



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

**GCE**

**Ancient History**

**H407/13: Macedon and the Greek world**

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for November 2020**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.











This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2020

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page
N/A	Highlight
	Omission
	Seen
	AO1
	AO2
	AO3
	AO4
	Irrelevant
	Correct point
	Evaluation

**Section A: Relations between Greek states and between Greek and non-Greek states, 492-404 BC**

<b>Question 1*</b>	‘The change in the relationship between Sparta and Corinth after 446 BC led to the Spartans declaring war on Athens in 432 BC.’ To what extent do the sources support this view? <b>[30 marks]</b>		
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	<p><b>AO3</b> = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• historical events and historical periods studied</li> <li>• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b> = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements</p> <p><b>AO1</b> = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p><b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources &amp; historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</b></p>		
<b>Additional guidance</b>	The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Candidates should discuss the change in the relationship between Sparta and Corinth after 446 BC and discuss the extent to which this led to Sparta declaring war on Athens in 432 BC. They should also consider other factors which may have led to war.</p> <p>Answers are likely to include some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An outline of the Thirty Year Peace and Corinth’s reaction to Sparta’s proposal for Peloponnesian intervention in the revolt of Samos (440).</li> </ul>

Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Epidamnus and Corcyra affairs; Corinthian involvement and reaction to Athens becoming involved</li> <li>• Corinthian involvement in the revolt of Potidaea (432)</li> <li>• Possible Athenian interference in the Ambracian Gulf</li> <li>• The Corinthian speeches in Sparta and their role in persuading Sparta and the Peloponnesian allies to declare war</li> <li>• Other causes of complaint against Athens: the Megarian Decree, Aegina</li> <li>• Thucydides' assessment of the 'real reason for the war'; is this substantiated by other events, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Athenian aggression in interfering in areas of Corinthian interest</li> <li>• War was inevitable</li> <li>• Aristophanes' version of the reasons for the war</li> <li>• Plutarch's discussion of the reasons in Pericles</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aristophanes Acharnians 524-39</li> <li>• Plutarch Pericles 30-31</li> <li>• Thucydides 1.23, 33, 35, 40-41, 44, 55-58, 60, 66-69, 86-88, 115-7, 118, 121-2, 139-40</li> </ul> <p>Credit all relevant source material</p>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

<b>Question 2*</b>	'After the Peace of Nicias (421 BC), Alcibiades could have won the war for Athens, but in the end caused her to lose it' To what extent do you agree with this view? <span style="float: right;"><b>[30 marks]</b></span>		
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	<p><b>AO3</b> = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• historical events and historical periods studied</li> <li>• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b> = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements</p> <p><b>AO1</b> = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p><b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources &amp; historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</b></p>		
<b>Additional guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with a conclusion either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p><i>Candidates should discuss the extent to which Alcibiades was the key man in Athens after the Peace of Nicias (421 BC), both in terms of her potential to win the war and the reasons why ultimately she lost. They may offer alternative reasons why Athens lost the war.</i></p> <p>Answers are likely to include some information on-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alcibiades' involvement with Argos, Mantinea and Elis (420-418)</li> <li>• His promotion of the Sicilian Expedition</li> </ul>

Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and its consequences</li> <li>• His involvement in the mutilation of the Herms and sacrilege concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries</li> <li>• His escape and arrival in Sparta – advice to the Spartans, Gylippus, Decelea and to become involved in the Aegean</li> <li>• His return to Athens and influence with the Persians</li> <li>• The battle of Notium and final exile</li> <li>• Attempt to influence Athenian generals at Aegospotamoi</li> </ul> <p>Candidates might also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thucydides’ view of the importance of the Sicilian disaster</li> <li>• Nicias’ view of Alcibiades expressed in his speech</li> <li>• Other factors affecting the outcome, which might include decisions made in Athens not involving Alcibiades, the radical democracy, Persian financial help to Sparta, Lysander</li> </ul> <p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thucydides 5.43; 6.8, 13, 31, 89-91; 7.18, 27-8; 8.28.17-8, 52, 87</li> <li>• Xenophon 1.5.1-3, 6.6-11; 2.1.20-32</li> </ul> <p>Credit all relevant source material</p>
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	



Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No response or no response worthy of credit</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 3</b>		How convincing do you find R. Osborne's interpretation of the contribution of Greek unity to the victory over the Persians in 480-479 BC? <b>[20 marks]</b>	
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>		<p><b>AO4</b> = 15 marks = Analyse and evaluate, in context, modern historians' interpretations of the historical events and topics studied.</p> <p><b>AO1</b> = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p>	
<b>Additional guidance</b>		<p>The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>Please note that interpretations can be evaluated in the context of the wider historical debate connected with the issue or of the historical context about which the historian was writing. There is no expectation that the interpretation will be evaluated in the context of the methods or approach used by the historian, or how the interpretation may have been affected by the time in which they were writing, though credit can be given for this approach to evaluation if done in a way which is relevant to the question.</p> <p>A learner's knowledge and understanding of the historical period, including the ancient sources may be credited, but only where it is presented in a way which is relevant and intrinsically linked to the analysis/evaluation/use of the interpretation, it should not be credited in isolation.</p>	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response has a very through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and fully substantiated evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> </ul>	<p><i>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing with Osborne's interpretation, disagreeing with it, or anywhere between, providing the response has addressed the issue of how convincing. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</i></p>
Level 4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response has a through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and well supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> </ul>	<p>Candidates should question the idea of to what extent Greek unity contributed to the victory over the Persians in 480-479 BC, and look at the extent to which the sources support Osborne's interpretation. They should consider the unity of the Greeks. Candidates may also consider other factors which might have led to the Greeks' victory in order to address 'how convincing'.</p>
Level 3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response has a good analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding</li> </ul>	<p>Candidates may discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The discussions of the Greeks over strategy, Tempe, and the roles of Leonidas</li> </ul>

		of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1)	and Themistocles in deciding strategy and tactics
Level 2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response has some analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a partially supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at Thermopylae and Artemisium</li> <li>• Lack of agreement amongst the Greeks between Thermopylae and Salamis and Themistocles' role in managing to have the battle at Salamis; the tactics used by the Greeks at Salamis</li> <li>• Lack of agreement amongst the Greeks about what to do after Salamis</li> </ul>
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response has a basic analysis of the interpretation, with parts of the answer just describing the interpretation. Response produces a very basic evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reluctance of Peloponnesians to commit to defending Attica in 479</li> <li>• Greek tactics at the battle of Plataea and the role of Pausanias <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comparison of Greek and Persian equipment, including triremes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The leadership of the Persians, including the role and character of Xerxes as portrayed by Herodotus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of Greek geography</li> <li>• The unity, or otherwise, of the Greeks</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	<p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Herodotus: 6.48-9 (Persian preparations), 103-116 (Athenian preparations and the battle of Marathon);</li> <li>• Herodotus 7.1 (Darius' reaction), 7.49-50 (Artabanus' warning re the geography and size of the Persian force), 133, 139 (Herodotus' opinion about the importance of the Athenians), 141-5 (Themistocles &amp; Delphic oracle and Greek conference), 175 (decision to defend Thermopylae), 207 (doubt amongst the Greeks at Thermopylae)</li> <li>• Herodotus 8.3 (discussions over leadership of Greek fleet), 49-50 (council of war before Salamis), 56-63 (threat to retreat to Isthmus of Corinth and Themistocles' role in securing the battle at Salamis)</li> </ul>

--	--	--

- Herodotus 9.6-8 (preference of Peloponnesians to defend Isthmus wall & Athenian request to defend Attica), 62 (comparison of Persian and Spartan troops), 71 (contribution of Spartans)
- The Serpent column (the extent of the Greek alliance)

Credit all relevant source material

### Section B: The Rise of Macedon, c. 359–323 BC

<b>Question 4</b>		How useful is this passage for our understanding of how Philip secured Macedon against external and internal threats? <b>[12 marks]</b>	
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>		<b>AO1</b> = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. <b>AO3</b> = 6 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.	
<b>Additional guidance</b>		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptors</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 6	11–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach substantiated, well-developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either way as to the source's usefulness to understanding the issue in question providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the following information in relation to contents of the source:</p>
Level 5	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Philip's destruction of ethnic and tribal ties. His divide and rule policy. The creation of a more united population.</li> <li>The use of intimidation rather than violence to prevent internal opposition.</li> <li>The care Philip took to manage Macedonia's borders.</li> </ul>

