OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Classics: Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 H442**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H042**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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.

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:

This year most candidates have shown a good understanding of the material they have studied and have addressed the question set effectively. The majority of candidates were able to organise their work effectively under exam conditions, and answered the questions in full; there were a small number who either did not complete a question, resorted to bullet pointsor produced rather short final answers. In some cases it was clear that overly long answers to the first questions attempted (usually (a) and (b) questions) were the problem, but there were relatively few of these this year. Most candidates now focus very clearly on the passage in (a) and are not drawn into writing extended responses drawing on other evidence; but there remain a small number of candidates who appear not to have understood this. But in the main examiners are pleased to report that candidates approach the paper in the right way and have organised their time effectively during the exam.

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 their time was clearly well organised so that everything 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 in previous years, this can affect how the questions are approached, as the paper is designed to be answered in order. The work of a few candidates who dealt with questions in a different order could be out of balance, especially if they lost sight of the demands of the (a) question (focused only on the passage) and (b) question (where they cannot use the passage printed in the question).

It is worth reinforcing to 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 expected, but this cannot be credited at all for (a) questions under AO1. There are still a small number of candidates who do not engage with the evaluation of the sources used at all in the (c) question and the essay; more significantly, there are still too many who seem to rely on generalised evaluation, occasionally in paragraphs prepared in advance. This method of evaluating evidence usually does not contribute much to the final mark as it does not relate closely to the material under discussion and is indicative of an underdeveloped response. This is very noticeable where identical wording is found across a number of answers. Less strong responses often attributed quotations or examples to the wrong source (and often then exacerbated the problem by evaluating the author they had chosen).

Examiners once again noted that too many candidates have a vague grasp of the order of events for the period they have studied. Jumping from one part of the period to another (and back again) with no explanation does not indicate a sound understanding of events and their consequences, especially where the question demands some understanding of change over time.

The Instructions to Candidates on the paper request that the candidate indicates the number of the questions they are attempting in the margin. Most did this clearly and effectively, but there were a small number of candidates who did not set out their answers clearly. In most cases examiners were able to determine what the candidate was doing. A much more problematic 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 easy to do; 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 are still a number of candidates whose writing presents a significant challenge. In many cases candidates have now been encouraged by centres to use an appropriate method to present their work and this is helpful. Where the handwriting of candidates is likely to present difficulties 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. Examiners are keen to give the candidates the appropriate mark, but this can sometimes not be as straightforward as we would like.

Where candidates make use of a word processor, they should be strongly encouraged to double space their work (examiners rarely see this) and to make sure 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 only a handful of candidates who do not do what is expected of them. The (a) question is answered by selecting detail from the set passage (or passages), and there is no expectation of a broader exploration of the topic of the question beyond the detail of the passage itself, though, of course, the candidates' broader knowledge should enable them to pick relevant elements form the source. There remain a very small number of candidates who engage in a more extended response or who write generally about the topic set in the question; examiners are unable to award much credit, if any, for this. The (b) question demands a selection of relevant examples 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 (for example, a different inscription or a non-specified passage of Thucydides). There is no need for evaluation in the (b) question, though examiners are still able to credit it; but the (b) questions are looking for interpretation of the source material selected from memory, and examiners again report some worthwhile discussions in all sections of the paper. A number of candidates wrote at too great a length on the (b) question which restricted the time available for the (c) question and Section B which carry more marks. The (c) question is intended to allow a more fully developed response, including some evaluation of the sources on which the response is based. Once again, it is important for candidates to employ careful time management so that this answer does not become too lengthy, and it is worth reminding candidates that the passage (or passages) in the question should be used as part of the evidence in response, as the question was set to develop some aspect of the source(s) used.

In Section B, the majority of candidates were able to respond to the essay questions effectively and address the assessment objectives. It is worth restating yet again that the bullet points are not designed to form an essay plan, but should remind candidates of what needs to be covered. It remains the case that some weaker responses offer very generalised evaluation. One characteristic of successful essays at this level is that candidates closely integrate their discussion of the sources at points where this allows them to develop their argument. Weaker responses still include too many generalisations, often corralled together almost as an afterthought at the end of the essay, sometimes to the exclusion of a considered conclusion where the question is addressed. 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.

