased so as to allow discussion of Athens' relationships with states outside the empire, but relatively few candidates took this opportunity, preferring to keep the focus exclusively on allies.

Q. 5(a) Although the majority of candidates used both passages to good effect, there were some who focused only on the decree. Most were able to make salient points, though there was, as often, some confusion over the status of Melos.

Q. 5(b) Some answers focused exclusively on revolts, and failed to draw on a sufficient detailed range of evidence. The question was phrased to allow discussion of states outside the Delian League, though relatively few candidates commented on this.

Q. 5(c) This question was generally answered effectively by candidates, with good arguments presented for different approaches to the question. Most were able to make a good case for consistency, with some good examples drawn across the period. Some countered this with specific examples such as the Methone decree, though some interpreted this as another example of Athenian decisions made to suit Athenian interests. The later part of the Athenian Empire, towards the end of the Peloponnesian War, was generally less well known.

Q. 6(a) Many students were able to draw relevant material out of this passage, but some were clearly struggling with the Old Oligarch and were unsure about what was being argued here. There was some confusion over who 'the good men' were. This is a complex text, and candidates need to work through some of the ambiguities during routine preparation.

Q. 6(b) The question left it open to candidates to interpret 'the ways the Athenians influenced allied states', and most were able to do so confidently. Many used examples of political and military interference, though there were also good discussions of the coinage decree. A few candidates focused on states who were not allied to Athens.

Q. 6(c) Some candidates ignored the time range suggested in the question (the Peloponnesian War), which perhaps made the question harder to answer. Examiners accepted any reasonable interpretation of the time frame, but Thasos and Naxos really fall outside this period. There were however some excellent answers that showed a very good understanding of the period. Relatively few candidates critically assessed Thucydides 2.8, but those that did were appropriately rewarded.

Q. 7 Not all responses recognised the focus of this question on the reliability of Thucydides' account, but those that did critically assess our understanding of Athens' relationships with other states from his work produced some excellent answers. Many answers only dealt with allies, rather than 'other Greek states'.

Q. 8 The majority of candidates answered this very effectively, and were able to make a judgment on the benefit from the Athenian Empire. Many were quick to assess the benefits to Athens as *hegemon*, and were aware of the positives and negatives for Delian League members. Relatively few broadened their answer to include 'the Greek world', though those that did found interesting things to say about the benefits of trade for Corinth and the increasing readiness of states to turn to another leader for Sparta.

Option 3: Politics and society of Ancient Sparta

Question 9 proved more popular than Question 10. Question 12 proved much more popular than Question 11, though there were some excellent answers to Question 11 from candidates who understood both Sparta's strengths and weaknesses and the importance of our Athenian sources.

Q. 9(a) This question was generally well answered by candidates; most were able to draw a good range of material from the passage, though there were a few answers that focused on the role of the *gerousia* in the government of Sparta. Some responses became a little confused about the details in the passage, but the majority were able to deal with this effectively.

Q. 9(b) Some candidates found this a challenging question, understandable given the limited range of evidence available. However there were some excellent answers that were able to provide good examples drawn from the sources and also discuss the assembly in the wider context of Spartan government. A very few answers became confused between the assembly and the *gerousia*, and some focused more on the *ephors.* There were some excellent discussions of the assembly meeting in Thucydides Book 1.

Q. 9(c) This proved quite a challenging question, though there were some excellent responses. Relatively few candidates used the passage itself (where the quotation comes from), and some struggled to identify any rewards within the Spartan system. A number of responses turned the question on its head and looked at punishment within the Spartan system (in the *agoge*, in the army). But there were some very effective answers that drew on a range of approaches to build up a picture of a highly structured society where military prowess was valued.

Q. 10(a) These passages were used successfully by most candidates, who were able to make a good range of points. However a number commented only on the longer second passage. The best answers picked out particularly the references in Xenophon to the changing relationship between Sparta and other states. Not all of those who commented on the Thucydides passage showed a clear grasp of the situation.

Q. 10(b) Most candidates were able to deal with the importance of wealth effectively with references to the banning of money, land redistribution and many examples of corruption of kings and generals.

Q. 10(c) This proved quite a challenging question, best answered by those with a secure understanding of chronology and a clear idea of the context of their examples. Many were able to establish the Spartan role during the Persian Wars, but were generally less able to deal with the element of change over time implied here. Candidates who knew the outcome of the Peloponnesian War, and Sparta's subsequent history made good use of this material, but this was not needed for a high mark. Candidates who were able to chart Sparta's turbulent relationship with Corinth in the period before the Peloponnesian War and at the end of the Archidamian War produced strong answers. Weaker responses were unclear about Sparta's role as leader after the Persian Wars.

Q. 11 This proved a challenging question, and some weaker responses focused solely on the strengths and weaknesses of Sparta. Stronger answers were able to identify some of our sources as Athenian, and so use them effectively to answer the question. There were some interesting discussions of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, but Thucydides was perhaps underused. Better candidates were well aware of Archidamus' speech in Thucydides Book 1, and could use this as a strong element in their answer. There were some interesting discussions of *helots.*

Q. 12 This proved a very popular question. Candidates were, as a rule, more prepared to discuss the *helots* in detail, and some struggled to find anything to say about the *perioikoi*, but not all answers focused on the sources and the issue of success. However there were some very strong answers, where candidates showed an excellent grasp of the available evidence, and were able to assess the contributions made by both groups to what Sparta achieved. Most candidates were clear about the role of the *helots* in Sparta, and commented on the importance of both groups for the *agoge* and for the Spartan army. Some were also able to discuss the contribution of both groups to the war effort (at Plataea or during the blockade of Sphacteria, for example).

F392 Roman History from Original Sources

General Comments

There were very few rubric errors. Both the level of difficulty and time allowed were appropriate.

The standard of written English was generally quite good with few examples of illegibility. As in previous years apostrophes were seldom used and capitals often followed no particular pattern. There was frequent misuse of the words *bias* and *biased*. Spelling was quite poor in many scripts. Practically all answers to Cicero questions misspelt Catiline (Cataline) and there was quite a range of spellings of *grateful*.

In general, (a) questions were answered well, with good use of the passage/s. A few candidates provided unnecessary evaluation, and there were also some instances of contextual comment outweighing use of the passage/s.

Longer answers were mostly quite well structured into paragraphs with introduction and conclusion. Few candidates included essay plans this year, but those that did tended to be far more coherent and more incisive in their analysis. A significant number of candidates decided to answer the essay question first. This proved to be successful apart from in the case of those candidates who then answered parts c through to a. These candidates made little use of the passage in their part c answer and wrote relatively brief commentaries for part (a).

Most candidates were able to use the ancient sources to clearly support their line of argument. Those that didn't tended to rely on generic words or phrases which they presented as specific source evidence. Equally, some students wrote largely narrative paragraphs with unattributed quotes followed by evaluation. This significantly undermined their argument as it was difficult to see the link between evidence and evaluation. Some candidates were able to quote from the ancient sources with great precision but unfortunately failed to match this to the correct author. Candidates may benefit from learning a little more about the context of individual authors.

Evaluation itself was generally quite limited. Most candidates continued the practice of using stock comments about individual writers, with little comment about what effect that had on the use of that source in the context of the question. This was particularly an issue in the use of Plutarch and Suetonius as support for answers in the Cicero option. Many candidates also have only limited understanding of the chronology of their sources, and this does make it harder for them to use and evaluate those sources effectively.

Happily, though, there were many candidates who wrote carefully considered answers which demonstrated an excellent understanding of the Roman world. By contrast, some offered pockets of analysis but ultimately failed to address the question set.

Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

In general question 1 was answered more competently than question 2.

Q. 1(a) This question was generally answered well with most candidates identifying Cicero's opinion of his achievement and comparing this well with the achievement of the generals. The passage was used well to support answers.

Q. 1(b) Generally answered quite well, but a number of candidates included his success against Catiline. A surprising number brought in his success against Verres, despite being well outside the timeframe of the question.

Q. 1(c) A large proportion of candidates answered this question well, giving specific detail on gratitude through the reward of Parens Patriae. Many discussed the lukewarm response from Pompey and the apparent support of Crassus. Cicero's exile was also mentioned by a large number. However, a significant number of answers gave little specific detail and had shaky chronology by suggesting his election as consul showed gratitude.

In general question 2 this was answered less well than question 1. Few candidates really engaged with the idea of *factions*.

Q. 2(a) The majority of candidates answered this question well. Good use was made of the passage, with most showing some knowledge of the setting for the speech. Few candidates seemed to be aware of the sacrosanctity of the tribune.

Q. 2(b) The word *factions* was treated in a very general manner. Some candidates discussed optimates vs populares, but these were in a minority. More were aware of the actions of Clodius and discussed his conflict with Milo, many mentioned the Triumvirate and a few included Catiline + supporters; quite a few, though, just wrote about any identifiable group (Senate, plebs etc). The word *violence* was also interpreted widely to include any kind of conflict including military and political.

Q. 2(c) The issues of interpretation were similar to 2(b). A significant number of candidates did discuss the issue of *how serious* the effect was, especially identifying that the Triumvirate showed that co-operation was often more successful than conflict. Use of sources for this question was fairly poor with many general references to Suetonius, Plutarch and Cicero.

Q. 3 Generally answered better than Q. 4. Most candidates approached this question well. Many used the CP well to show the importance of rhetoric and used Cicero as an example of the power of a successful orator. Many candidates also did well under AO2 by comparing other factors of success such as military power and amicitia. In general, evaluation of sources in this question was quite basic, especially with many standard paragraphs on the authorship of the CP.

Q. 4 This was generally answered quite poorly. This question led to a wide interpretation of the word *competition*. Some candidates addressed political competition through the *cursus honorum*, but most answers focussed on conflict rather than competition. Many candidates did not stick to the chronological parameters of the question. In general, sources were used and evaluated in very general terms. In a number of good answers the argument was focussed and dealt with the issue of importance. Like Q. 2(c), many used the Triumvirate to show the importance of co-operation.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

Question 5 was far more popular than Question 6. Most answers to Q. 5 dealt very well with the passage and mostly used both paragraphs. Sources were used quite well in 5 (b) and (c), although specific evaluation was rare.

Q. 5(a) The majority of candidates were able to select at least several methods used by Augustus. The best candidates were methodical in their approach and used succinct quotations and clear interpretation of the methods used. A significant number of candidates however included excessive quotations without interpretation. Also, some candidates included unnecessary evaluation.

Q. 5(b) Many candidates failed to comprehend the meaning of the term 'despotism'. However, most candidates were still able to deploy a number of sources to show different methods of 'control' which were used by Augustus. The best candidates included a synthesis of archaeological evidence (chiefly coins, often relating to Actium) and a number of written sources. Suetonius and the Res Gestae were the most commonly cited sources though several candidates wrongly attributed a quotation from Suetonius as coming from Augustus and vice versa. Similarly, comments made by Strabo about the Augustus' division of the provinces were wrongly attributed to Dio Cassius or Suetonius. There were also a number of candidates whose answer was simply a narrative of Augustus' attempt to secure a successor without any link to the ancient sources. Equally some candidates attempted to write about the passage again and tenuously suggest that Tacitus' views are simply mirrored by Suetonius and Dio Cassius.

Q. 5(c) Most candidates were able to offer at least a basic argument about the extent to which Augustus personally took over different powers in Rome, though the functions of the Senate and the magistrates were not always well understood. As with part (b), the Res Gestae and Suetonius were the most popular sources though they were not always used correctly. The 'law' was the most frequently neglected part of the question and those candidates that addressed it tended to focus on the Julian laws. Similarly, when discussing the Senate, a number of candidates struggled to make links with the ancient sources. However, those who did generally had precise knowledge of Dio Cassius and used this effectively. Most candidates offered at least some evaluation as part of their answer. In the best answers this allowed them to address the 'how far' aspect of the question whilst weaker candidates simply offered stock evaluation often focused on the contemporary nature of sources.