Level 4	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The defeat of nearby enemies to secure the borders.</li> <li>Manipulating neighbouring royal houses to establish loyal rulers on their thrones.</li> <li>The veracity of Justin's account in relation to the contents of the passage and the context in which it was produced. The latter issue may be related to Justin's background, aims, the context of the time in which he was writing, and the relationship between his writing and that of Trogus. Students may comment that Justin's work, being an epitome, lacks detail.</li> <li>The context of the passage within the timeline of events of Philip's rule. The passage is placed just after Philip's return from victory in the Third Sacred War.</li> <li>Other, earlier factors that enabled Philip to secure Macedon that are largely absent from the passage: Philip's diplomacy with/manipulation of Athens, including over Amphipolis; bribery of/military action against the Thracians and Paeonians; the development of the Macedonian army; political marriages; the defeat of the Illyrians; the monarchies of the northern tribal states abolished with their members now joining the Macedonian nobility and their sons becoming pages; actions in Thessaly and relationship with the Thessalian League; victory in the Third Sacred War; dealings with the Chalcidians.</li> </ul>
Level 3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a reasonable range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	
Level 2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	
Level 1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1)</li> <li>Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way but judgements about how the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question are either not present or are not linked to analysis and are merely assertions. (AO3)</li> </ul>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

<b>Question 5*</b>		How far do the sources enable us to understand Philip and Alexander's attitudes towards the Athenians? <span style="float: right;"><b>[36 marks]</b></span>	
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>		<p><b>AO3</b> = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• historical events and historical periods studied</li> <li>• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b> = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements</p> <p><b>AO1</b> = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p><b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources &amp; historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</b></p>	
<b>Additional guidance</b>		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptors</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 6	31–36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>This question requires supported judgement relating to the utility of the evidence regarding Philip and Alexander's attitudes towards the Athenians. Judgement should be made on the issue of the extent to which the evidence allows us to reach a conclusion as to their individual attitudes towards the Athenians. Some students may also make an overall judgement. Others may discuss whether the sources show that attitudes may have changed over time or issue by issue. Higher level answers may discuss significant moments when the underlying attitudes of both men are potentially revealed. Students should discuss how the sources portray the behaviour of both men towards Athens and the Athenians at different times. In doing so, students should analyse the reliability of the information presented to them as well as discussing how it may be interpreted. Judgements on the comprehensiveness, usefulness and reliability of the evidence as a whole should be offered. However, some students may also pass comment on individual writers. Better answers will use the different sources in coordination to construct a line of argument.</p>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<p>Some students will give a rounded, multi-dimensional assessment of both men's attitudes within the context of an overall judgment on the utility of the evidence.</p> <p>Answers may include some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Athens' failed support for Argaeus and its implications for Philip's attitude towards the Athenians.</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Philip's dealings with Athens over Amphipolis, Potidaea and Olynthus, and what they reveal about his attitude towards the Athenians.</li> <li>Philip and Athens in the Third Sacred War. Philip's prosecution of the war and his behaviour in its aftermath. The Peace of Philocrates and the Amphictyonic Peace. Philip's influence on Athens' religious status at Delphi and Delos.</li> <li>Philip and Athenian interests in and around Thrace, including the Chersonese, Perinthus and Byzantium.</li> <li>The build-up to the Battle of Chaeronea. Philip's motives.</li> <li>Philip's actions in the aftermath of the battle: his treatment of Athens, becoming hegemon of Greece, the creation of the League of Corinth and its aims.</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alexander's treatment of Athens at the outset of his reign.</li> <li>Alexander's actions after the Battle of the Granicus.</li> <li>Alexander and the burning of Persepolis.</li> <li>Alexander and the Exiles' Decree as well as the possibility of a Deification Decree.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting source details may include:</p>



Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diodorus, <i>Library of History</i>: 16: 3, 8, 38.1–2, 53–54, 60, 74, 77, 84–87, 89, 92</li> <li>• Demosthenes: 8.5–8, 8.13–15, 9.7–12, 19.39–41</li> <li>• Justin, <i>Epitome of Trogus</i>: 8.4, 9.4</li> <li>• Arrian, <i>Campaigns of Alexander</i>: 1.10, 1.16, 3.18, 7.23</li> <li>• Plutarch, <i>Life of Alexander</i>: 13–14, 16</li> </ul> <p>Analysis of the sources might also focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strengths and limitations of Diodorus as a source. Reference might be made to his aims and method.</li> <li>• The contexts in which Demosthenes' evidence is proffered should allow for fruitful discussion and analysis regarding his claims as to Philip's attitude towards Athens.</li> <li>• The aims, background and sources of Arrian and Plutarch may be taken into account when reaching a judgement on the utility of their evidence.</li> </ul>
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

<b>Question 6*</b>		'The conspiracies and mutinies of Macedonians and Greeks were serious challenges to Alexander's authority.' To what extent do you agree with this view? <b>[36 marks]</b>	
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>		<p><b>AO3</b> = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>historical events and historical periods studied</li> <li>how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b> = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements</p> <p><b>AO1</b> = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p><b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources &amp; historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</b></p>	
<b>Additional guidance</b>		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptors</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
Level 6	31–36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>This question requires analysis of the challenges Alexander faced. Students may differentiate between these challenges from the perspective of Alexander himself and from a more neutral point of view. Students might take a position on Alexander's character, aims, beliefs, abilities, personality or psychology in order to analyse what he may have considered his 'greatest challenges.' The seriousness of the various challenges Alexander faced should be analysed to reach supported judgements based on the ancient evidence. Some attempt to connect the different challenges Alexander faced may be made when reaching conclusions. Other students may discuss whether the nature of his 'greatest challenges' changed over time.</p>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> </ul>	<p>Other challenges Alexander faced may also be considered, and could include the following: establishing his rule, military actions, rebellion among Persian satraps and the subsequent purges, his paranoia, how to rule different peoples, and his obsession with competing against the deeds of mythical figures.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<p>Regarding conspiracies and mutinies, answers may include some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The threat posed by the conspiracy of Philotas. Students may analyse this event in its historical context to draw conclusions as to the nature and extent of the challenge it presented to Alexander.</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students may discuss the opposition of Cleitus and to what extent this posed a challenge to Alexander. Some students may discuss whether Cleitus' opposition is compatible with the terms of the question or whether it should be classed as a separate factor. Others may locate Cleitus' opposition within a greater challenge of subduing Bactria and Sogdiana.</li> <li>The threat posed by the Pages' Plot. Students may analyse this event in its historical context to draw conclusions as to nature and extent of the challenge it presented to Alexander. Some discussion of the position, actions and treatment of Callisthenes in events before and after this plot may be offered.</li> <li>It is likely that students will discuss the mutiny at the River Hyphasis (Beas), particularly in connection with Alexander's aims.</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)</li> <li>The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some students will also analyse the causes, course and implications of the rebellion at Opis.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrian, <i>Campaigns of Alexander</i>: 4.7–14, 5.25–29, 7.8–12</li> <li>Plutarch, <i>Life of Alexander</i>: 48–55, 62</li> <li>The Alexander Sarcophagus</li> </ul>

		<p><i>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silver tetradrachm minted by Ptolemy</li> <li>• Porus Medallion</li> </ul>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<p>Analysis of the sources might focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrian: Students may take Arrian's background, sources and aims, as well as the context in which he was writing, into account when analysing the challenges Alexander faced. The evidence should be interrogated to investigate how challenging these conspiracies and mutinies were for Alexander from different perspectives. Judgements may be made on individual mutinies/conspiracies.</li> <li>• Plutarch: Students may comment on Plutarch's role as a biographer concerned with studies of character when analysing the evidence related to the challenges Alexander faced. An understanding/view of Alexander's character could inform judgments as to how challenging Alexander viewed different situations. An appreciation of the nature of Plutarch's sources may also be rewarded when made relevant.</li> <li>• The archaeological evidence can give rise to discussion on Alexander's priorities and thus the challenges he faced in implementing these aims.</li> </ul>
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3)</li> <li>• The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2)</li> <li>• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)</li> </ul> <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored