

## **A LEVEL**

*Examiners' report*

# **ANCIENT HISTORY**

**H407**


For first teaching in 2017


## **H407/22 Summer 2019 series**

Version 1

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Paper 22 series overview .....	4
Section A overview .....	6
Question 1 .....	7
Question 2 .....	10
Question 3 .....	12
Question 4 .....	14
Question 5 .....	16
Question 6 .....	19


 **Would you prefer a Word version?**

 Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Save As Other ...** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as ...** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word* converter).



**We value your feedback**

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates. The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report. A full copy of the question paper can be downloaded from OCR.

## Paper 22 series overview

This is a new specification for Ancient History and new criteria for assessment. This required candidates to assess themes in the Period Study and to explore specific issues in more depth in the Depth study. In addition, Section A included a new element of assessing the view of a modern author on specific debate. In the Depth study the candidates had to analyse and evaluate a specific passage from prescribed sources on a well-defined topic. In general candidates rose to the challenge and in a number of cases excellently, with few clearly having difficulties. The specification highlights the use of ancient sources as a key component for assessment and responses showed candidates meeting this criterion, for the most part, in a reasonable manner; some responses indeed exhibited a set of skills which was very good, even excellent. This was especially true in the newer style questions (Questions 3 and 4).

The examination questions proved accessible to all levels where candidates had engaged with the subject during their period of study. The great majority had clearly studied the prescribed sources and had appreciated the nature and differences between them in terms of genre and content. There was a consistent engagement with the sources which was especially pleasing to examiners.

For successful responses candidates need to display a secure knowledge of the ancient sources and the historical periods studied, displayed in precise and accurate examples; in addition to perform well their judgements needed to be well-developed from the evidence, rather than asserted sentences; the prescribed sources needed to be carefully evaluated in the context showing how the context, genre and preconceptions of the author impacted on the reliability of the evidence.

The majority of good responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding at least part of the period and the Depth study, although clearly in the context of an examination of limited time, errors were made and misconceptions arose, more numerous only in the less successful responses. There were many good responses which displayed a pleasing and an equally secure knowledge and understanding of both the Period and Depth study.

The majority of good responses formed most of their judgements on the evidence, literary and material, which provided convincing, and at times thorough, explanations although not always consistently. The vast majority of responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the text, but again not consistently. This showed they had engaged with the material in the specification and had understood the issues in both the Period and Depth study. Less successful responses were characterised by limited sources, generalised factual knowledge, inaccurate chronology, general source references ('Suetonius tells us', 'According to Tacitus' or simply Dio in brackets after the information), confusion between emperors and simple inaccuracies.

The analysis and evaluation of sources and the way the context of sources production affects the portrayal of events was very variable. Candidates who were less successful offered a paragraph on the author or genre (sometimes), or the background and supposed bias. For example, 'Tacitus was a senator and was biased towards emperors' with little attempt to relate the evaluation to the evidence being used. Sometimes the paragraph which followed concluded that we could not trust the author but the candidate did not seem to see that this negated the argument just presented in the response. On the other hand, many made attempts to deal with specific evidence, notably with material examples such as coins as propaganda. The Depth study contains a good number of inscriptions and coins. Candidates clearly engaged with these and analysed their usefulness very well when used.

There were, of course, some less successful responses, much of the time due to a failure to produce ancient sources; occasionally this amounted to none at all. This, in terms of the assessment criteria, damages the response even where it displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the issue and context in the question.

Timing appeared not to be an issue with candidates- very few indicated an unfinished question. Only occasionally was a question not answered at all. The candidates appeared to find the questions accessible at all levels in some form.

## Section A overview

Question 1 was more popular than Question 2 which required a detailed knowledge of a specific ancient source. Most responses for Q1 displayed a knowledge of the period and an understanding of the historical features in A01; there was a good variety of sources including material evidence for A03; the candidates in this component also showed a good knowledge of the genre and agenda of the relevant authors, some of whom were writing close to the period of their Depth study; explanations and judgements varied from one sentence to clearly expressed and logically reasoned judgements substantiated with developed explanations based on the evidence (A02).

Question 3 (the newest element in the specification) revealed how well the candidates had engaged with the material. The responses displayed relevant and well-developed skills in assessing the opinion of the author, both in agreeing with and challenging it.

## Question 1

- 1\* To what extent and for what reasons did the emperors attempt to improve the lives of the inhabitants of the city of Rome?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**

The responses varied from the very good to those exhibiting little understanding of the issue in the questions. The majority of responses dealt with the attempts and reasons well.

Very good responses took the approach of not narrating each emperor. They identified the key ways in which improvement could be made and dealt with what a selection of emperors did in each of these ways - similarly with 'reasons', grouping actions under headings and identifying how the actions of emperors related to these. This is more analytical and less a run through events with a brief added note on a reason.

Responses had a variety of material to show the attempts made by emperors. Good responses included various attempts – food supply, water supply, security and fire prevention, entertainments, creation of peace and stability, provision of work, enhanced status and roles for the upper classes, multiple buildings and money handouts. Many responses assumed inhabitants means poor/ordinary citizens ignoring other groups who lived/worked in Rome.

Not all responses made clear connections between actions and improvements: the corn supply, aqueducts, the night-watch, and so on were relatively straightforward and dealt with well; explaining how the building of the Temple of Mars improved lives proved more difficult; The Augustan Forum is explained in Suetonius but appeared very rarely. Most mentioned 'bread and circuses', some referring to Juvenal correctly but hardly ever explaining the rest of the reference and giving the quote a context.

Better responses had a range of reasons and linked them clearly to the attempts. Reasons covered most often meant 'making happier'; there were rarely multiple reasons. Most frequent were popularity, maintain power and support, rarely to avoid riots, or genuine concern. Sometimes they were specific to emperor such as Claudius' need to gain immediate support given the antipathy of the Senate or only 8 days of grain left and needed to get on with it.

Good responses displayed a good range of knowledge of the sources, often detailed, with accurate quotes or close paraphrases. This was used to support the judgements and explanations in those which performed well. Good evaluation of specific examples produced well-developed judgements.

Less successfully in some responses they were treated as fact rather than as support for an explanation. For example, they were selective especially on Gaius (hate me/fear me, only one neck,) and generalised assertions follow. There was much less of the context and how that impacts the conclusion we can take from them. 3 or 4 lines of general 'evaluation' often followed with no explanation as to how the background of the author, for example, impacted on the validity of the reference/quote just used. These many isolated paragraphs add little because they are not integrated into the development of the judgements.

Common mistakes were that The *Res Gestae* has the quote on brick and marble; Tacitus not Suetonius has Tiberius (literally) thrown into the Tiber. Sources might be named with a general idea of their view (e.g. Pliny the Elder comments on the buildings but no detail of what comment, or Virgil and Horace referenced for religion but again no specific point made).

Responses which chose to narrate through the emperors generally made much of Augustus using *Res Gestae*, Suetonius and Dio. After Augustus the responses gradually declined in quality, either through

lack of information or sources or the candidate had spent too long on Augustus and needed to finish. Claudius and Nero, therefore received less discussion and assessment.

Assertions were made that Tiberius or Gaius did nothing to improve lives even when giving examples of actions they took such as Gaius reduction of the auction tax. Equally it was asserted without any evidence that the emperors did nothing for the senatorial class.

The question did not ask how far lives were improved but the extent to which attempts were made; responses which discuss the improvement of lives often were left to assert an improvement with no evidence, assuming a new temple did improve lives for example. Great play was made of Tiberius' failure to improve lives, or even made them worse with trials, but the issue in the question was: did he make any attempts and why; responses became diverted by his 'brutality' and lost focus.

Most responses had very good or at least good sections but were affected by a variety of misconceptions. A perfectly relevant reference to evidence might be affected by a misattribution leading to an erroneous conclusion or a misunderstanding of the context again leading to an unconvincing analysis. Minor errors of dates or events are to be expected to some extent in a timed examination and do not seriously affect the performance unless they lead to misunderstanding or an unsubstantiated judgement.

Common errors included mixing up the emperors - Claudius assassinated by senators (Gaius?), Gaius building a Golden House (Nero), Nero finishing aqueducts, Claudius thrown into Tiber (Tiberius- actually not literally thrown), Gaius' golden 5 years (Nero?); *Pontifex Maximus* was voted to Augustus in 23 BC by the Senate; he abolished the tribune; Augustus created the *Cursus Honorum*.

