OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Classics: Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 H442**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H042**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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, OCR Nationals, 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 report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	**Page**

F391 Greek History from original sources

General Comments

In this summer's paper the majority of candidates have again demonstrated a clear grasp of their chosen option and conveyed their understanding effectively on paper. There were relatively few candidates who were unable to complete the questions within the allocated time, though there were a number of candidates who included bullet points or notes as part of their answer. However there were some relatively short essays which did not allow candidates to cover the full range of the question. In some cases this was due to the excessive space given over to the earlier questions, particularly the (a) and (b) questions: this was an issue for some candidates who attempted to develop a fuller answer than was required for these questions, often because they included irrelevant material or included general evaluation. However, as in previous years, examiners were pleased to report that the majority of candidates were well-prepared for the demands of the paper and were able to approach the task in an appropriate way.

As in previous years, the majority of candidates worked their way steadily through the paper, dealing first with the document study and then with the essay, and organising their time effectively to ensure that all was covered. There were some who dealt first with the essay before turning to the document question; this approach could work effectively, though, as reported last year, this can affect how the questions are approached, as the paper is designed to be answered in order. The work of some candidates who dealt with questions out of sequence could be unbalanced, especially if they lost sight of the precise demands of the (a) question (focused on the passage only) and (b) question (excluding the passage itself).

It is worth reminding candidates that examiners are not looking for evaluation in (a) or (b) questions: this can be rewarded in (b) questions, though it can lengthen the answer beyond what is required, but this cannot be credited at all for (a) questions under AO1. There are relatively few candidates who fail to engage with evaluation at all in the (c) question and the essay, but there are still too many who seem to rely on generalised evaluation, occasionally in pre-prepared paragraphs. This usually does not contribute a great deal to the final mark as it does not relate closely to the material under discussion and suggests that the argument of the essay is underdeveloped. This is very noticeable where identical wording is found in a number of answers. Weaker responses often attributed quotations or examples to the wrong authors (and often then compounded the problem by evaluating the author they had chosen).

Too many candidates show an uncertain grasp of the chronology of the period they have studied. Jumping from one part of the period to another with no explanation does not suggest a good understanding of what has happened, especially if the question demands some understanding of change over time.

The answer booklet requires the candidate to indicate the questions they are attempting. Most did this clearly and effectively, but there were a small number of candidates who did not set out their answers straightforwardly. In most cases this was easy enough for examiners to deal with. A much more significant issue arises where students write outside the designated writing area or make additions to their answers by means of arrows or indicators such as asterisks. Examiners make every effort to track down such additions but this is not always possible; candidates are best advised to avoid this, or to make clear where the addition can be found (e.g. on the final page of the answer booklet, using the page number).

There were a number of candidates whose writing presents a significant challenge. In many cases these candidates have now been encouraged to use a different method to present their

work and this is helpful. Where candidates are likely to present problems on paper, they should be reminded of the importance of using black ink for clarity after scanning and, if necessary, writing on alternate lines. Very small writing and also very large, round writing that fills the line present their own challenges when marking on-screen. Examiners want to give the candidates the right mark, but this can sometimes be challenging.

Where candidates have the use of a word processor, examiners would prefer them to double space their work and to ensure that in their enthusiasm to cover the questions fully they maintain a reasonable standard of accuracy in typing. It is also helpful if centres ensure that where a candidate requires a scribe, the scribe's handwriting is clear and easily legible.

In Section A there are now very few candidates who do not do what is expected of them. The (a) question requires selection from the set passage (or passages), and there is no expectation of a broader exploration of the topic of the question. There remain a small number of candidates who engage in a more extended response which cannot be credited. The (b) question requires a selection of relevant issues drawn from the sources studied (excluding the passage or passages in the question): the sources listed in the specification are all that is required, but credit is given for other sources where appropriate (a different inscription or a non-specified passage of Thucydides). Examiners are often pleased to see evidence of wide-ranging discussions in class that go well beyond the set material. There is no need for evaluation in the (b) question, though examiners may still reward it; but these questions are looking for interpretation of the source material selected from memory, and examiners report some excellent discussions in all sections of the paper. Some candidates spent far too long on the (b) question which restricted the time available for the (c) question and Section B which carry more marks. The (c) question is designed to allow a more developed response, including some evaluation of the sources used. Here again, it is important for candidates to employ careful time management, and it is worth reminding candidates that the passage (or passages) on the paper can be used here, often to very good effect.

In Section B, most candidates construct essays of reasonable length and depth, which cover the assessment objectives. It is worth restating once again that the bullet points are not designed to form an essay plan, but should remind candidates of what needs to be covered. One important issue remains the tendency of candidates to deal with the evaluation of sources in rather a very general way, separated from the material they have drawn on to develop their answer. One characteristic of successful essays at this level is that candidates closely integrate their discussion of the sources at relevant points. Weaker responses still include too many generalisations, often martialled together in splendid isolation at the end of the essay, often to the exclusion of a considered conclusion. In some cases these are presented in a balanced way ('Herodotus is the 'Father of History', but also the 'Father of Lies''); it is often not at all clear what contribution such evaluations make to the essay as a whole, and examiners are left contemplating Level 3 for AO2 at best.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5th century

This option was a little more popular than Option 2, but Sparta remains by far the most popular option.

Question No. 1

This was less popular than Question 2. The majority of candidates who attempted this question dealt with both passages to good effect, and there were some well organised responses that made good selections from the material. Not everyone commented on the significance of the 'backing of the people' in the first passage or picked out ostracism in the

second. In (b) candidates showed a good understanding of the relationship between Nicias and Cleon, and drew on a range of sources, including Aristophanes' *Knights*. There were also some good discussions of what Thucydides says about Pericles. In (c) candidates were often sceptical about the controls applied to 'powerful individuals', and there were some excellent discussions of the extent to which figures such as Cleon and Pericles were able to control democratic Athens. Weaker responses tended to write very generally, but there were a few who showed an excellent understanding of the importance of *euthunai* and *dokimasia*. Relatively few were able to discuss the *graphe paranomon*.

Question No. 2

This passage proved a rich source for the (a) question, and most candidates seemed to recognise the context well, even if the passage in itself is quite a demanding one. The (b) question was not always answered in a focused way, as some responses failed to deal with 'participation' to any great extent. In many cases there was a good knowledge of the sources shown, particularly the Old Oligarch and Aristophanes, including some interesting material from outside the specification. There were also some excessively long answers which could cause problems for time management. Weaker candidates were not always clear about the significance of the quotation in (c), but there were some good assessments of Pericles' ascendancy in Athens and the significance of the 'Trial of the Generals' in Xenophon. Better responses were able to discuss the manipulation of the people by political leaders.

Question No. 3

This was by far the more popular essay question, though some answers became rather too much of a list. Many candidates were able to pick out 'hostile' sources, and there were some good discussions of the evidence provided by the Old Oligarch, even if there was some uncertainty about the reliability of the source. There were some interesting assessments of Aristophanes here, and it is worth considering the importance to the playwright of the competition into which his plays were entered. Many candidates picked out relevant details from *Acharnians* (often incorrectly spelled), *Wasps* and *Knights*, though relatively few showed an understanding of how the *Knights* ends. Some candidates could have made more of the problematic nature of comedy as a source for our understanding of the past. There were some one-sided discussions of Thucydides, perhaps influenced by the passage in Question 2; better answers balanced the Funeral Speech against the Pylos debate and other examples.

Question No. 4

This question proved less popular, and was generally less well done. It is important to remind candidates of the need to cover the specification in detail. In this case, the role of generals can be seen in a number of the set sources, though the roles of magistrates are rather less clear. However examiners were prepared to consider a range of 'offices' beyond *archons*, and credit was given for anyone acting in an official capacity, such as jurors, members of the *Boule* and others. Many candidates discussed the importance of the role of general to political leaders such as Pericles, Nicias and Cleon, and made some effective use of the evidence they selected. Not all candidates were aware of the changes made to the archonship during the period studied.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

The essays were fairly evenly divided in this option, but Question 5 was much less popular than Question 6.

Question No. 5

Most of those who attempted this question were able to pinpoint the reasons for dissatisfaction with Sparta and could also comment the role of Aristeides here. The early years of the Delian League were the focus for (b), and there were some interesting discussions of 'effectiveness' here (though some weaker responses relied mainly on narrative). (c) proved quite challenging, though the better answers could certainly suggest some interesting examples of Athenian treatment of allies down to 446 BC. As often in this option, candidates were often unclear about the dates of particular events and sources, and this may be the reason for the small number of candidates who attempted this question. There were some interesting discussions of inscriptions, including the Athenian Tribute Lists.

Question No. 6

Candidates clearly found this question more straightforward to approach, and were able to draw from the two passages a range of relevant material related to imperialism for (a). Weaker answers in (b) chose examples where the connection with Athenian aggression was not very clear, though the best candidates explained how they saw aggression at the root of events. Some answers also switched the focus round to Athens, which undermined their answer to the question. Responses to (c) generally showed a good understanding of the material studied, but were often let down by a weakness in chronology which made it difficult to see how they were addressing 'increasingly'. Answers that jumped back and forth in time without any explanation made it difficult to follow the argument. A good number felt that Athenian behaviour towards Skione and Melos demonstrated a significant development in Athenian treatment of other states, but others argued that the aftermath of the revolts of Naxos and Thasos early in the Delian League showed clearly what was to come later.

Question No. 7

Candidates who chose this question were generally well versed in the evidence for the changes in tribute during the period studied, though they did not always unpack the idea of domination as clearly as they could. The best answers were able to trace the development of tribute from the beginnings of the Delian League and the gradual extension of money payments to more and more states; candidates were often able to discuss the significance of the movement of the treasury of the Delian League to Athens and assess the evidence provided by ATL and other inscriptions. However only the best answers kept the focus on 'Athenian domination', and there were some interesting discussions of particular events. As is often the case in this option, candidates were less able to discuss events later in the period (e.g. after the Sicilian expedition) and only a few were aware of the extent of support for Athens in the final stages of the Peloponnesian War.

Question No. 8

This question proved a popular one, and it allowed some freedom for candidates to choose how best to approach the 'changing relationship'. As in 6(c), the main problem in many answers was the lack of structured chronology; where candidates move backwards and forwards through the period with no acknowledgment of change over time, it is hard to follow exactly what they are arguing. Weaker responses did not engage clearly enough with the focus on sources in this question, preferring instead to give a potted history of highlighted events. As often in this option, our lack of sources from states other than Athens make our assessment of the perspective of anyone other than Athens problematic, though we can certainly identify some unhappiness with the development of the league from the revolts noted by Thucydides and others.

Option 3: Politics and Society of Ancient Sparta

As in previous years, this was overwhelmingly the most popular topic. Question 10 was significantly more popular than Question 9, and Question 12 than Question 11.

Question No. 9

Most candidates were able to pick out relevant information from the Herodotus passage, though there were some significant misunderstandings: some candidates identified those who 'had no heart for the fight' as Spartans and others were inclined to identify everyone referred to in the passage as Spartan. A few candidates entirely ignored the Aristophanes passage. In (b) there was some good use of Tyrtaeus and some specific examples from Herodotus and Thucydides; there were also some interesting discussions of Sphacteria and Leuctra. (c) proved quite challenging; some candidates focused almost entirely on Thermopylae, but the majority were able to look at a range of examples to support their discussion. Relatively few used the Aristophanes passage to show that even by 411 BC Spartan behaviour at Thermopylae was still remembered by other Greeks.

Question No. 10

The majority of candidates were able to select relevant material effectively from the passage in (a), though there were a few who focused only on religion, and there were some confusions over the role of the ephors. (b) was more challenging, though many candidates could recall Herodotus on orphans, heiresses and roads, and some made good use of Anaxandridas' difficulty in producing an heir. Examiners allowed some leeway in the identification of 'duties' here, but weaker responses tended to deal more with privileges without explaining how these might be considered relevant. There were some good discussions in (c), and a range of views. Many candidates were prepared to see individual kings as very significant over time, though some argued for the greater (short-lived) power of the ephors. Better responses were able to give specific examples to support their argument, including discussion of individuals such as Sthenelaidas, Brasidas and Lysander. Some also discussed the significance of helots and *periokoi*, but this generally seemed to work less well as an answer to this question. Aristotle's comment that kings were in effect 'hereditary generals' (*Politics* 1285a) was used by some to good effect.

Question No. 11

This question produced some effective responses, though not all were focused on the relevance of the two groups to Spartan domination. Weaker answers tended to focus almost exclusively on the helots with limited specific examples. However better responses were able to consider both groups and look at various points in the period; there were some good discussions of the aftermath of the earthquake in the 460s BC, and some interesting analyses of events at Pylos and Brasidas' northern expedition. Too many candidates take no account of the later stages of the Peloponnesian War, and so wrote Sparta off after Pylos and the Peace of Nicias. Even if the final stages of the war are not covered in detail, it is worth reinforcing to candidates that the Spartans were victorious, though at the cost of a problematic alliance with the Persians. Relatively few went on to deal with the conspiracy of Cinadon (Xenophon *Hellenica* 3.3.4-11) or the aftermath of Leuctra. But there were some very effective answers that showed a pleasing command of the material studied.

Question No. 12

As often proves to be the case, questions about the *agoge* prove to be very popular. Here weaker responses did not focus very clearly on 'Spartan values' and tended towards a descriptive account of what happened to Spartan boys. A few devoted too much space to a discussion of 'relationships' within the *agoge* without relating this very clearly to the question. There were also some answers that omitted any discussion of the education of girls. The strongest answers were able to balance the detail of different aspects of education in Sparta with an assessment of Spartan values; there were some excellent responses that considered the limited range of evidence we have, especially for the fifth century.

F392 Roman History from Original Sources

General Comments:

This year the vast majority of candidates were able to respond appropriately to the questions set and show clear knowledge and understanding of their chosen option within the time allowed. There were very few rubric errors, although a number of answers did make use of the passage in Qb, despite the specification being in its seventh year and the instruction 'what can we learn from other sources…..' being clearly given as part of the question. Of course 'other sources' means anything outside the passage. It does not mean 'other writers'.

Overall, responses to the questions were of a very good standard and indicative of significant amount of preparation focused on the exact material in the ancient sources. This allowed candidates to make precise comments and achieve higher levels for AO1 across the paper. There were certainly fewer quotations attributed to the wrong author than in previous years. However, some candidates clearly struggle to understand the context surrounding the quotations they have learnt. In addition, given the long periods of Augustus and Roman Britain, many candidates would benefit from learning some of the key dates of the period.

The context questions, on the whole, were well done by the vast majority of candidates. The passages seemed familiar to the candidates and were mined for relevant support in Qa and Qc. Candidates must show understanding of the question in Qa and not just simply rewrite the passage in the candidate's own words. Equally, there is no point in going beyond the passage or offering extended responses as these cannot be credited; examiners did see evidence of unduly long Qa answers which may have caused time difficulties later on in the paper.

Qb requires a detailed use of sources to answer the questions supported by relevant discussion. Low scoring answers made assertions or unsubstantiated claims. It is useful to be quite specific when using sources and candidates should be encouraged to learn specific references when possible and use direct quotations. Statements such as 'the Res Gestae tells us that Augustus built many buildings' cannot be considered as 'well-supported with evidence and reference to the sources.' In this case, it would be better to mention some of the buildings by name and discuss how these may have benefited the people of Rome. There is no need for evaluation in Qb question, though it will receive limited credit.

Qc should be seen as a 'mini-essay' and for marks in the highest bands, it should be evaluative and analytical. Too many candidates treated it as an extended Qb answer with a clear, developed argument often missing. To receive a mark in level 4 or 5 in AO2, answers must offer a clear response to the specific question set. Needless to say, evaluation is expected and needed, but generic references to the reliability of an author, without discussion of the citations used by the candidates in their answer, will receive very little credit. Most candidates were aware that the passage set can be used in Qc and many used it to good advantage. It was rare but still disappointing to see candidates struggle to find material in Qc but then fail to make any use of the passage printed on the question paper.

The importance of effective time management should be emphasised to all candidates as a few wrote far too much for Qc and significantly ran out of time for the essay in section B. Qc is worth 25 marks, the essay 45 marks and this should be considered when structuring an answer. A good number of candidates decided to start with the essay and although this did not appear to affect their answers to the paper as a whole, the paper is designed to allow all candidates easy entry in the form of a very straightforward Qa based on a passage which should be totally familiar.

The bullet points are to give guidance to candidates how they should approach an essay; in a sense, they simply remind candidates to structure their answers in terms of the assessment objectives and to include evaluation. They are not essay plans. Essay questions are broader than context questions and require a higher level of judgement and analysis to gain marks in the higher bands. Again, generic evaluation adds little and there is still a tendency for candidates to reproduce a learnt essay rather than deal with the precise terms of the question. Simply put, AO2 is about answering the questions and answers which miss the focus of the question in their analysis will gain level 3 marks at best.

This said, the vast majority of candidates seemed well prepared for the question paper, with examiners seeing wonderful engagement with the questions set and evidence of thorough knowledge, understanding and preparation. Centres must be praised for their excellent work in preparing candidates for all three options.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

Question No. 1

The majority of candidates who attempted this question dealt with the passage in Qa well, showing clear understanding of the relationship between Caesar and Bibulus. Similarly, most candidates identified that Caesar was more powerful than Bibulus. The passage was used well to support answers. The best answers showed an understanding of the context of the *Lex Agraria*.

In Qb most candidates made good use of the Com Pet as the main source of information. Many candidates rarely tackled the 'what can we learn' aspect, so were limited for AO2. On the whole, the answers for this part question were very pleasing and often highly rewarded.

In Qc, a significant number of candidates gave very pleasing answers, showing specific examples of the importance of the consulship to politicians, but countering this with cases such as Clodius, who had power without the consulship. Many identified Caesar's decision to abandon his triumph, as clear evidence of the importance of the consulship. Some of the weaker responses merely repeated most of the answer they gave to Qb. In general, evaluation of sources was quite basic and did not often relate to this specific question.

Question No. 2

In Qa, the majority of candidates answered this question well. Nearly all identified Catiline's own character as a reason through phrases such as '*bold and versatile'*. Many identified the motivation of poverty and unequal wealth. The bribing of the *young men* was also commonly found in the answers. Some of the best answers were able to explain the reference to *Etruria* and *Cisalpine Gaul*, to show a fuller context.

Strong answers to Qb made very good use of the Second Catilinarian Oration to show the variety of groups mentioned. Many also used Sallust well and over half the answers identified members of the upper class who supported Catiline. The weaker answers were particularly basic in the detailed use of sources, scoring low AO2 for 'what can we learn…'.

In Qc many candidates made good use of the passage in their answers and identified phrases such as '*only a spark was needed'* to support the view that it was inevitable. Most answers agreed with the proposition, but some of the stronger responses were able to show other

conclusions, particularly citing Catiline's personal motives. As with Q1c, evaluation was fairly basic and generalised.

Question No. 3

Relatively few candidates answered this question compared to Q4. Most responses did discuss Cicero's view of each triumvir. Some of the better answers were clear about the way his relationship with Pompey changed over time. Many also identified the difficulties in assessing his relationship with Crassus, although some answers dismissed any assessment regarding Crassus, by stating that there was nothing in the sources about Cicero's relationship with him. The main issue with this question was the limited use of detailed sources to support the discussion. Good answers made specific use of Cicero's letters, but a number of candidates made quite general references to what Plutarch and Suetonius say.

Question No. 4

This question was answered well with the vast majority of candidates showing an understanding of *rhetoric* and providing specific examples of bribery and violence. The examples of Pompey and Clodius were regularly used to show how violence could succeed and Crassus and Bibulus were used to show bribery. Many answers cleverly used Caesar as an example of someone who successfully used all three tools. Many answers supported rhetoric, as it was Cicero's strength. A good range of sources were used by most candidates and, although evaluation was quite basic, some did show insight into the value of Cicero's writing as a reliable source of his actions.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

Question No. 5

The majority candidates were able to select a range of examples from the passage and explain how Augustus was presented as a leader. Whilst most candidates understood the use of hyperbole in the passage, fewer candidates grasped the inevitability of Augustus' victory and a small number of candidates misinterpreted the passage and did not understand that Apollo was speaking to Augustus. A minority of candidates presented lengthy quotations from the poem but did not explain precisely what they showed about Augustus. These candidates would benefit from planning their answer and selecting shorter quotations which show Augustus as a leader. The lines concerning Romulus and the swift fleet of the Egyptians were occasionally misinterpreted, however, most candidates were able to show good understanding of the passage.

On the whole in Qb, candidates were able to recall specific references to the battle of Actium from other sources than the one printed on the question paper but rather oddly, a significant number of candidates incorrectly thought that Augustus discussed the battle Actium as well as Antony and Cleopatra in great depth in the Res Gestae. The better answers clearly explained Horace's accounts of Actium in Epode 9/Ode 1.37, the evidence from Vergil's Aeneid alongside epigraphical evidence such as the monument at Nikopolis. However, a significant number of candidates presented evidence from the poets in the form of very short one or two word quotations which they then struggled to explain, eg 'doom-laden monster', with no real understanding of the context surrounding Actium and certainly not addressing 'what can we learn…'.

High scoring answers in Qc were able to discuss the short term significance of the victory and whether the victory was important to Augustus later in his reign. A few candidates were able to describe the powers that Augustus had held prior to Actium and discussed the extent to which the victory had brought him further political influence and powers. Some candidates failed to focus their answers on Actium and presented a range of other examples which occurred long after Augustus have won Actium, e.g. his appointment as Pontifex Maximus in 12BC or Pater Patriae in 2BC.   A significant number of candidates ignored the passage in their answers, especially where they would have benefited considerably from use of the passage. Evaluation too often appeared in its 'stock' form, at the end of their answer. Centres should remind candidates to take care with their evaluation and find precise reasons why the sources used are useful / limited.

Question No. 6

As with question Q5a, there were a minority of candidates in Q6a, who simply presented lengthy quotations without explaining their real meaning. The best candidates added brief contextual comments to support the quotations they used - particularly those that mentioned the return of the Parthian standards. Only a handful of candidates elaborated on the meaning of not breaking the 'Julian edict' or who the 'Getae (from Thrace) or Seres' (from lands of Silk) might be.

Qb was a very broad question allowing candidates to draw from multiple taught themes with a wealth of evidence available which would be considered relevant in answering this question. The better responses to this question discussed the extent to which Augustus had improved life for the Romans and his motivations for doing so. Weaker responses used the Res Gestae only and were only able to say that Augustus provided aqueducts and various donatives.

Many candidates who answered Qc struggled to explain the reliability of the Roman poets in any convincing fashion. Most answers made reference to the patronage of Maecenas and the influence this must have had on their poetry but evaluation of individual poets or poetry in general did not go much beyond this. Candidates tended to make reference to Horace and Vergil whilst a few mentioned the work of Ovid. The historian Livy was often presented as a poet, as was Velleius. The better responses made good use of the poetry regarding Actium, religion and military achievements.

Question No. 7

In Q7, very many candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the Res Gestae and its uses and limitations. In the better answers candidates dealt with the different aspects of Augustus' reign such as his powers, his achievements, his family, his building projects, and his relationships with other groups. In these discussions, the high scoring answers were able to cross-reference this material with other sources they had studied such as coins, poetry, Tacitus and Suetonius. In addition, many candidates were able to cite specific examples of material which was absent from the Res Gestae which in turn affected its reliability. The most popular examples of this nature were the defeat of Varus (9AD) and the lack of any opposition to Augustus mentioned in the Res Gestae. In the stronger essays, candidates were then able to cite specific examples of opposition to Augustus in Suetonius, Pliny, Dio and other sources. In the better responses, candidates were selective in their approach and thus able to reach clear judgements because they carefully evaluated the sources used. Some candidates detracted from their overall argument by tagging 'stock' evaluation onto the end of the essay rather than evaluating specific examples from one source alongside those from the Res Gestae. Whilst there were many engaging responses to this question, it was clear than even some highly competent candidates had little understanding of the nature of the Res Gestae as

a source. Some candidates confused it as a book whilst few seem to consider how Augustus would have constructed this account of this life i.e. whether it was all written at once and if so when.

Question No. 8

In Q8, the better answers focussed fully on the idea of 'family values' and were able to cite a good range of source material such as Horace 3.6 on the neglect of religion and morality and the Carmen Saeculare.   Most candidates were able to discuss the Julian laws but not always with support.   Most candidates chose to discuss the exile of the elder and younger Julia but there was very little reference to the sources here also. It was promising to see the way in which the changing role of some members of Augustus' family (Tiberius in particular) was understood with precise dates and support from the ancient sources. On the whole, though there was a generally good range of sources used by candidates answering this question, there was relatively little attempt to explain what 'family values' might mean. Some candidates attempted to turn their answer into an explanation of how Augustus dealt with the constant succession crisis.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

Question No. 9

Qa was mainly well answered with candidates selecting appropriate quotations from the passage, showing the importance of the invasion for Claudius' reputation in Rome. However, many failed to explain the importance of Claudius physical presence in Britain when it was conquered, or the significance of what Claudius did back in Rome.

Qb was done well, with the majority of candidates able to recall specific evidence from the sources concerning the attitudes of emperors towards Britain in 1st century AD. The majority of candidates began with Augustus relying on the sources from the beginning of the principate; although this was allowed it did not always fully focus on the question set. Most answers stopped at Caligula, and a large minority tried to include Claudius' reign in the answer. Only a few included Nero's attitude as described in Suetonius, and even less brought in the Flavian attitude as demonstrated through the Agricola and the Stanegate. Julius Caesar was not an emperor, nor did he live in the first century AD, as some candidates believed. In fact, the number of references to Caesar, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius shows that not all candidates appreciate the chronology.

Despite the word 'modest' in Qc being taken from the passage, many candidates chose not to use it in their answers. There were varying interpretations of the word 'modest' and examiners allowed any possible interpretation of the word, although it must be said that we expect candidates to be familiar with the context of all of the set sources. Some considered the results of the invasion, others the scale of it, some discussed whether Claudius was self-promoting. The better answers were able to recall and evaluate sources such as Dio, Suetonius, the aureus showing Claudius' arch and the arch itself. Some candidates seemed keen to answer a question about why Claudius invaded, rather than assess the precise terms of the question set.   Evaluation all too often appeared as generalisations.

Question No. 10

Most candidates in Qa commented on the geographical advantages and physical preparations the Britons made for defending against the Romans, but only a minority mentioned why

Caratacus was an important choice as leader, or that the terrain was chosen due to fewer troops. This question was mostly well answered though with candidates successfully picking out details of Caratacus' preparations against the Romans, and explaining them. The better answers considered evidence from both paragraphs.

The better answers in Qb discussed the importance of the amphibious Batavians in both Caesar's and Claudius' invasions, as well as the archaeological evidence from tombstones; some candidates even mentioned the iron chain mail from the Folly Lane site. Whilst detail could be lacking, most candidates focused on the auxiliaries for this question; nevertheless, many just grouped the auxiliaries with the legions. Candidates also need to be aware of the constraints of the questions with a number of answers using material post Boudicca's rebellion.

Again in Qc, few candidates made adequate use of the passage; nevertheless there were many good answers which discussed Caratacus' involvement against Claudius' invasion force in 43 AD, Vespasian and the II Legion in the south and south-west, as well as providing some good discussion about the British attempts to stop Caesar in 55 and 54 BC. However, too few candidates attempted to evaluate the accounts of Caesar and Dio and therefore did not really take into account the impact of Caesar's rushed attempt or Claudius' alliances with certain southern tribes on the successes of the British. In general the early conquest period from 43-60 AD was less well known.

Question No. 11

This proved the most popular question and many candidates demonstrated a relatively good range of opinions about Britain and the Britons, derived from the sources. Most relied on their knowledge from Caesar, Strabo, and Cicero's letters and attempted to highlight some of the more obvious contradictions and observations from all three, especially in terms of mineral wealth. Archaeological evidence such as the Lexden Tumulus, Hengistbury Head, Welwyn Burial, and the coins of British Tribes were used but not always convincingly. In general, candidates evaluated well, the best answers comparing the archaeological evidence with the literature, and pointing out the problems with the literary evidence. However, there were fewer answers about what we are not told, i.e how complete is the evidence?

Question No. 12

Whilst this was the least popular question of the two essays, it was, on the whole, the much better answered. A minority of candidates just focused on one aspect of the frontier system (usually Hadrian's Wall), but the majority of candidates were able to give a nice overview of at least a half of the time-span included in the question; questions with such a large scope should be embraced by candidates and not feared; examiners do not expect everything. Those candidates that attempted to discuss the wider historical period could give a better overview of the changes to Roman policy towards the northern frontier and therefore gained higher marks more easily. Most candidates used the evidence of the walls and the Stanegate well, but few candidates mentioned the epigraphical sources which noticeably demonstrate a more haphazard attitude even under one emperor. The better answers in AO2 focused on reasons for the changes in policy, some pointing out that it was down to different Emperors and their empire-wide policies. Few were able to quote the literary sources on this however. Details of Hadrian's Wall were generally sketchy, but there were some successful attempts to evaluate the evidence that we do have.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

There were, as ever, some excellent answers which examiners greatly enjoyed reading. However, this year there was a notable tendency amongst candidates to fail to engage fully with the question set, and attempt to turn it into something which they had pre-prepared. For example, a considerable number of candidates seemed to read the question on Socrates and the Sophists as 'to what extent was Socrates a sophist' or something similar. Teachers should remind their students that effective engagement with the question set is a key element in ensuring high marks.

A number of key weaknesses were also noted by examiners:
- Many candidates simply do not include dates in their history essays. When combined with an apparent lack of awareness of the order of events, this can cause some confusion.
- Many candidates resorting to generic evaluation of the sources, often tacked onto the end of the beginning of an essay rather than evaluating specific references.
- There was a problem with candidates not thinking clearly about the evaluation of the sources. Some, for example, argued that the gods and fate had a role in the conflict rather than that the sources might have thought they had a role.
- For Option 2 (460-403) many students chose to include varying amounts of evidence from before the date restriction (on one occasion referring to "this period" as starting in 478); in many other questions there is generally a lack of knowledge of the period 460-431.
- There is a tendency in Option 2 to ignore any conflict pre-431 and refer to the Peloponnesian War simply as "the" war.

Q1. How significant were the actions of individuals to the outcome of the conflict between the Greeks and the Persians?

This question led to some excellent answers, but all too many responses took the form of a list of different individuals simply stating what they are had done and not examining whether the actions were significant or not. Characters such as Miltiades and Themistocles, as well as Xerxes, featured highly, but often there was a general sense that Herodotus in particular placed too much emphasis on the actions or roles of individuals, without further qualification or development. The best answers were able to recall what the sources said an individual did and then discuss the significance of their action, taking into consideration other issues such as weapons/armour, motivation to fight, the system of government/command in place. Too many candidates recall of the sources was not detailed enough. Candidates who tried to argue that Artemesia had a significant role on the battle of Salamis were on shaky ground. There were a number of responses which did not take account of 'outcome' and focused on 'causes'; a few argued that if so-and-son had not started the conflict it would never have ended the way it did.

Q2. 'Doomed to failure'. To what extent is this a fair assessment of the Ionian Revolt?

Many essays included a long narrative of the revolt, and included details from throughout the narrative of this episode. However, all too often there was a statement of what happened, followed by an almost choral repetition of the idea that this meant that the whole revolt was doomed to failure without any explanation as to why it was. The theme of lack of unity amongst the Ionians was strong in some answers, and traced through effectively to the battle of Lade. Others focused on the nature of the Greek leadership and the vast resources of the Persian Empire, and some more astute candidates also looked at the Persian side of the conflict, and considered what the Persians might have been offering to the Greeks which might have made them eager to remain part of the Persian

Empire. Good answers appreciated that for many Ionians the revolt was not a failure as democracies were introduced, arbitration brought in and tributes reassessed; they also argued the revolt was started by individuals who did not actually want it to succeed (Histiaeus was going to quell it and gain his freedom from Susa). Too many candidates thought that Aristagoras' failed campaign on Naxos was part of the revolt rather than appreciating that this was what started the revolt. The best answers had a firm grasp of the details, especially of what happened at Sardis/Ephesus and the battle of Lade. Too many candidates tried to argue that the Ionian revolt lasted until 449 and described the Greek successes at Salamis, Plataea and Eurymedon as evidence that the Ionian revolt was actually a success.

Q3. **How far do the sources help us to understand why only a few Greek states opposed the Persians, while most welcomed them?**

This essay really challenged candidates who had a shaky grasp of what the sources actually said about why some Greeks did or did not oppose the Persians. The best answers dealt with geographical position (some very good discussion about the failure to fight in the vale of Tempe), political conflict both within and between city states and the benefits of being in the Persian Empire. Good answers discussed how individual city states tried to work out who was going to win and on whose side it was in their interests to be on; they also discussed why Sparta and Athens had the confidence to resist (the reference to how they treated the Persian messengers in 491 was pretty critical). Good candidates mentioned how Athens had given earth and water in error and then refused to take back Hippias and so were on a war footing with Persia already and they discussed how Aegina eventually fought so well at Salamis. The best candidates appreciated that the sources are in fact very limited and much has to be worked out by reading between the lines, especially the fact that Herodotus glosses over the fact that there was a pro-Persian faction in Athens (Alcmaeonid shield signal and the need to fight outside the city walls, referencing the ease with which Eritrea was betrayed and captured). Many responses focused on Athens and Sparta (naturally enough) for those who opposed and Thebes for those who welcomed Persia. Some added Thessaly and Aegina; There was mention of Argos and Sicily, although the details were omitted (and strictly Argos was neutral). The reasons for the stances of various states included political difference within Greece, ideological difference with Persia and Greek fear of Persian strength. The issue of the 'sources' was dealt with only in the better responses; many, while using sources, did not assess their value.

Q4. **'Herodotus fails to take into account significant political and economic aspects of the conflict between the Greeks and the Persians.' To what extent is this an accurate assessment?**

This question often led to lengthy criticisms of Herodotus, which did not bear that much relationship to the question set. Many answers gave detailed descriptions of what Herodotus has to say about the conflict, but did not then consider the question of the political or economic aspects which Herodotus might have ignored. The best, however, were able to set the conflict between the Greeks and the Persians in the wider context of the expansion of the Persian Empire, and then develop their arguments from this point. Good use was made of the Ionian Revolt in this context. A number of effective responses started by evaluating Herodotus' aims which were focussed on the actions of individuals, and suggesting that therefore references to politics and economics would be incidental rather than his focus; they then went on to point out where Herodotus indirectly mentions things, eg the bedroom scene with Atossa where she outlines clearly to Darius specific political reasons why he should invade Greece. Weaker answers tended to focus solely on economic factors, making scant references to politics and failed to link the actions of individuals to a political background, eg Mardonius desire to invade Greece and then to stay on after Salamis.

Q5. **To what extent did the behaviour of the leaders in Athens make conflict with Sparta inevitable throughout this period?**

This was a very popular question. Unsurprisingly there was a tendency in many candidates to focus on 432/1, although a few explored 465-435. However many candidates expanded their answers well beyond the date range by investigating Themistocles. Candidates' knowledge of individuals was generally strong, especially Pericles, Cleon, Nicias and Alcibiades. However candidates' understanding of their role in causing conflict was not always as strong. In particular candidates often failed to distinguish between the individuals' role in causing, prolonging or creating success in conflict. "Inevitable" was almost never defined, explored or debated in responses. Candidates rarely explored explicitly the relationship between Athenian leaders and the assembly or the extent to which leaders were able to direct the policy of Athens.

Q6. **'The different ideologies in Athens and Sparta were the main reason for conflict in the Greek world in this period.' How far do the sources support this view?**

This was a popular question, which seems surprising as a significant number of candidates seemed to be unaware of the meaning of political ideologies (despite the term "political ideologies" being on the specification). Many candidates dealt with the differing ideologies of the two hegemons, but perhaps were less clear on the role of ideology in causing conflict (rather than being influenced by conflict). The better answers explored the idea of imposition of political systems as a means of ensuring loyalty (and avoiding conflict) rather than as a punishment. Some made good use of the conflicts within the Athenian Empire and identified cases where ideology was or was not important. Some candidates explored the speeches of the Corinthians at the Congress in Sparta 432 as a way of defining ideologies of the two hegemons beyond the purely political. Most candidates were noticeably stronger when handling other causes of conflict.

Q7. **'The economic effects of conflict on Athens and her allies were far greater than the effects on Sparta and her allies.' To what extent is this a fair assessment?**

Candidates sometimes had somewhat limited knowledge of economic impact of conflict, many stretched social impact to become relevant, with varying levels of success. In particular knowledge of the evidence for the Athenian tribute and any changes to it was poor. Generally candidates were clear on the issues with the sources for Sparta and indeed the allies. There was a general misunderstanding of the Methone decree and the requirement to only pay "the goddess' share". Some candidates had a tendency to refer to the 30 tyrants as a "decarchy". Reference was made to 'Persian money' for Sparta in the Decelean War, although the effect on Sparta and the subsequent corruption (according to Xenophon) was not explored by most.

Q8. **'The sources are so biased towards Athens that we cannot assess accurately relations between Greek sates.' To what extent is this a fair assessment?**

This was the least popular question, and seemed to result in either very strong or very weak responses. Candidates had some issues with deciding what evidence to marshal in support of their assertions about what the sources can actually tell us about the relations between Greek states. Some candidates appeared confused by the term "Greek states" - many only explored Athens' relations with Sparta or with her own allies, few answers explored wider relationships between Greek states.

Most candidates appeared to be confused by the meaning of the term "biased towards", none expressly defined it. Most appeared to assume that biased should be read as prejudiced, specifically prejudiced in Athens' favour. However a number of better answers explored not only the sources' prejudices but also their coverage and awareness of the

various states and that fact that most sources' knowledge of and coverage of Athens was rather greater than of Sparta.

Q9. **'All Athenians saw themselves as superior to non-Athenians.' How far do the sources support this view?**

This question elicited a wide range of responses. Only a minority of candidates focused effectively on the idea of 'all' at the beginning of the question. The majority tended to launch into discussions of whether the Athenians as a group saw others in a picture way. Some candidates focused on the divisions within Athenian society, and seemed to regard Athenian women as non-Athenians. There were, however, some excellent discussions of the Parthenon sculptures and their significance, as well as a range of literature. In particular, the discussion of Pericles' Funeral Oration showed that candidates were well aware of the Athenian leader's thoughts on this topic. Some used Cleon's speech on Mytilene to good effect in terms of the relations with the allies.

Q10. **To what extent does Athenian art help us to understand the lives of women in ancient Athens?**

The best responses to this question showed a strong knowledge of a both pottery and sculpture, and discussed these in the context of other forms of evidence, not least drama. Many candidates made good use of their knowledge of relevant plays, although there is a tendency for candidates to simply recall plays. There were some candidates who seemed to think that Medea was a typical Athenian woman, but more common was the approach that Sophocles' Ismene represented the stereotypical Athenian woman. The best answers were able to place the evidence of different aspects of women's lives side by side, and discuss the extent to which the art was a realistic depiction.

Q11. **How far do the sources help us to understand the purposes of Athenians festivals?**

This question was well handled by many candidates – although it is worth reminding students about the lack of weekends in ancient Athens. There were some strong discussions of the different types of festivals, including dramatic festivals, with intelligent attempts made to discern the purposes of festivals from the evidence available. Some candidates made excellent use of Isocrates' comments on the Great Dionysia to argue that festivals not only had a benefit for the individual people of Athens, but that they also served a political function in enabling the state to present itself to its allies. Many focused on the sources as the question asked, and produced a varied range of examples. The importance of competition was under developed and often limited to dramatic areas.

Q12. **'Socrates only asked questions: the other sophists tried to change Athens through their teaching.' To what extent is this a fair assessment?**

This question led to some excellent considerations of Socrates, with appropriate detail and some intelligent discussion of his philosophical methods and aims. There was a particular focus on the *elenchus*, with some strong support from Plato's *Euthyphro* and *Meno* evident in many answers. Candidates also made effective use of Aristophanes' *Clouds* to suggest that Socrates did wish to change answers. There was also intelligent discussion of both Alcibiades and Critias. Effective use was also made of Xenophon by a number of candidates. That said, all too few of the candidates failed to bring in adequate detail of other sophists, and discuss either their teachings or the potential effects of their teaching. Gorgias and his impact on rhetoric in particular would have been a welcome addition to some answers. That said, a goodly number of candidates made reference to Pericles' association with Damon, as outlined by Plutarch.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

General Comments:

The Examiners welcomed the extent of candidates' knowledge, assessment of evidence and focused responses. As always the candidates appeared to have responded well to the high standard with which this unit is taught in Centres.

Addressing the question and the terms in which it is set is vital, but we still see candidates who fail to do so in their factual knowledge and analysis. This is most prevalent where the question contains the terms 'evidence' or 'sources'; this is ignored and no argument/conclusion is offered on these aspects.

There continues to be a sensible and thoughtful approach by the majority of candidates to the evaluation of the evidence. There remains, however, some generic and repetitive passages detailing authors' background and biases with little relation to the examples chosen. These paragraphs add nothing to the analysis, nor the interpretation of the evidence. This is especially true when the information is accepted **as fact** after stating that it is **untrustworthy.** However, the majority make an effort to be precise (even when unsure of the author). A lengthy and generalised evaluation at the start or end of the answer, even when an author is not used in the response, simply wastes the candidates' time. Often this was doubly so when the learnt passages were repeated in the second response. In addition some candidates repeated the same version of evaluation every time an author was used. Quotations from texts are admirable but do need to be developed in terms of the question. A number refering to the sources Suetonius or Tacitus might have used 'imperial' or 'senatorial' records without giving a clear idea of what these might be. They also assume access to records makes their material reliable. Material evidence, especially coins, appeared more frequently; however, it is important to be precise about this evidence. It is not sufficient to say 'a coin' provides evidence of some aspect without some detail of its context and appearance. Out of context quotes can lead to mis-interpretation and analysis can suffer. It is apparent in responses where the candidate has no idea of the context, and knows only the quote, never having read the author to any extent. General statements such as *'Plutarch was not reliable because he was not contemporary'* or *'because Plutarch was a 'biographer'* his works are of little historical value' add little to the evaluation. Equally likely was *'Suetonius is a gossip with access to archives….'*, without identifying the relevance of the source or these generalised statements to the representation under discussion. This generalised discussion of sources does not add to the arguments used by the candidates and can detract from the overall argument.

Candidates who have a secure grasp of the order of events produce clear, sound responses, of which there were an increasing number. Placing an event or action in the right point in a period can often mean the analysis is good rather than partial. There are still candidates who appear to have no sense of change in a period because they lack accurate chronology. Candidates must also be reminded to stay within the period unless they can indicate events outside have a bearing on their analysis of events in the period. Some candidates focus their response on providing knowledge of relevant points without discussion of the implications of this relevance. The result is candidates doing well in AO1 but much less well in AO2.

Very many candidates grasped the essence of the issues and developed responses showing awareness of the contexts. Most deployed excellent knowledge of the periods and produced well-organised arguments. Candidates generally produced responses which developed towards a coherent conclusion, with fewer responses offering long passages of narrative with no focus on the question.

Finally it needs to be said that the issue of illegibility is a growing issue but it is difficult to see what can be done, other than the practice of handwriting in the weeks before the examination. It remains true that if the script cannot be read then it cannot be assessed appropriately.

Candidates also add additional paragraphs making it difficult to follow the argument, when the extra piece is somewhat removed from the main body of the response. Writing down the margin is not the best way to add a new thought. Careful planning beforehand of the responses might avoid much of this, as well the rather unstructured narrative from some candidates.

In **Option 1** Question 2 and 3 were more popular than Questions 1 and 4 but not by a great deal. The majority of responses focused on the first half of the period, as might be expected, although relevant material from later was often omitted. There was much 'as we learn from Plutarch/ Sallust/Cicero' without pinning down what precisely we learn. This mattered when other parts of the same author provided different evidence contradicting the argument. This was true for example when only partial knowledge was apparent on what Plutarch says about Clodius' tribunate. Claims of 'bias' were not always supported by a sufficiently appropriate example. It is also questionable how far access to 'imperial' records helps in this period. It was pleasing to see candidates differentiate between contemporary and later sources, making relevant and sound comments on their value.

In **Option 2** Question 5 was the most popular, with the others being equally attempted. There was some stereotyping of emperors in terms of their actions and personalities, based upon partial knowledge of the evidence. In addition some emperors were treated to very little analysis (for example Tiberius not wanting to do anything with anything). Generally, however, the period was well-covered and most responses had a good range of examples. Differentiation between emperors was a pleasing aspect in this Option. There was a much broader use of sources in responses and not the over reliance on Tacitus and Suetonius. Poetry was used quite well in Question 5 and 6, particularly Horace 'Carmen Saeculare' and Ovid 'Fasti'. The use of coinage and archaeological evidence was impressive this year with some very accurate descriptions and sound evaluation. However a number still mention Tacitus as source on Gaius (and to some extent Domitian). There is still the insistence of candidates giving a narrative of all emperors without any sense of selectivity based on the question.

In **Option 3** Q.10 was the most frequently attempted. There were many responses which deployed material evidence with varying success, depending upon how precise they were. 'An inscription from the East' is difficult to assess and analyse thoroughly. Many responses showed a pleasing grasp of the whole period and used material from both early and late emperors and governors in Q.11. Some responses employed only Pliny and Tacitus (*Agricola*) in responses, and seem unaware of the distinction between governors and procurators in more than one question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1 Cicero claimed, in 59 BC, that the Republic was finished. How far do the sources support this view?

Responses should examine the statement made by Cicero in its context and in the text from which it comes; the focus should be on the extent to which evidence supports this view or not. They should provide factual information and evidence of the Republic before and after the date given. This might include references to specific instances of the institutions' failures and/or challenges to the institutions affecting the working of the Republic. These could include the issues surrounding bribery, corruption, illegal commands, the use of violence and manipulation of the system by politicians leading to its fall. This should be supported by specific use of evidence from ancient sources and their views which agree or contrast with Cicero's. Responses should evaluate and interpret the relevant evidence.

More successful responses noted the need to address the evidence as well as the validity of the statement by Cicero. Knowledge of the period as a whole was essential for the better responses and many displayed this with varying degrees of detail such as Caesar's consulship, Pompey's commands and Clodius' tribunate. Better responses developed a view of the context in which Cicero made his statement. In addition they displayed an awareness of Cicero' s own stance on the issues using relevant material from both letters and speeches. Successful responses showed a detailed knowledge of the sources e.g. the views of Sallust on the decline of morals, or Plutarch's report of Cato's comment on the triumvirate). This was used to address the question and evaluated the references thoroughly in a number of instances. Equally better responses dealt with the threat to the Republic of corruption and the control of armies. A few considered the inability of the Senate (and why this was) to control the politicians even when clearly united (the vote of 370 for laying down arms in 50 BC). As in previous years weaker responses simply failed to address the issue of the evidence, and answer the question of 'support'. Precise knowledge of the institutions of the Republic supported better responses whereas vague ideas of what the 'Republic' meant damaged responses.

Question No.2 To what extent were the tribunes no more than agents of powerful politicians during this period?

Responses should identify a range of tribunes and their roles with the context of events during the period. The range should include potential agents and independent tribunes for discussion. The range should deal with the period as far as possible. Evidence should be provided from a variety of sources which is interpreted and evaluated in the context. The analysis and argument should be focused on the issue and deal with the 'no more than' aspect of the question. The question of use by politicians should be developed in terms of 'extent' and the possibility of tribunes acting independently and as agents at the same time. The issue of relationships between politicians might be addressed as well as the limited nature of sources on the motives of tribunes.

Better responses had a full range of tribunes to focus on from the 70s to the 40s – Macer (and others in some cases), Gabinius, Manilius, Flavius, Rullus, Vatinius, Clodius, Milo, Curio and Titius to name but a few! Less successful responses made heavy weather of assigning the correct act to the correct tribune. Others could remember what (Pompey's commands for example) but not whom; some could not get past Pompey. Flavius was occasionally confused with Caesar on the land reform. A few responses discussed other ways in which politicians gained what they wanted, with little reference to tribunes, in an effort to answer 'to what extent', by placing the focus on politicians' success. This was not the question set. Most picked out Clodius as no one's agent (although Plutarch clearly states he was acting for Caesar in part). However, there was a tendency to treat everything Clodius did as if he was a tribune throughout the 50s. Better responses noted this and used it accordingly. Responses attacking the issue of 'agents' directly were more successful, rather than those with a discursive discussion of the failures of the Republic. Even good responses, however, tended to omit the tribunes of the 70s, some of the 60s and the end of the period. Others tried to go into the period of Augustus and his tribunicia potestas.

Question No.3 To what extent does the evidence support the view that bribery played a significant part in Roman political life during this period?

The focus of the responses should be on the evidence and the argument should be directed towards assessing the value of it. Examples of bribery should be offered and discussed to determine the significance of each act in the context and beyond. Distinction should be made between legitimate canvassing of support and illegal/illegitimate bribery with some appreciation of the fine line between them. Areas for discussion might include elections, the courts, bribery of armies, the plebs and other politicians for their support. Responses may argue that other factors

are more significant but the emphasis should be on the use of bribery and assess it in specific cases against other factors.

The main issue here were responses which ignored the 'evidence' aspect of the question and went for narrative of examples of bribery. Responses varied in their definition of 'bribery' extending it to clientala and marriage alliances; the use of the army was partially dealt with as bribery but often the analysis was not coherent; the responses tended to deal with general corruption at times, sometimes based on a general understanding of Sallust 's views. Responses dealt with 'to what extent' by introducing other factors which played a part in the politics of the period, often at the expense of carefully analysing the part played by bribery. Therefore, the comparison was unbalanced especially when few examples of bribery were offered (most often Caesar's bribery for his consulship, accompanied sometimes with Bibulus and Cato; Clodius' trial ran a good second). Better responses had a wider range from Verres to Octavian, in a number of contexts such as the courts, elections, buying support of politicians (Caesar and Curio for example) or the people or the army (Tacitus' 'seducing' the people and army). Evidence against the significance of bribery was taken from the Commentariolum and Cicero's career (although it was suggested Cicero out-bribed Catiline in 64 BC, with no evidence given and contrary to Plutarch). Speculation about possible bribery without evidence was distracting from the argument.

Question No. 4 How far were the social effects of political and military conflicts important in Roman politics during this period?

Responses needed to identify social effects resulting from political or military conflicts, and assess how far these played a part in political activity and the importance of that part. Social issues resulting from conflicts might include the issue of debt, land reforms, the influx of wealth and its effects, the role of the poor and their demands, those displaced by war and land allocations, the issue of land for veterans, the urban violence, unemployment and food supply. Conflicts which might be discussed are the various foreign wars in Spain and the East, the pirate problem, civil wars and their consequences politically and socially, the Catiline Conspiracy, the struggle between optimates and populares, the triumvirates and their opponents and conflicts between individual politicians.

Weaker responses which showed that the question had not been read properly, saw "military conflicts" and launched into civil wars and Caesar's campaigns with little/no reference to social effects; they responded with a discussion on the political consequences of conflicts (leading to the popularity of Pompey, or the dictator ship of Caesar); this led to narratives of conflicts even where social effects were identified; others simply did not understand the term "social effects" clearly enough to construct a coherent answer. There were some responses which successfully focused on the 'social' aspect and developed clear arguments linking them to the politics during the period- the problem of the dispossessed and debt resulting from Sulla and proscriptions; failed veterans in Etruria- linked then to Catiline and the disruption in the 50s and later; or the issue of the pirates or Spartacus and the resulting disruption of trade and corn supply leading to the rise of Pompey and his commands in the 60s. Some identified the analysis by Sallust and Plutarch of Rome's problems and argued the effects, due to conflicts, played a part in the optimates/populares issue in Rome.

Question No. 5 'Bread and Circuses – this is all the emperors contributed towards the well-being of the people of the city of Rome.' How far do you agree with this view?

Responses needed to develop a range of examples detailing the actions by emperors which were directed either intentionally or not towards the well-being of the citizens of the city. Responses should include actions relating to the food supply and the provision of entertainment, and develop those to deal with the issue that this was all emperors did. Responses should

identify where emperors did more in areas such as water supply, fire prevention, policing, accommodation, employment, sanitation, hygiene and health, stability and security, and building amenities of all sorts. A range of emperors should be included covering the period but not all need to be included. Support from evidence, literary and material, should be provided appropriately interpreted and evaluated in terms of well-being; responses may consider what this term covered in Ancient Rome in order to assess the issues.

There was great emphasis on Augustus and the Res Gestae (variously spelled). Some candidates mis-read the question here to mean 'all the emperors contributed Bread and Circuses', which then limited the range of their responses since they did not discuss other aspects of well-being. The better responses identified the Juvenal reference accurately and then attempted to evaluate Juvenal's work. The better responses also engaged directly with 'well-being' from the outset. This is good practice for these sorts of questions where the terms need some definition. Very few realised that 'the people of the city of Rome' could mean the population of the city as a whole and included other groups such as senators and equestrians. There was some confusion between emperors and what they did among the weaker responses; equally the detail of their actions was lacking especially important when trying to argue they contributed to well-being. Most responses had a range of other ways emperors sought to please the people from the water supply to religious buildings. However, identifying precisely who put up which aqueduct for example, or who started the fire-service was typical of less successful responses. The use and accuracy of source material varied but there was a wider use of alternatives to Suetonius and Tacitus.

Question No. 6 To what extent does the evidence help us to understand the attitudes of the emperors of this period towards traditional religious practices?

The focus of the responses should be on the evidence for attitudes and the argument should be directed towards evaluating the extent to which it helps us understand these attitudes. Responses should develop views on the extent to which it is limited in identifying emperors' motives, while useful in dealing with their actions. Responses should clarify the range of traditional religious practices such as rites, sacrifices, activities of priests, divination, the use of festivals and priesthoods, building of temples and shrines, establishing cults related to traditional religion and the extent to which emperors engaged in these. The Imperial cult may be considered as incorporated into the traditional forms in terms of the worship of deified emperors and family members. Responses should consider how far this was untraditional and reflected a lack of interest in the traditional practices. The evidence for foreign rites may also be considered in this context.

As with Q5 the better responses set out some sort of understanding of what 'traditional religious practices' entailed before engaging with the attitudes of emperors in relation to these. It was important here to set out the limitations of the sources when assessing the attitudes of emperors. Weaker answers were unclear about 'traditional religious practices' and how emperors engaged in these- from their priesthoods, especially Pontifex Maximus) to the ceremonies and festivals which they supported. Not everyone mentioned the Pontifex Maximus as a regular post for emperors. Many went onto develop the argument for the Imperial Cult as showing no concern for the traditional religion disregarding the regular involvement of emperors in these practices. Good responses identified the repeated use of the Secular games, the building of temples, the development of the Compitales, Domitian's actions towards Vestals and the claims of emperors to be keeping ancestral practices. References to the banning of cults were also ascribed to a support for traditional religion as well as the reverse- the support for Isis under the Flavians. The incorporation of the Imperial cult into traditional religion was a feature of better responses.

Question No. 7 'None of the emperors of this period managed to achieve a good working relationship with the Senate and senators.' How far do you agree with this assessment?

Responses should offer a range of factual knowledge detailing the extent to which emperors were able to work with the Senate and senators in governing/administering Rome. Examples of emperors working with the Senate on variety of aspects should be included. These might include the range of commissions on aspects such as road, aqueducts, food supply, finance, public works as well as decisions/debates concerning the Empire and the political situation in Rome. Responses might include instances of efforts by emperors to include the Senate and senators and instances of the unwillingness of them to engage with the emperors for one reason or another such as maiestas trials or the autocratic nature of some emperors. A range of emperors should be included to deal with the issue of 'none' in the statement. The relationship between emperors and the senators might be included where it affected how they worked together as might evidence of plots against emperors. Reference to individual senators would be relevant where supported by evidence.

The definition of 'working relationship' was an aspect of the better responses, where they developed examples of how the emperor and the Senate (or individual senators) worked together in the governing of Rome. Narratives of the relationship, good or bad, partially missed the point. Precise detail of the interaction between emperors and senators was a feature of the better responses- debates, decisions made with the involvement of both, roles taken up by senators in administration, autocratic actions by emperors. Where available, better responses used precise statements about the Senate by emperors such as Tiberius 'slaves' quote (although this was rarely given a context). Responses which focused on relations/relationships without due attention to 'working' performed less well. Focus on plots and assassinations as a sign of bad relations was frequent, although errors were made for example claiming that senators killed Domitian or only senators killed Gaius. Nero was often assassinated. Very few individual senators were mentioned – Thrasea Paetus being the exception. A feature of weaker responses was the acceptance of the attitudes of the sources as fact.

Question No. 8 'Compared with other emperors of this period, Augustus and Vespasian as achieved far more for the city of Rome than the other emperors of this period.' How far do the sources support this view?

Responses should develop the evidence for or against the statement and provide an assessment of their value in arguing how far the statement is correct. Responses should make clear comparisons between the emperors named and other emperors of the period. Detailed examples of the performances of emperors should be included to develop an assessment of what they achieved for the city of Rome. These may cover amenities, security and policing, religion, food and water supply, buildings and city planning, administration and entertainments. Evidence should cover material and literary examples. The achievements should be placed in the context of each reign for assessment. Responses may also include actions damaging to the city in contrast to achievements to aid the argument and comparison of emperors. The portrayal of the reigns in the sources should be evaluated.

The better responses set out the context for Augustus and Vespasian's reigns but few went so far as to identify how that might have affected the view presented by the sources on how much they had achieved for the city. Good responses tended towards listing imperial achievements and assessing them in comparison with the other emperors; better responses listed imperial achievements as identified by the sources while evaluating whether the sources give enough credit where credit is due to all emperors. The focus on the sources and their presentation of achievements provided better responses. Very detailed material on achievements featured in many responses with a clear comparison; however, the issue of the sources was not always dealt with in as much detail. Evaluation was addressed well in this question but there was also underdeveloped analysis. There was wide knowledge which was not used to its best advantage.

As with Q5 confusion between emperors marked the weaker responses and even some relatively good ones. Victories in the Empire were sometimes employed as achievements for the city of Rome. In addition instances of damage to the city were also employed to show some emperors did not achieve much. Gaius' bridge of the bay of Baiae would not be relevant. However, there were also instances of assumptions that 'bad' emperors did little when this is questionable.

Question No. 9 To what extent and for what reasons did the Romans ignore Augustus' advice not to expand the Empire during this period?

Responses should include a range of evidence covering the extent of expansion or consolidation and the reasons behind the activities of a range of Romans involved in the Empire. The policies of the Roman government should be considered where possible, but also the independent activities of Roman governors on the frontiers. Issues might include political pressures on emperors and others and their personal considerations and personalities, defence and security, the need for resources, financial rewards, military demands and the Roman view of imperialism. Responses should offer evidence, both material and literary, for interpretation on the issues and evaluate it in terms of the question.

Responses to this question varied depending upon the extent to which candidates had a range of reasons. The use of the sources was indicative of the quality of responses where Tacitus on Domitian's reason for withdrawing Agricola, for example, was either accepted as fact or properly evaluated in terms of the needs of the Empire as a whole in terms of manpower and the difficulties in Germany. Better responses dealt with expansion or lack of it ranging from Germany and the Neckar Valley to Dacia and Parthia. Taking in the appropriation of client kingdoms on the way; weaker responses had limited examples – generally Britain but also Judaea which was not technically an example of expansion but rebellion. Trajan in Dacia (ignoring Domitian) was usually mentioned, but fewer dealt with Parthia, and the activities of other emperors in minor examples. The reasons were often limited to personal glory, even where Trajan was concerned when clearly the candidates knew of the resources acquired from Dacia; the alternative reasons for Claudius' invasion were sometimes mentioned in the better answers but many seems not to know of Berikos, or the resources available. The Roman attitude to expansion in general was again a feature of better responses, but absent in the less successful efforts (Virgil's admonition in the Aeneid was not used). Few dealt with the motives of those other than emperors and their wish for glory or advancement. The assessment of the effort of the Romans to expand suffered at times from a lack of source material and assumptions about the reliability of the evidence.

Question No. 10 'Once the Romans took over, provincials soon lost their local and regional identities.' To what extent do the sources support this view?

Responses should show factual knowledge of the evidence for the local/regional identities and the effects of Roman occupation upon them; consideration should be given to the maintenance or loss of local customs and practices due to the presence of the Romans. A variety of evidence may be used including inscriptions, coinage, art, infrastructure, and literature. A range of aspects should be covered for example the use of Latin, amenities, law, industry, religion, urbanisation, and entertainment. Instances of rejection of Roman culture (such as in Britain or Judaea) may be used to discuss the extent of support from the sources. The spread of citizenship may also be developed in terms of Romanised elites, or whole communities. The effect of the presence of the army and colonies can be used as part of the discussion. Literary sources from Roman authors need to be evaluated for its use as evidence of non-Roman views.

Better responses argued that the local identities continued to exist alongside the Roman culture or were combined with them, rather than seeing it as Roman culture replacing local culture.

Better responses had arrange of material evidence and offered variety of interpretations showing an understanding of the limitations of the evidence. However, the analysis of the evidence was superficial in even good responses for example Cogidubnus' inscription being evidence of local identity lost in general, when it refers to an elite member of the tribe (and a airly unique one). Equally the Fishbourne villa (much of which is dated outside the period) was used without making it clear that there are problems concerning who owned it. Weaker responses made little of the context of epigraphic evidence. The evidence from the spread of Roman citizenship was analysed well in good responses but too often it was simply taken as proof of a loss of identity. The evidence from the *Agricola* was universally employed – the use of Latin for example was taken to mean loss of identity without consideration that local languages continued; the wearing of togas and use of baths was assessed as Romanisation by weaker candidates without comment whereas stronger ones questioned the evidence and the limited support for it. The interpretation of epigraphic evidence is often difficult and needs careful handling if it is to be effective in terms of the different types and contexts. Evidence of Romans taking on local culture was cited for example Epona but it was less successfully used when no specific example was stated. Also included usually were examples such as Bath, and the Sebasteion.

Question No. 11 The sources provide only a limited account of the governor's role and success during this period.' How far do you agree with this view?

Responses should focus on the sources and direct the argument towards whether or not they are limited in their accounts of Roman governors. The roles of governors should be covered with examples from the whole period using literary and material evidence. These might include the maintenance of security and defence, aggressive expansion, judicial, financial and military duties, relations with provincials, development of infrastructure and Romanisation. Discussion should include the extent to which sources offer accounts of the successes of governors, and how limited these accounts are. Analysis might consider the tendency of the sources to focus on problems rather than successes.

There were fewer responses to this question. There were some very good ones which cited more than Pliny and Agricola. Pliny's Letters were commonly the main source material (and candidates were aware that they were not written for publication). Most understood the nature of his governorship. The majority had a number of examples of his duties in the province, although selecting the appropriate letters proved a problem with some: for example getting citizenship for a friend is not part of the role of a governor; it is patronage. Better responses differentiated between Agricola and Pliny well but had less material on the former. Chapter 21 was cited as part of his role; also his dealing with the corn levy was often included; some referred to the St Albans forum as supporting evidence; however, his military role was often omitted. The financial role of Pliny was cited by many but this was not always developed to show that it was less usual for governors to be this involved, other than in tax collection. This was also true of his involvement in construction. Peace and security, good relations with the locals featured in better responses with examples of where governors failed in this respect (Judaea and Britain, although strictly it was the procurator). Success was dealt with well in a number of responses with (again) Tacitus used appropriately (including how jealous Domitian was showing his success!). However, assessing this caused weaker candidates more problems when they did not clearly define what they meant by it.

Question No. 12 How far does the evidence support the view that Boudicca's revolt was not at all typical of resistance to Roman rule during this period?

Responses should provide a clear account of the Boudicca revolt based up the available sources, identifying the key elements and differences in the accounts and material evidence. Some assessment of whether the Boudicca revolt was typical or atypical required close comparison of the evidence of other examples of resistance to Roman rule. The discussion

might include comparison of causes, course, the scale and outcomes of resistance as well as the leaders involved and their motives. This might also involve the involvement of the Roman administration and its responses to the resistance. The evidence should be interpreted and evaluated as part of the comparison in order to develop an argument in terms of the question. Better responses had detail of the Boudicca rebellion enabling them to make detailed comparisons with other examples of resistance. The comparison was usually with the Jewish rebellion of AD 66. The religious aspects were compared (Claudius temple and the statue of Gaius, although this was much earlier). Weaker responses were limited to this comparison while better ones ranged across the period. Vindex was cited as a revolt against Nero not the Empire as such. Better responses included the Frisii, Batavians, Sacrovir and Tacfarinas. The use of coins was welcome as evidence of motives but needed to be more precise and evaluated more clearly. The causes of resistance were most often compared rather than the course of revolts – tax and maladministration. The evidence in Tacitus and elsewhere for this was evaluated superficially in weaker responses where his statements were accepted regardless of his prejudice against procurators and freedmen; some argued the resistance was to taxation rather than Roman rule (as Tacitus would argue). The scale of the damage done by Boudicca was also compared with other examples as a sign of how untypical it was, although details of other revolts were less in evidence. Many were aware of the inherent limitations that the sources were largely Roman or Roman-inspired but did not use this in specific examples. The mutinies in AD 14 appeared in weaker responses. In addition some candidates discussed examples of welcoming Roman rule making Boudicca atypical.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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