Those who did attempt Question 6 did quite well with the sources and mostly made some reference to all 3. In 6 (b) and (c) there was limited understanding of the views of provincials as opposed to Romans in the provinces (eg army).

Q. 6(a) Most candidates who attempted this question focused their answer on the extract from Pliny and were generally able to select several challenges faced by Augustus. The challenges evident in the coin and Res Gestae were often not understood and instead candidates simply presented the achievements of Augustus in the provinces.

Q. 6(b) There were some excellent answers for this question which included reference to sources such as the oath of loyalty sworn by provincials (Res Gestae), the revolts in Pannonia and the temples they erected in places like Narbonne. Some candidates however misinterpreted the question and simply offered sources which focused solely on the actions of Augustus.

Q. 6(c) The best responses were able to combine the sources in part (a) and some of the information they had used for part (b). Tacitus and his comments about provincials preferring life under Augustus was regularly used to develop a good argument as were the references to the temples and oath of loyalties – with the general argument that there must have been a good relationship otherwise provincials wouldn't have behaved in this way.

Q. 7 This was the most popular essay question and most answers showed a very good knowledge of the Battle of Actium; a noticeable group devoted a large part of their essay to a narrative of the battle. Most candidates were able to offer at least some evidence from the court poets and many indicated the role of Maecenas in this 'propaganda'; some had a good detailed knowledge. However, most essays had limited grasp of what was meant by *propaganda* and, therefore, rarely dealt with the specific question. A great many candidates made reference to coins, in particular, that of a crocodile showing 'Egypt captured'. The best answers offered evidence from a range of different poets and coins often with a high degree of precision. These responses also correctly distinguished between the initial explicit reference to Actium in the sources and other ways in which Augustus used propaganda later in his reign. In particular, they made good reference to Augustus' role in religious affairs.

Many essays used sources from later periods, which obviously were not used by Augustus, failing to identify that the question referred to propaganda for Augustus' principate rather than his reputation after he died. Equally, some candidates seemed to be confused by the chronology of the Augustan period. These candidates frequently used the Res Gestae and wrongly presented it as though it had been visible to Romans during the reign of Augustus. Similarly, some candidates presented sources such as the Ara Pacis and the statue of the Prima Porta as though they were directly linked to the events at Actium.

Q. 8 Though this was not as popular as question 7, there were some very good quality answers which considered a range of individuals from across the Augustan period and the sources we have for them. Many candidates were able to offer good interpretation for the different reasons behind Augustus' approach to those individuals though sometimes their argument was hampered by blocks of generalised evaluation of the authors used. The most frequently cited individuals were Cinna and Julia the Younger, though, when using the sources, candidates frequently attributed references from Seneca to Suetonius. However, there was also excellent use of the more violent parts of Suetonius and this allowed many candidates to develop a good explanation of how Augustus treated individuals.

Surprisingly, given the wording of the question, a significant number of candidates devoted large parts of their essays to groups rather than individuals and this naturally detracted from the quality of their argument.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

Question 9 was the most popular of the 2 context questions by a considerable margin, and answers ranged widely across the levels.

Q. 9(a) This was not well answered, given the wealth of detail in the passage. Many responses did not give a good overview of the passage, instead focusing on one or two areas; those that did try and give an overview often gave little interpretation and mainly copied out large quotes. Better answers compared the passage to other ethnographies (eg Caesar) and provided some context to the passage; the best mentioned stereotypes. Evaluation was often provided, though unnecessary and usually stock.

Q. 9(b) A few candidates wrote about Britain as well as/instead of the Britons here, and some just rephrased the Strabo passage. A few more managed to use Tacitus, Caesar and perhaps a Boudicca reference or two and later parts of Strabo. Some did give an 'argument'; again, there was a fair amount of unnecessary evaluation. The main hindrance to good marks was not really mentioning views after the 43 invasion. There were few dates, and few mentions that Caesar actually went to Britain, or that Strabo did not.

Q. 9(c) In answering this question candidates mostly used Caesar along with Strabo and Cicero but often with little context. A lot mentioned gold, silver, corn etc, but in passing. Breadth of knowledge was often lacking, though some had knowledge of burials or harbours – but they lacked dates and really specific details and seemed to think that British coinage was used in Britain to buy and sell, or even spent in Gaul and Rome. Some briefly mentioned economic reasons for invasion (either focusing on Caesar or Claudius) then listed other reasons for going, which were not relevant to the question. There were many instances of generic evaluation comments.

Q. 10(a) Answer quality was very variable, with many of the respondents not understanding the context of either the lead pipe or the inscription. A number of responses suggested that Agricola was emperor, or that he gained the titles on the inscription that were in fact for Vespasian.

Q. 10(b) There were some good answers to this question, though some lacked breadth. Most responses included the Ordovices, along with Mons Graupius, and a few mentioned problems with Domitian. Some candidates did mention what his difficulties told us or suggested to us about Agricola, a "governor", though there was little detail about dates.

Q. 10(c) A few candidates wrote good essays on how good Agricola was using the same evidence/difficulties from part b). This was fine as long as they were critical and evaluative of Tacitus as a source. Answers often lacked geographical knowledge or understanding of Paulinus, Cerialis and Frontinus, as well as any decent evaluation. Domitian was forgotten, or ignored by many candidates.

Q. 11 Most students were able to a give a good overview of why Claudius invaded, and it was obvious most had studied this and discussed it in class. Many candidates however appeared not to have decided on whether they thought it was personal or political before they started the essay, and there was as a result less focus than there might have been with a little more planning, though there was generally some sort of argument. A lot really tried to divide the reasons between the two viewpoints, but as they are hard to actually divide they really struggled. The best took the viewpoint that the invasion was both, and mentioned each factor with a personal and political outlook in evaluating the events, details and sources. There was too much dependence on knowledge of Suetonius without actually mentioning specifically what he writes, and some confused Dio with Tacitus; there was also a fair amount of source evidence that was either mis-remembered or made up. The majority of students focused on the question (personal or political) and most evaluated the archaeology and Claudius' actions on return to Rome – but most didn't really get to grips with evaluation of literary sources except on a generic level.

Q. 12 Paulinus was the primary focus, and many took a chronological approach to the final battle on Watling Street. There was some confusion between the Dio and Tacitus accounts, and very few responses went beyond the last battle. Candidates rarely questioned the chronology of the revolt and their main trump card was to mention the ash deposits in London and Colchester. There was more focus on the actual question here, as with Q. 11, though in some instances evaluation of source material could have been improved.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

As in previous years, there was a wide spread in the nature of the responses to the questions set. There seemed to be slight increase in the number of candidates taking option 1, but over-all there was little to distinguish this year's candidature from previous years. Teachers would be well-advised to ensure that their candidates – in particular those who are finding the subject challenging – learn the basic facts in relation to the topics which they are studying. In Option 1, for example, the chronology of events was muddled by some candidates, whilst in Option 3 candidates were sometimes confused between the outlines of different plays, or the names of characters (Cleon and Creon were frequently used interchangeably).

Another noticeable general trend was candidates who did not read the question carefully enough. For example, in Option 3, question 12, the question is about *dramatic festivals*: a number of answers did not notice this point. Candidates should be encouraged to think carefully about the key ideas in the question. In Option 1, for example, question 2 the idea of *over-emphasising* individuals was not well considered by the majority of candidates. In the main, they considered whether the sources placed emphasis on individuals, rather than considering what might be meant by *over-emphasis* and what other factors might also be relevant. Likewise, in Option 2, question 6 the idea of *transforming* Athens and Sparta was rarely considered effectively: many candidates looked at what their chosen individuals did, but did not then develop this further to look at the effects on the city.

Option 1: Greece and Persia 499–449 BC

Whilst there were many excellent responses to this topic, many candidates seemed to be imprecise in their recall of the detail of Herodotus' opening statement about his aims in writing, which, in some cases, led to flaws in their arguments. In addition to this, a firm grasp of the chronology and names of battles and people is essential to a clear, well-argued and successful essay: confusing Aristagoras and Aristeides or Salamis and Artemesium undermined a number of candidates' arguments.

Question 1

This question was not popular, and the few who answered it tended to pass over the obvious things like Athens being burned to the ground. Some candidates dropped into a narrative of all the battles, but did not get to grips with understanding the growth of the Persian Empire. The stronger answers looked at short and long term impacts – unity of the Hellenic League and the growth of the Persian Empire. A number used the evidence to argue for an initial fear from the Greeks which was replaced by growing confidence as a result of their military successes. Very few candidates made a distinction between those Greeks who medised and those who fought for freedom.

Question 2

There were many answers in which candidates could recall all sorts of examples of individuals doing things but there was very little analysis of whether this was over-emphasis. There was a lot of 'and this is clearly over emphasised', but with no argument as to why. The best answers discussed the differing political systems and command structures and how individuals could wield enormous influence and power and therefore, for example, Darius and Xerxes as autocratic monarchs might not have had their roles over emphasised by Herodotus. Some of these answers made effective use of Persian inscriptional evidence to support their analysis of the Persian system of government. Some candidates could not resist using details which had nothing to do with the conflict.

Question 3

This question was often poorly answered because candidates tended to describe all Xerxes defeats in great detail and then state as a conclusion that the Greeks were free without mentioning any of the events post 479. The best answers defined what could be meant by being free – free because there were no Persians on mainland Greece, free from fear of invasion, free from Persian intervention in Greek affairs and free from the power of Athens. There was some very good evaluation of the sources – why Thucydides was writing the Penteconteia, Plutarch's biographical slant and the fact that Herodotus finished his Histories in 479.

Question 4

The biggest problem here was candidates ignoring 'of the causes' and just writing about whether Herodotus gives a balanced account. There were also problems with candidates trying to simply repeat what they had written for question 2 about the Aristagoras and the Ionian revolt. Whilst the same material can be used in different essays, candidates must take care to ensure that they are using that material effectively to develop an argument in response to the question which they are answering. The best essays looked at the Ionian revolt, how this allegedly impacted on Darius and how in turn the failure of the 490 expedition impacted on Xerxes and judged the evidence in the light of Herodotus' supernatural beliefs, hubris and nemesis, the epic influence and the need to glorify deeds.

Option 2: Greece in conflict 460–403 BC

There were some very impressive responses to all questions on this option. Almost all candidates were able to reference some relevant sources, although some gave the impression on occasion of giving a name, and hoping that it was the correct one. A considerable number of candidates made no attempt to use dates, which often hampered any chronological understanding that they may have had of the issues in the question. Source evaluation of Thucydides in particular was often weak with a surprising number of candidates falling back on generic comments, lack of awareness of the knowledge we do have about his life (where he was and when) and some very shaky supposition that if he was Athenian he "must" have been "biased" towards Athens (or vice versa because they exiled him). Candidates should also be encouraged to make use of other source-material such as Aristophanes, inscriptional evidence and Plutarch to develop their answers further.

Questions 5 and 6 were by far the most popular, whilst fewer candidates answered question 8, and those that did often failed to evaluate the sources effectively, not least because of a lack of wider knowledge of other source material.

Question 5

This was a very popular choice, and often very well done. Candidates were aware of a range of explanations and were able to support these by reference to specific examples. Many candidates were able to discuss the role of ideology, individuals & the development of Athenian imperialism effectively. A surprising number of responses did not refer to Thucydides' statement on the Spartan fear of growing Athenian power, which might have made a natural starting point for a discussion of this topic.

A number of answers looked at Naxos and Thasos – which are before the period – and only a handful only rarely made them relevant to the period. Some also looked at helot revolt of mid 460s – but were better making this relevant to their discussion of the period. There is, however, a need to link evaluation directly to the point raised: some, for example, stated that Thucydides was around at the time of the helot revolt, when in reality he had not even been born.

Question 6

This was also a notably popular choice. Most responses worked through individuals – usually Pericles, Cleon, Alcibiades, Brasidas and Lysander, although others did make guest appearances. Candidates often had considerable knowledge linked to the sources. Some candidates tried to look at issues (military, political, economic). Although they were not always entirely successful in this approach, it did help with developing the quality of their argument and led to some work which could be rewarded under AO2. On the other hand, some candidates who wanted to write all about the careers of the individuals and implied transformation, but did not get to grips with the issue in the question.

A disconcertingly large minority of candidates believed that Thucydides wrote about the movement of the treasury from Delos to Athens. In general there was a lack of awareness of which sources covers which events in Pentacontaetia – including the building programme, accounts of which were frequently attributed to Thucydides.

In general, however, there was an excellent balance of individuals from the vast majority of candidates – covering both Sparta and Athens, and a strong awareness of issues with the authors on this topic and their Athenocentric nature.

Question 7

There were candidates who really thought about the meaning of the question and developed a clear and direct line of argument which included financial costs and benefits to a number of different states and the impact on morale and behaviour in both Athens and Sparta. The best answers were able to argue for both positive and negative effects and reach clear judgements about which outweighed the other. Generally there was a good balance of different states and time periods, with most candidates coming on the fact that not all impacts of conflict were negative. A number had a tendency to believe that conflict was an impact of conflict (an interesting concept, but generally just a misunderstanding). Some candidates believed that "demoralisation" was the decline of morals seen across the Greek world during this period. A significant minority of candidates did not understand what social/economic meant and simply recounted events. A large number omitted any reference to the plague.

Question 8

Many of the answers to this question showed a lack of knowledge of the sources, and failed to get to grips with the issue of the 'relationships between Greek city-states', talking instead in general terms about the two authors. With a question such as this candidates should be reminded of the importance of looking at the key issues in the question, and planning how they are going to draw together the relevant strands to develop their answers.

Option 3: The culture of Athens 449–399 BC

Some candidates taking this option produced excellent answers, but in general there was a tendency towards narrative accounts, often lacking in detail, of the key areas in the questions. Candidates should be reminded of the need to analyse and evaluate the evidence, and draw conclusions from it. For example, it is a common statement that Aristophanes exaggerates everything. The question, though, is whether this matters in the context of the issue being discussed. Equally, some candidates talked at length about whether or not we could trust Thucydides' account of Pericles' Funeral Oration, when they were simply using the Funeral Oration as a starting point to then explore Athenian values more fully. Such evaluation can be helpful, but all too often it was turning into stock evaluation and passage which were of questionable benefit in response to the question set. Candidates should also be reminded of the importance of using detail in their answers: there were some general treatments of plays such as Euripides' *Medea* or Sophocles' *Antigone* without a clear focus on the sections in the play which would be helpful in addressing the question set.

Question 9

This question proved both popular and challenging. Many candidates talked in general terms about what the sculptural decoration on the Parthenon and other contemporary buildings showed, as well as a pleasing number who went beyond this, and considered other developments both in Athens (such as the Agora) and beyond. However, many failed to explore the idea of political and social values: they often latched on to the idea that the Athenians saw themselves as superior and did not tie this in clearly as a value; others used Pericles' Funeral Oration to suggest some values, but then did not then explore these in the chosen art and architecture. Some made good use of pottery, and looked in particular at the roles of women (although in some cases this came to dominate the essays rather too fully). Very few candidates addressed the idea of 'using' art and architecture to express these values: candidates should be encouraged to challenge the assumption in the question, and explore what it might mean.

Question 10

This question produced a range of responses, with some candidates simply talking about the different sections of Athenian society, based on the analysis by Aristotle. Although this was useful background, at the heart of the question was the idea of the attitudes of the Athenians towards these different sections of the population. Some candidates made excellent use of sections of the *Old Oligarch,* Xenophon and Lysias in talking about slaves, metics and women. Effective use was also made of pottery. Some candidates also discussed the architectural sculpture in this context: whilst their use of the Panathenaic frieze was effective, only a few managed to discuss the difficulties of interpreting the implications for different sections of society. Many candidates made good use of Pericles' *Funeral Oration*, in particular in relation to women. All too often, though, only the final parts of what he said were recalled, and the key role of women as 'producers of citizens' was ignored. There was also some effective discussion of tragedy and comedy, with candidates looking to draw messages about the roles of women from Sophocles' *Antigone* and Euripides' *Medea* (although many just stopped at saying that they were tragedies, and then failed to look beyond this to draw further conclusions), and there was also some effective use of Aristophanes in his treatment of fellow-citizens – most notably in his vilification of Cleon and his depiction of Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians*. Some candidates also wrote at length about the sophists, but often failed to note that Socrates was Athenian, which caused some confusion in their arguments.

Question 11

This question was popular, but not well answered. Many candidates saw it as an opportunity to write what they knew about Socrates, with only a minority developing their answers by looking at a range of Sophists. In the main, though, candidates knew something about this group of teachers, but failed to open out their answers to look at the effect of these men on the intellectual climate in Athens. A number began to develop answers looking at rhetoric, and some made effective use of the sources on both Pericles and Alcibiades. In general, there was a certain amount of explanation of what the Sophists did (although this tended to be focus on Socrates, with a note that he was not really a Sophist), and then the odd comment on Athenian society. Some candidates noted that the fact that the Sophists charged money for their teaching limited the effect, but then did not go further to look at the effects of the education of these people more widely. Some candidates made use of Aristophanes' *Clouds,* but often the evaluation of this play was rather weak, with general points about exaggeration rather than specific comments on what it can show about the intellectual climate in Athens.

Question 12

Some candidates responded well to this question, but a large number either failed to notice the word *dramatic* in the question and just talked in general about festivals, or moved to a summary of a play which they had read. There was a lack of knowledge of the detail of the festivals, and the more political elements of the Great Dionysia. Some candidates however made effective use of Aristophanes to suggest that there were political elements to the dramatic festivals, and some gave intelligent discussions of the tragedies which they had studied.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

The examiners were largely pleased with the ways in which candidates used their knowledge of events and sources; clearly candidates are showing greater facility in their interpretation and evaluation of the evidence, another feature which examiners found both pleasing and enjoyable to read. The enthusiasm for all aspects of the subject is apparent in the many interesting responses examiners encountered. This is a credit to those in centres who have worked hard and long to enthuse their students.

A good number of candidates are now using specific examples of the evidence in varying forms. It is also pleasing to see more use of material evidence in many answers especially in Options 2 and 3. The precise nature of some references is excellent and displays a good understanding of how to apply evidence of this sort to analysis.

There are clearly candidates whose grasp of chronology and detail is excellent; however, another pleasing aspect was the range of candidates who had a secure understanding of the period they were studying as well as the major themes within it. These options are thematic and an approach via the themes is much more rewarding than a narrative of events.

It needs repeating that the information and argument in their answers has to be relevant to the specific question. This is especially true of quotations from sources or reference to sources. Offering as large a range of information as possible, some of which, if reflected upon, would be seen as not relevant, is not necessarily the most productive approach.

A number of questions invite the candidate to consider 'how far the sources support this view' or ask 'how far the evidence enables us to understand/assess'. Candidates should be aware that the focus here is not just the evidence, and the analysis and argument needs to be structured to answer the question. The information is as much the evidence as the purely factual information.

Examiners were pleased to see less of prepared paragraphs of general evaluation. As reported previously, evaluation should be tied closely to the specific reference made in support of the answer. While it may be true that Suetonius is led astray by 'gossip', it would be useful if the candidates indicated which part the evidence cited was 'gossip' if any. Dio may be writing 200 years later and be inaccurate, but again the candidate should indicate which part of the information they do trust and why, and which they do not.

Option 2 and 3 are especially prone to confusion over persons, attributing actions to the wrong emperor or references from sources to the wrong author. Option 1's area of confusion seems to be in dating events, since many candidates place events in '50s', or '70s' assuming that they need not be more precise. In all options a common problem is giving reasonably precise dates for the authors – Tacitus is not writing the *Annals* during the reign of Domitian; Appian (or Arrian?) is not from the 1st century AD.

One final general point is that it is apparent that sometimes candidates are not aware of the context of the quotation they are using and so make inappropriate conclusions from the evidence. The context is often important for a full understanding of the value of the evidence and candidates should be aware that only reading the sources will provide this.

Handwriting continues to be an issue for examiners where there are real problems in understanding what the candidates is attempting to say. Centres need to be aware of this and consider alternatives where a candidate's hand writing is so bad that it may impede their ability to effectively communicate their answers.

Option 1: The fall of the Roman Republic 81–31 BC

All questions were attempted. Most candidates made an effort to cover the period. Where they did not, answers tended to stop at 50–49 BC, omitting the final 20 years of a 51 year period.

There was a variety of responses to **Q.1** (How far do the sources enable us to understand why relationships between politicians changed during this period?). The concern with weaker answers was that the focus was not on the 'sources' issue, or even the 'why' in the question. Narratives of various relationships (1st Triumvirate, 2nd Triumvirate were popular) replaced serious discussion. 'Change' was also an issue to address, and the majority of answers were able to describe some changes at length. A common example was the relationship between Crassus and Pompey starting with Spartacus and 70 BC; however, not all candidates had a full knowledge of Plutarch's information; the majority simply described it as bad (due to jealousy on Crassus' part) when this is not quite what the evidence tells us. Cicero's various relationships were used with varying success. Some candidates are still referring to his letters by the numbers in the Wilkinson text used at AS. Better answers provided a range of explanations for the changes in relationships – the aims of politicians, different ambitions, pressures from other politicians, greed, ideals for some, threats and bribery amongst them. Occasionally answers focused on the nature of relationships in general rather than specific examples of individual politicians but this required a sound knowledge of Roman political practice and quite detailed use of the source material. The question was quite popular and generally the answers were sound with some very detailed and thorough discussions.

Q.2 asked the candidates to consider to what extent politicians manipulated the demands of the plebs for their own purposes. Weaker answers addressed only the part about manipulating the plebs and ignored the issue of their 'demands' and 'for their own purposes'. Many rightly made the point that evidence for the plebs and their views is limited but that some inference might be made from their actions. The majority of answers had good examples of the various ways in which 'demands' were met, although the issue of the tribunate was rarely dealt with. Candidates tended to go for money, grain, jobs, land, entertainment as ways of manipulating the plebs to do what they want. However, the purposes were not always developed, not least through the sources for the period where there is sufficient evidence concerning the reasons for gaining the support of the plebs, even if it is not always reliable. There was a not infrequent claim that Cicero and Cato did not attempt to gain support of the plebs, which suggests that knowledge of the careers of some politicians is partial for some.

Q.3 ('The Senate had little control over public affairs during this period.' To what extent do the sources support this view?). As in Q.1 it was essential to have some specific source material to answer the question. Candidates did not always see this part of the question and provided a narrative of the events (often only as far as 50 BC) with very little reference to the sources. Equally candidates did not deal with the term 'public affairs' and the role of the Senate in the running of the Republic. Candidates clearly had the main instances when the Senate struggled to affect the outcome of events and the actions of individuals – Sulla's dictatorship, Pompey's commands and consulships, Caesar's consulship, Catiline's plot, the death of Caesar and so on. However, as to their control outside of these moments, few candidates offered an opinion. The argument over their control or lack of it during Catiline's conspiracy raged on in the answers with the better ones using Sallust and Cicero (and Plutarch) with some detail; on the other hand it was generally assumed that they lost complete control throughout the 50s. There was a tendency towards generalisation. Better answers were balanced and argued with the idea of 'little', so addressing the nuances of the question set. The best had a considered conclusion on the support from the sources with evaluation which assessed the reliability of the material they were using.

Q.4 (a popular choice) asked the candidates whether they agreed with the view that military support was essential for the success of a politician during this period. Some candidates took this as an opportunity to recite the military career of some politicians as proof of the statement. Most offered a balanced argument regarding 'essential' with examples of those who had support and those who did not. Cicero was the most frequent example of the latter with references to Plutarch's judgement on his success with Catiline and his consulship against all the odds. Better ones indicated that after 63 BC his career was not very successful, perhaps because he lacked the support which Pompey and Caesar had, especially in 44–43 BC against Octavian and Antony. Some even pointed out that he knew he needed some military success (in Cilicia) and that he used Octavian for precisely military support. Weaker answers did not develop examples such as this fully, and did not show a knowledge of the period in this way. Cato and Clodius were other examples of success without military support, but again assessing the extent of their success compared to others was an issue. Better answers had a good range of examples with detailed material. Some candidates chose to identify other ways of getting success with only a passing reference to the military without developing its role fully first. Errors occurred over Pompey's career confusing his return in 71 BC with 62 BC and what he did with his army; some were not quite sure whether Gaul came before or after Caesar's consulship.

Option 2: The invention of Imperial Rome 31 BC–AD 96

All questions were attempted with Q.5 and Q.8 slightly more popular than Q.6; Q.7 was the least popular question. There was a notably increased number of answers which avoided the list of emperors approach to the questions – this was pleasing given the thematic nature of the option.

One issue (with regard to Q.5 and Q.8) was that answers had much information of the activities of the emperors but failed to apply it to the issues of 'discontent' and 'transformation'. More often assumptions were made rather than assessing the evidence for these two issues.

There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to **Q.5** (To what extent was there discontent with the emperors during this period?). Weaker answers took the approach that this was about gaining and keeping popularity, similar to a previous question. This highlights the danger of prepared answers. Better answers focused on the 'extent' aspect and considered the range of discontent among different social groups within Rome. They also employed specific and relevant source material which identified cases of discontent such as instances of a riot or a conspiracy. The best answers approached it by themes looking at the discontent either for each social group or for a specific reason rather than a narrative of the reigns of emperors. Frequent among weaker arguments were the assertions that an action (for example the building of the Golden House, or treason trials under Tiberius) caused discontent without offering any evidence for this, or even arguing that it may have but there is no evidence for it causing discontent. Generalisation of consequences is not good analysis in this case. Equally better answers argued that within a reign there were different times when there was discontent and times when there was not such as Gaius at the start and end of his reign. Weaker answers asserted he was disliked leaping straight to his assassination. It was usually assumed that Augustus was universally liked despite the evidence in Cassius Dio and Suetonius. Many answers to this question and Q.8 put emphasis on the actions of the emperors and less on the impact of the action on the lives of the people of Rome.

Q.6 asked the candidates to consider extent to which the evidence helps us to understand the aims of those who sought to control the succession. As in other questions in which the focus is on the evidence a number of answers simply did not deal with that part of the question. Better answers focused their material on 'aims' in order to answer the question; weaker answers gave a narrative of emperors' efforts to secure a succession, fairly lengthy on Augustus at times. There was much factual knowledge about successors or lack of them but often not a great deal of the source material relating to them. The material on Tiberius was frequently omitted and only a minority included Domitian's aims in Suetonius *Domitian* 15. As in Q.5 a thematic approach produced the better analyses, for example dealing with the role of wives across the period, then

the military, then the Senate, and the emperors themselves. There was good knowledge in the majority of answers and a fair range of different sources including epigraphic and numismatic material. Some insightful comments were made regarding Augustus' tentative efforts in what was a completely new situation within his 'restored Republic' and regarding the situation in AD 69. Good use was made of Vespasian's law on succession as well as the role of persons such as Livia and Agrippina.

Q.7 ('The emperors of this period deliberately promoted the equestrians in order to reduce the role and power of the Senate.' To what extent do you agree with this assessment?) was the least popular question and produced some weak answers. Answers displayed a lack of a clear understanding of the policies initiated by emperors, nor of the roles the equestrians. There was a noticeable lack of detail about the duties of the equestrians within the administration. Arguments centring on Claudius' use of equestrians (and freedmen) failed to make it clear which roles were removed from the Senate and given to the equestrians and why this may have happened. Assertions that senators did not want Claudius as emperor (so he turned to others) were not well supported by evidence. Better answers made valid comparison between emperors' use of equestrians in specific roles (eg Praetorian Prefect, Governor of Egypt, various curatorships and so on). Answers, which did not have a clear idea of what the two groups did in Rome, could not develop an analysis of the policy and actions taken by emperors. Better answers identified specific areas of administration eg grain supply, water supply, policing, fire fighting etc. Some answers gave factual information about the structure of administration in terms of the various commissions and boards of magistrates, and the innovations by Augustus, for example. This aspect was less well known by the majority of candidates. Better answers also made some attempt to answer the issue of 'deliberately' arguing that it was not a policy but simply a natural transition to Empire.

Q.8 ('The emperors' achievements in transforming the life of the people in Rome during this period were considerable'. How far do you agree with this view?) This question was quite popular. Many had good factual knowledge of the achievements of the emperors from buildings, to the grain supply, water provision, policing, housing, infrastructure of Rome, health and social welfare and so on. Better answers could name aqueducts and who built them, and could be specific and detailed about the buildings and their purposes. Augustus' marriage laws were given clause by clause by some candidates. There was great detail of the numerous games and shows put on by emperors to enliven the daily grind of living in Rome. Even the economic prosperity of the Pax Romana was developed to show that life was transformed. The issue lay in establishing that these efforts did transform life. Good answers used poets such as Juvenal to indicate effects (or lack of effect) these actions had, although evaluation of satire was often quite weak or generic or completely lacking. There were some who showed confusion over the actions of the emperors and their efforts. There was also a tendency to make claims for Suetonius or Tacitus which were erroneous for example over Nero's redesigning of the streets and houses of Rome. Good answers did deal with the issue of 'considerable'. There was a tendency for candidates to simply write all they knew about 'buildings and games' without really addressing the terms in the question. There were some who claimed that Claudius' invasion of Britain made life better.

Option 3: Ruling the Roman Empire AD 14–117

There were some excellent answers with detailed use of a wide range of evidence. Answers presented a range of good ideas, often well-argued even when limited by focus on a specific part of the period. There was a clear effort in a large number of answers to approach the option in a thematic manner. It is also apparent that no matter what the question some answers will always try to include instances of revolt, especially Boudicca's rebellion – somewhat over-used as a stock piece of information to fall back on if all else fails.

Q.9 invited candidates to discuss how useful the evidence is for assessing the military activity on the frontiers during this period. The responses varied considerably. As in other questions the focus for better answers was on the evidence rather than on the events and narrative of activity. There was usually a range of evidence, literary and archaeological, to support the argument. Much of it focused on Britain at times, for which there is good material but somewhat limited in range for the period and the Empire. Evidence of other parts of the Empire was sometimes barely included. There was generally good detail of the various attempts at expansion as military activity, except for sparing references to the Parthian Campaigns of either Nero or Trajan; there were some answers which attached Corbulo's activity in Germany/Danube area to Domitian. Claudius' invasion of Britain featured prominently with some detailed description of further activity in Britain with the help of Tacitus' Agricola. Better answers included Domitian and Trajan in Dacia, although the sources for these were more limited. However, good use was made of what there is, both literary and archaeological. Some developed the notion of 'activity' in terms of the other duties soldiers had on the frontiers with some useful material from inscriptions. Revolts were a frequent topic as part if the activity, although this seemed to stretch the idea of 'frontier' a little at times, especially with instances in Gaul and possibly Judaea. Some narratives were noticeable in weaker answers, often ending in the middle of the century. As elsewhere, general assertions about Nero's complete lack of interest in the Empire are best avoided.

Q.10 (To what extent did Roman governors rely on the co-operation of local people for the smooth running of the provinces during this period?) was popular and produced some very good well-documented answers covering the involvement of some locals in running the provinces. However, the concept of 'running the provinces' was often vaguely addressed. For some candidates it appeared to mean that there was peace and no revolts. Better answers offered some instances on local elites (eg Cogidubnus, town councils in Bithynia). As in Q.9 there was some tendency to focus on Roman Britain, partly because evidence to some extent is more accessible. The use of *Agricola* 21 was common, with a variety of explanation as to how this showed co-operation. Weaker answers either took it at face value or added that Tacitus cannot be trusted because of his relationship with Agricola. Few included the small amount of archaeological evidence which might support the passage (even truer in Q.12). Pliny's *Letters* were used extensively, although not always well directed at the question to show the level of co-operation and what it meant for the running of the province. Inscriptions were sometimes cited as evidence of the involvement of local elites in religion, or as magistrates, and those who did use them did so accurately. There was a tendency to produce a statement about inscriptions, that since they were often fragmentary, they were limited in use. Since this did not apply to some of the ones used, the evaluation seemed unhelpful.

Q.11 ('Emperors were worshipped in both the East and the West for political rather than religious reasons.' How far do you agree?) was answered by a large number of candidates. The vast majority had a clear understanding of what constituted the worshipping of emperors; oaths of loyalty are not necessarily signs of religious worship despite Pliny's enthusiasm for them. The majority of answers had a reasonable range from both East and West, although with varying degrees of detail and, at times, accuracy. There was some confusion over Tiberius acceptance and refusal of worship in terms of the places involved, as well the author who deals with them. Much was made of Gaius' attempt and failure to get his statue in the temple at Jerusalem, although opinion differed over whether this was religious or political. Claudius' temple in Britain was a favourite item, with Tacitus quote from the Boudiccan revolt added, unfortunately with little attempt to make it relevant in some cases. There was some good analysis of the limitations of the evidence for understanding the motives. Most answers argued that political far outweighed the religious aspect, especially for the local elites who sought to curry favour with the emperor either for themselves or their community. The East was more often seen as religious than the West who did not have a tradition of worshipping leaders, unlike the people of the East (if we ignore the Jewish people, as a number did).

Q.12 ('For the provincials, the advantages of Roman rule far outweighed the disadvantages during this period.' How far do the sources support this view?) As before the key question was whether the sources supported the view, and the evaluation of the material was often generic rather than specific when the case was argued. Advantages were not always developed as such – citizenship was cited but what this meant was not always explained; equally there was much about trade with only better answers providing instances of clear benefit. Inscriptions were used well to identify elite participation, and the way this might benefit a community as well as the individual. It is to be expected that Boudicca and the Jewish Revolt of AD 66 would figure largely in the answers as examples of disadvantages since they resulted from mistreatment. Answers, however, did not take the analysis further and consider whether or nor this was an isolated incident or a more general problem. Some narrated the events at length. Better answers selected elements which provided evidence for the discussion of 'far outweighed' with an emphasis on **far**. Another issue was identifying the causes of these revolts, and the evidence for them. This was not always accurate and sometimes it involved more speculation than fact. There was some confusion about who said what about Gaius and the Jews, and what exactly were the grievances of the Jews in AD 66. There were some good answers which balanced the revolts with examples of advantages and disadvantages among the provincials, such as Cogidubnus, or at Aphrodisias, or in Pliny *Letters*. Good arguments were made that sometimes there was a difference between elites and the ordinary people in the benefits. The point was often made that our information from the provincials is limited in the sources. Some judiciously used archaeological evidence of roads, baths and villas, remembering the period of the option. Tacitus' portrayal of Agricola was totally unreliable; Pliny was making himself look as good as he could; Josephus hated, first, the Romans, then the Jewish lower class. Better answers saw the limitations of the sources but were able to differentiate between the unreliable opinion and the reliable fact.