### Exemplar 1

	<p>Furthermore, Claudius is most likely the best emperor for long term solutions to benefit Rome. There was low grain supplies especially in the winter months due to storms. But, Suetonius explains that Claudius ensured the arrival of grain by "insuring merchants against loss of their ships". This is reliable because it would have been common knowledge with Suetonius would have heard about. Suetonius goes on to explain how Claudius had the Aqua Claudia and the "harbour at Ostia" built to ensure clean water to Rome and to protect ships whilst in harbours. This is reliable as there is archaeological evidence in support of this. Therefore, Claudius is portrayed as improving the lives of all within the city of Rome.</p>
--	---



This extract highlights good and limited aspects of the response. It starts with a clear statement. This is supported by a specific instance. This itself is substantiated by a reference to Suetonius with a quotation. There is a brief statement of reliability linked to the evidence (although not in depth). The response continues with further examples of a material nature with a reason why these were built. Reliability is again mentioned but vague (archaeological evidence). It ends with a summary of 'improving lives'. It has identified three attempts and attempt to support these with further evidence. It has hinted rather than explicitly developed the reasons. The evaluation is integrated into the discussion but has not provided in one case any real support. The response here gains credit in all assessment objectives, and with a little more might have been seen as, well-developed and convincing.

## Question 2

- 2\* How useful is Suetonius for our understanding of the reigns of the emperors of this period? You must consider the accounts of at least **two** emperors in your answer.

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. [30]

Very good responses took specific episodes and compared the detail in Suetonius with that of other writers/evidence. Reasonable responses produced narrative of episodes with sources attached offering some comparison with other evidence to match Suetonius. However, they lacked consistently developed points. The responses often assessed 'useful' in terms of how credible he and others were - for example the account of the fire in Rome (AD 64) and Suetonius differences on the cause and effect from Tacitus' more 'balanced' account. Another example was the *quadrans* of Gaius and the reference to the tax in Suetonius, developed with the later riot over taxes recorded in Dio or Josephus. A further example was the comparison of Suetonius and Velleius on Tiberius especially on his generosity or buildings. This allowed assessment of the positive/negative account of the reign by Suetonius.

Some very good responses, instead of dealing with emperors in turn, looked at themes within the accounts such as the relationship with the senators, the attitude towards administration, the characterisation of the emperors and other themes and assessed the usefulness of the accounts.

Assessing the reliability of written or material sources is achieved only by using specific examples. General evaluations (that Suetonius always relies on gossip, or that Tacitus is completely negative towards Tiberius) do not allow the response to deal with the context and its impact on the issue convincingly. An example of undeveloped evaluation was to mention Augustus and Agrippa's aqueducts or the *Cloaca Maxima*, while claiming Suetonius is not to be trusted always because he writes as a moralist. It is not explained why the account of aqueducts is no longer credible in this case.

Some very carefully selected episodes are identified and explored analytically. Good assessments were formed on the opening of Claudius' reign. Suetonius' presentation of the 'accident' of his accession was interpreted as a deliberate way to show his weakness. Very good responses developed this by showing that there were also instances in Suetonius where he is shown as administratively competent and even excellent. This suggested a more through and sustained analysis. Some responses attempted a more narrative exploration of the emperors selected which reduces the opportunity for analysis. Some candidates prioritise exploration of the sources in a generalised way that detracts from the argument being made at a given point.

The focus for the good responses was the detail provided by Suetonius for a reign; some balanced their response by contrasting the Suetonius' focus on character at the expense of the reign. Good responses selected a few key episodes which they could develop their assessment rather than a general, sometimes, erroneous overview of his biographies.

Less successful were the responses with a general sentence of Suetonius' view of an emperor followed by a (sometimes) detailed assessment of another author (e.g. Tacitus on Tiberius). They then concluded that Tacitus was more useful. This approach loses focus on the author in the question. A good comparison might be made with The Res Gestae and how Suetonius includes matters which Augustus preferred to leave out (e.g. Varus disaster or his less acceptable behaviour as a triumvir or the plots In Ch 19).

There was, naturally, a focus on Augustus, with much time spent here; there was a limited focus on a second emperor (although a number chose to do more than two).

The usual opening paragraph about the limitations of Suetonius was not applied consistently later in the response. A common opening statement was that Suetonius belonged to the senatorial order; he was in fact an equestrian - thus arguments of senatorial bias were somewhat difficult to sustain. Responses did not appreciate the different genres and approaches of authors when comparing them.

In addition, some responses used Tacitus as a source for Gaius and the invasion of Britain in all questions.

If we are going to criticise Suetonius for using gossip, an example of it would be useful to make it convincing as evaluation.

## Question 3

### 3 Read the interpretation below.

How convincing do you find Beard's interpretation that 'Augustus appears to have abolished nothing'?

You must use your knowledge of the historical period and the ancient sources you have studied to analyse and evaluate Beard's interpretation. **[20]**

It is important in this question to read the extract carefully and deal with the phraseology of the extract, and not rephrase it in some minor or major way.

Responses which dealt with what Beard actually wrote and assessed the points with close attention to the text were clearly going to score well. They supported their views with precise knowledge of the context and details of this debate. Many were able to show Beard's analysis was in some ways superficial by detailing the various actions Augustus took: for example, the less republican numerous consulships, or his grandsons gaining it well before the legal age. The majority had the major powers to hand. Most could quote Cassius Dio on 'the monarchy' and/or Suetonius comment that Augustus thought of restoring the Republic twice. Responses which had precise and detailed. Of the reality as opposed to the pretence scored well.

There were, therefore, difficulties for candidates in not using the quote from the question in full, usually excluding 'appears' but focusing on 'abolished nothing'; this led to the view that the analysis argues the Beard is wrong since Augustus did abolish things, not all of which were constitutional (e.g adultery, Antony and Cleopatra, the Civil War, books of prophecies).

The extract mentions privileges of the Senate which was translated in responses to powers. Therefore, the reduction in the Senate's roll was treated as a diminution of power rather than a possible enhanced status. Good responses had examples of Augustus' new regulations on the Senate which may be seen as enhancement. Many responses pointed to the rise in the qualification making it more elite, or the rules of attendance and speaking giving it more respect. More relevant, but needed developing, was the change in the organisation of provinces as a change in privilege rather than power.

Less success was gained when responses explained Augustus' settlements as if this was a question asking 'did Augustus restore the Republic?'

It was not always clear in responses what they understood by Beard's 'governing class'. Beard's statement on the offices still being filled was often countered by the view that Augustus decided who filled them. The creation of the 'Consilium' was seen as evidence of Augustus decreasing the privileges of the Senate or changing the governing class.

Misconceptions (about how republican his powers were) was noticed in responses claiming the tribune was new or imperium was unprecedented or the title of pro-consul was new.

Good responses supported their views with reference to specific knowledge of Augustus' practice whether they argued the view was or was not convincing. A sense of the background was present in the majority of responses - Caesar's murder, the danger of appearing like a king, the traditional Roman loyalty to the Republic, all found favour in the responses and served well for candidates.

Good responses showed an understanding that Augustus had to be circumspect given the assassination of Caesar. Good responses developed the importance of maintaining relations with the upper class, which formed the basis of an appreciation of the points in the extract relating to 'appears'; in addition, the

extent to which he really did abolish some things if not in name but in reality, was convincingly argued. Concepts such as 'illusion', 'façade' were commonly found in good analyses.

The detail of Augustus' power/roles/titles and how they were acquired was variable- in better responses there was a clear knowledge of the evidence in Dio, while weaker ones claimed Suetonius as the source. The episode of Augustus resigning and receiving his powers in 23 BC after an illness is claimed to have been in Suetonius who tells us he 'forced' the Senate (presumably section 28 which says no such thing).

## Question 4

### SECTION B: The Flavians, AD 68–96

#### 4 Read the passage below.

How useful is this passage for our understanding of reasons for Domitian's actions both before and after his accession to the principate? [12]

Responses focused largely on the envy of Domitian for Titus; good responses supported this by reference to both Dio (Titus' death) and Suetonius (plotting) with varying accuracy and detail (some clearly being struck by the idea of packing Titus' body in snow).

The issue of Domitian's 'hiding his character' to avoid criticism and gain his aims produced good responses with references again to later in his reign; less successful analysis of this were not able to elaborate with support (pretence at Agricola's illness in Tacitus Agricola, contradictory character in Suetonius in various incidents).

Other aspects such as his relationship with his 'elders' and his plotting against his father and brother were highlighted. Well-developed responses could point to such evidence in support from before his accession or later in his reign. This might be his treatment of senators, Dio's story of the black 'joke', envy of Agricola or his relationship with Titus. An example would be Dio's claim that he resented his brother, hated any praise of Titus etc. Other responses made much of the idea of his desire for glory (thwarted by Mucianus) in his Chatti campaigns and efforts against Decebalus, even his false triumph (Tacitus Agricola) and his paranoia (Dio 67.14).

Less common but effective were discussions of how his reactions to Mucianus' suggestion and his attempt to get Cerialis on side reflected his need to be in control. This was compared to his role in Rome before Vespasian's arrival. This was also seen as resentment at a challenge to himself such as we see in desire to be 'Lord and God' or treatment of opposition detailed in Dio and Suetonius.

Good analysis was common on the overall attitude of Tacitus towards Domitian, and its impact on the validity of this portrayal showing understanding of the context and genre of the writing. Responses were able to show that the extract was less useful because of Tacitus' predisposition to see the worst in Domitian. Less successful were the bolted-on paragraphs of general evaluation which often undermined the argument preceding it.

There was also good analysis of the extent to which Tacitus was speculating about motive and thought; criticism was made of the use of indirect speech and the various assumptions Tacitus seems to be making about the actions described here. This was going beyond generic evaluations. Good responses identified Tacitus' own doubt at one point but noted his style in mentioning the claim anyway.

A misconception arose quite often that Tacitus was writing 'under Domitian' or 'at the time of Domitian' when in fact he wrote most the works after Domitian's death; that he experienced his reign is, of course, true and the impact of this on his view of Domitian was generally well represented in responses. There was generally an understanding that the usefulness Tacitus' account is seriously affected by his hostility towards Domitian. However, this needed to be shown in the passage not asserted.

## Exemplar 2

		Tacitus <sup>is</sup> has a hostile nature in regards to Domitian, because many senators were executed by Domitian at the time of his reign. Tacitus was also a senator, therefore he identified himself as subject of violence by Domitian. This indicates that Tacitus' personal views towards Domitian cloud his judgement of events, therefore we lack an understanding of the reasons for Domitian's actions before and after his accession.
--	--	---

This is a typical example of the evaluation paragraph which is detached from the argument and the source being evaluated. It gives a general overview of Tacitus' attitude towards Domitian. It explains why he was hostile (a senatorial bias). It explains that this would affect his view. The conclusion is that we cannot understand the issue in the question because of this. This occurs at the end of the discussion covering the previous page suggesting that any conclusion drawn from the extract are invalid. The response needed to have dealt with this hostility during the discussion. The response actually began with 'Tacitus is useful for our understanding of reasons...'. This displays the danger of the added paragraph at the end or beginning of a response.

## Question 5

5\* To what extent did the role and power of the princeps become more monarchical under the Flavians?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. [36]

Responses approached this issue of 'monarchical' in a generally sound manner making clear what was understood by the term and how it applied to the three emperors. One of the key features was to show progression, if any, and most responses naturally took the view that there was progression to Domitian's reign which is more overtly autocratic (at least in the sources).

Some very good responses dealt with the concept of 'monarchical' and looked at the various ways this can be defined; they linked the aspects of this to the different emperors when assessing the extent to which it was developed or not. This allowed for a more thematic rather than narrative approach. Less successful ones simply asserted it without explanation. The focus sometimes was solely on power or solely on role.

There were assessments of 'monarchical' based on the extent to which an emperor executed people or was cruel. Others focused on the relationship with the senators as a way to show a monarchy. More looked more closely at the powers which Vespasian acquired and his use of them rather than the relationship with the senators. Many of these detailed the Lex de imperio as a good way to approach the subject. 'Monarchical' was defined as 'taking more control' and this served the discussion well for the most part in assessing the issue. Some approached the issue by comparison with the Julio-Claudians and pointed out that, despite the pretence, they were 'monarchical' in practice. They used specific individual actions for comparison. Therefore, judgements about the Flavians were more developed in some cases concerning how far there was already a monarchy and how far the Flavians were more autocratic in practice.

Most responses used the statements in Suetonius and to some extent Dio that neither Vespasian nor Titus ever put anyone to death (unjustly at least) to contrast with Domitian's clearly unjust executions (in the sources). The contrast was also made between Vespasian's affability and approachability and Domitian's isolation in his villa (killing flies) or lack of interest in Senate meetings. However, few made the point that while Vespasian was pleasant to all, those around him (Mucianus, Titus) were much less pleasant in their treatment of others (*Tacitus Histories* 1.10, 4.68, Suetonius *Titus* 1 'loathed 6 'tyrannical').

'Dominus et Deus' was universally used as evidence of Domitian's desire for total control, although not everyone seemed to be aware of the evidence for this. Another contrast was Vespasian's dealing with opposition (Priscus, Caecina) and Titus abolition of treason trials and Domitian's reintroduction of them, along with his cruel treatment of senators. There was some detail of Domitian's 'cruelty' but mostly it was generalised. There are sufficient examples in our sources - Saturninus, Lucullus, Sabinus, Arrecinus, Clemens, the Vestal Virgins etc – for candidates to mention. Few mentioned that initially he is recorded as being moderate and self-restrained.

Using the sources, the majority of responses showed a sound understanding of some aspects and an engagement with the material. Most had a set of examples to use which were evaluated, sometimes with a sound analytical approach and in detail. Responses did tend to stereotype slightly when discussing the evidence for the characters and behaviour of the emperors. There were sound generalisations of an author whereas more detailed examinations were more nuanced in their assessment. For example, they noted that the sources present trivialised reasons (e.g. Suetonius *Domitian* 10) and developed views



accordingly. Another problem was the confusion between sources, and the placing of Suetonius in the time period.

A good contrast was also made between Vespasian and Domitian over their use of religion where Vespasian is traditional and Domitian more fixated on the Imperial Cult (house made into temple, Dominus et Deus, deified son – the coin used well here). How far this was more monarchical was not always developed.

Some responses did not cover the period (the Flavians) focusing on either Vespasian or Domitian lacking a sufficient balance.

Juvenal's *Satire 4* was good material, although mostly it was referenced rather than detailed. The existence of the council and the censorship for life again were well used as instances of Domitian taking more control of the state.

The use of buildings as a contrast was worthwhile and creditable. Indeed, with a little more balance the response may have been very good if there was knowledge of more of Domitian's buildings; simply to say Vespasian built for the people and Domitian for himself ignored the Temple to Capitoline Jupiter, the Baths, the Forum, the stadium, concert hall etc (in Suetonius).

The dynastic aspect of the succession was almost universally a starting point in responses. It was usually well-developed as a sign of a more open monarchy than the Julio-Claudians. Coinage was well analysed to show this aspect of a dynasty (most often the early coin of Titus and Domitian rather than later ones of Domitian) They were usefully interpreted as an element of propaganda for the dynasty, at least under Vespasian.

## Exemplar 3

It is probably the reign of Domitian ~~is~~ from which the idea of monarchy comes into play with the Flavians. Suetonius documents the complete difference between Titus and his brother Domitian. Through the reactions from the masses as they adored Titus, yet their favour for Domitian diminished the longer his reign progressed. Domitian also reintroduced the treason trials, much like Tiberius, and so his reign became almost tyrannical. The portrayal of Domitian ~~is~~ by Tacitus, would be heavily influenced by Tacitus' experience as a senator during Domitian's treason trials and so his perspective is not as reliable as Suetonius' portrayal. ~~The final line is evaluating the perspective of~~

This is effectively the final paragraph of a discussion about the 'monarchical aspect' of the Flavians. The section on Domitian is very brief. The Suetonius reference is very general and has little information. There is one piece of specific information (Treason trials) which is stated as 'almost tyrannical' by the comparison with Tiberius. We are told very little in terms of the issue in the question. A brief general assessment of Tacitus in comparison with Suetonius is finally made but there has been no reference to Tacitus. The response, therefore, is very unbalanced since Vespasian and Titus have been dealt with in much more detail. This has affected the assessment since clearly the response in the first line is making the point that Domitian was probably more monarchical but cannot substantiate it. This may be due to time (as the final question answered) but also due to planning a clear line of argument and giving space to all three emperors.

## Question 6

6\* How effective was Vespasian in dealing with opposition during this period?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. [36]

There were fewer responses to this question.

Responses used a number of instances of opposition from before Vespasian's accession to the end of his reign. Some responses focused largely on the opposition from Vitellius and others and how he dealt with it. Others made a great deal of the victory over the Jews. His dealings with the Alexandrian people was also possible. These were largely external/provincial opposition and less successful responses focused on this aspect for most of the response.

There were a few excellent responses which focused on the nature and types of opposition rather than the period as a narrative of his reign. Responses also focused on the means used to deal with opposition. The analytical approach served them well.

In the Civil War, they detailed his cautious approach, reliance on his supporters, control of Egypt, the actions of his commanders in doing the actual fighting as well as his military skill and reputation. Assessing the effectiveness of his strategy and actions often amounted to that fact that he won. However, there were responses which identified successful aspects in his use of swearing allegiance to Otho and getting the praetorian support. Egypt and the grain supply were good examples of his strategy (Josephus 4.607). Responses also referenced the situation in Rome especially with the praetorians, noting the effectiveness of Mucianus (the emperor-maker) and Domitian as supporters. Tiberius Alexander was also noted as a useful supporter in dealing with opposition.

The issue of the Senate and senators was well represented in some but not all. Good responses showed a knowledge of Helvidius Priscus and the Caecina plot. However, the details in the sources (Suetonius *Titus* 6, *Vespasian* 15 for example) were less well-known. Related to this was the opposition of the 'Stoics' and the expulsion of philosophers, notably Demetrius and Hostilianus. The sources and details of these events were largely lacking. However, responses mostly noted the importance of the role of Titus as praetorian commander and his contribution to the effectiveness.

There was some acknowledgement of the relationship with other groups and his dealings with the ordinary citizens in providing games and food.

The ways in which Vespasian sought to deal with opposition either before it developed or afterwards were analysed in most responses. Good responses included a wide range of options: the use of force (praetorians), propaganda (especially on the dynastic aspects and the Jewish victory), creation of peace, his moderation and generosity, both to upper and lower classes. Responses used both Cassius Dio and Suetonius to describe his treatment of senators and his accessibility as a way to defuse opposition before it got worse.

Responses made good use of the deliberate way in which Vespasian made comparison with Augustus and Claudius rather than Gaius and Nero. Some noted Tacitus comment on his deliberate moderation in lifestyle as a way to avoid envy and opposition. Responses included his humour, for example in dealing with Domitian's behaviour in Rome before he arrived. Again good responses mentioned his careful financial management (even when greedy according to Suetonius.)

Good use was made of the coins as propaganda for the dynasty and the successes. The Temple of Peace was a focus since his stabilisation of Rome and rebuilding was another means to defuse opposition. Good responses added other aspects of his rebuilding, usually noting his lifting of the first

stone on the Capitol (Suetonius). There was some good discussion of his efforts to keep the aspect of repression and execution out of the public consciousness.

There was a wide variety of sources used in the responses. Suetonius and Dio were most often used, naturally. There was some use of Tacitus detailing his support from various areas and legions. Josephus for the Civil War and Josephus' prophecy was included as part of the role of religion in gaining him support against his rivals, and in persuading him to make a claim as well as his account of the triumph. Vespasian was seen as a realist in the Imperial Cult and this was not seen as important. Less successful ones confused their sources of information, and presented only generic evaluation of those sources rather than carefully evaluating the reliability specific pieces of information.

While responses had a range of opposition and means to tackle it, they often let themselves down with lack of detail and sources. There were also some very weak responses with little knowledge of the range of opposition. Some candidates also responded to this question as if it was asking about how well Vespasian maintained good relations with the Senate and/or the plebs, and did not mention any specific episodes of opposition.

## Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

### Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

## activeresults

*Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. Available for GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Nationals.*

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level\*
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

\*To find out which reports are available for a specific subject, please visit [ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/](https://ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/)

Find out more at [ocr.org.uk/activeresults](https://ocr.org.uk/activeresults)

## CPD Training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

[www.ocr.org.uk](https://www.ocr.org.uk)

## OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: [resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here: [www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest](http://www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest)

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications: [resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk)

## Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

[www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/](http://www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

OCR Customer Support Centre

### General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2019** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge  
Assessment