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
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. There were relatively few responses that focused only on one or other of the two passages. Candidates were generally clear about the significance of the first passage, though not all were clear who 'Demosthenes' was. Some candidates struggled with the language of the Old Oligarch passage, particularly the 'ignorance and depravity and goodwill' at the end. In (b) some candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the background of politicians during the period, and there were a number of excellent discussions of the aristocratic families of figures such as Pericles and Cimon. Some candidates interpreted 'background' to include what politicians had done (such as being a general), and examiners allowed some latitude here. However this question clearly proved challenging, and there were some rather general discussions of wealth; Pericles was the only example cited in a number of responses, though there was often a contrast with Cleon. Sources were in some answers rather limited, though there was some good use of the *Ath.Pol. and also Plutarch.* In (c) candidates were able to offer some examples of poor leadership, though in some cases this became confused with 'leadership by the poor'. Stronger answers could quote Thucydides 2.65 to support an analysis of problematic leadership after the death of Pericles, though few were clear about the details of what was written there. Cleon's role as leader was often cited, though the discussion was not always very clear. Examples such as the Mytilene and Pylos debates were sometimes used to good effect, together with the debate about Sicily in Thucydides Book 6.

Question No. 2
This passage proved a rich source for the (a) question, and even weaker responses seemed to select the detail effectively. In (b) some answers focused almost exclusively on ostracism; but there were some good discussions of *euthune* and *dokimasia*. Many were also aware of the role of the *Boule*, the assembly and the courts. Not all answers linked their examples clearly to the sources. The strongest responses were able to give specific examples involving political figures such as Pericles and Cleon. Alas, no candidate brought up the suicide of the general Paches at his *euthune* after his return from supervising the punishment of Mytilene, mentioned by Plutarch *Nicias* 6. There were some good discussions of Thucydides and Aristophanes. In (c) there were some interesting answers that focused on significant individuals such as Pericles and Nicias, though it was not always clear how particular sources were interpreted. Many used Thucydides 2.65, but there were also good analyses of the Pylos and Sicilian debates. Aristophanes *Acharnians* (variously spelled) also was used to good effect, though there was some disagreement about the role of Dikaiopolis. Some answers considered the crowds at the assembly as a collection of individuals, and argued that the democratic system gave a great deal of control to individuals through such institutions.

Question No. 3
This was less popular than Question 4, though there were some strong answers. In some cases candidates elected to discuss Solon at considerable length, which rather undermined the focus of the essay. Candidates often had a decent sense of what the two individuals did, but they were not able to connect this to specific sources in many cases, or rather assumed that Thucydides dealt with everything (especially for Pericles), when it would be more appropriate to look elsewhere. There were however some good discussions of *Ath.Pol.* Weaker answers produced a list of things attributed to the two politicians, in greater or lesser detail, which were not always then related to the development of democracy. There was scope to make more of Pericles' introduction of state pay, even if the details of this are unclear.

Question No. 4
This question proved more popular, and there were some interesting answers. Relatively few candidates fully covered 'all sections of society', though there were some excellent discussions of women, metics and slaves. Some candidates made very effective use of the *Funeral Speech* to make a strong case for the 'extraordinary' nature of Athenian democracy, and most candidates were able to deal, at least in outline, with popular participation in the main organs of state. Better answers assessed 'participation' more rigorously and were able to use a good range of evidence across a number of areas, though for many the detail was a little hazy.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

Question 5 proved more popular than Question 6, and Question 7 than Question 8.

Question No. 5
Most of those who attempted this question were able to make good use of the passage for (a), though not everyone commented on the significance of the Peloponnesian fleet for the Athenians at this time. In (b) most students were able to point to relevant examples, though not all those selected involved the use of military power. Most examples were attributed to Thucydides, who does provide us with a good deal of evidence, though there were also some good examples from inscriptions. In (c), most candidates were aware that relations started on a good note at the inception of the Delian League, but that over time the picture becomes more complex. Better answers were able to point to different relationships with a number of states. It was good to see the Methone decree used to good effect, though candidates often assumed that Melos was an ally, so weakening their use of this example (and few mentioned Skione). Weaker answers tended to present material in an apparently random order, and there was often uncertainty about authorship of written sources.

Question No. 6
Candidates generally dealt effectively with the passage in (a), though not all candidates were able to set out exactly what we can learn from this passage and there was some uncertainty over how best to interpret what the Old Oligarch said here. The final part of the passage dealing with other states was often not handled very effectively. A number of weaker answers to (b) focused on Athenian activity to the exclusion of allied reaction, though better responses were able to list a number of revolts from Thucydides and elsewhere, and Aristophanes *Birds* was often chosen for discussion. Collection of tribute was also chosen, though there were relatively few developed discussions of the surviving epigraphic evidence. There were some excellent responses to (c), though a number focused on the use of military power without explaining why this was relevant. There was certainly scope to develop further what was said about the imposition of democratic government, as well as the use of the Athenian court system to sort out issues in allied cities. In some responses there was scope to make greater use of the passage.

Question No. 7
This question required candidates to assess the changes in the Delian League over time. Most were able to set out the early phase of the Delian League, when the Athenians and their allies got together in a spirit of friendship to continue the war against Persia. However many responses presented a rather negative account of the later stages of the alliance, placing all the benefit on the Athenian side. Stronger answers were able to balance this with discussion of the Methone decree and of the broader economic benefits brought about by Athenian control of the seas. Cleruchies were mentioned by many candidates, but often rather briefly and without explanation. Tribute was also discussed in some detail, especially its use by Athens to fund the building programme, though there was scope to develop this further in

many cases. As has been noted in the past, candidates were less clear about the later parts of the period, especially after the Sicilian expedition, and this in some cases weakened the arguments put forward.

Question No. 8
Many answers focused closely on Delian League members and did not take the opportunity offered to broaden the discussion beyond these; but there were some excellent discussions of the impact of the Athenian Empire on states as diverse as Sparta, Syracuse and Melos. The question invited candidates to assess whether Athenian success created a disaster for themselves and everyone else, though this was not fully developed as a rule. Most candidates recognised that Athens had brought defeat upon herself by the end of the Peloponnesian War, and some were able to judge the impact of this defeat both on Athenian allies but also on the victors.

Option 3: Politics and Society of Ancient Sparta

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

Question No. 9
This proved a popular question, and most candidates recognised the passage and showed they understood the context. In (a) candidates were able to pick out relevant elements from the passage to highlight how decisions were made, though not all were clear about the change of voting procedure, and some wrote as if Archidamus were mentioned in the passage. There was plenty of material for candidates to use in (b), though there was the usual problem of some fuzziness about the authority for particular elements in the role of the ephors. Although most candidates could draw on a range of evidence, they did not always present a clear interpretation and there was some confusion about the roles of ephors and *gerousia*. A good example used by many was the attempt mentioned by Herodotus to compel Anaxandridas to take a new wife: many omitted to mention the role of the *gerousia* here and the successful resistance to this first attempt by the king (which resulted in an unusual compromise). The oaths exchanged between ephors and kings (Xenophon *Constitution* 15) were often not mentioned. In (c) many candidates did not make clear who they took to be ordinary Spartiates, and this made some of their discussion less clear than it might have been. Most were able to use the passage to good effect, and there were some excellent discussions of the Great Rhetra from Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus*, which together suggest that the Spartan assembly could easily be controlled by other elements in Sparta. There were also some interesting discussions of the nature of Spartan society and the extent to which individuals could influence decisions unless they held office. The best answers included a range of examples drawn from the sources.

Question No. 10
This question proved less popular, perhaps because the poetic form made it more challenging. Responses were generally very effective, able to draw out relevant elements relating to 'courage' and the 'beautiful death'. More commonly omitted was the reference at the start of the passage to the consequences of cowardice on the individual and his family. In (b) there was a good range of detail drawn from the sources, though candidates often slipped into an account of the *agoge* without relating their chosen examples to training 'for battle'. In some cases details were connected with the incorrect source. When candidates turned to (c), they often focused on the positive impact of the defeat at Thermopylae, contrasted with the later surrender on Sphacteria, though there were a good range of other examples used as well. Other examples used include the Battle of the Fetters, Marathon and Leuctra; relatively few used the Battle of Mantineia in 418 BC as proof of the qualities underlying Sparta's reputation. The best responses were nuanced and able to present a well-argued case. There were some

good discussions of the role of the helots and the impact a potential helot uprising had on Spartan willingness to engage in longer campaigns beyond their frontiers, especially after the earthquake of the 460s.

Question No. 11
This question was more popular. Candidates were generally well prepared to discuss the role of the kings, though a number allowed the focus of their response to slip away from the focus of the question on 'what happened in Sparta' and spent too much time discussing the role of the kings on campaign. Stronger answers often selected examples from across the period, often arguing convincingly that there was a diminution of the authority of the kings over the period studied, perhaps caused by the challenging behaviour of individuals such as Cleomenes. There were some excellent discussions of the relationship between the kings and the other authorities in Sparta such as the *gerousia* and the ephors. Weaker responses often revealed a shaky grasp of the sources, and were inclined to attribute all examples to one source or another almost (it appeared) at random, or, in some cases, present a generalised narrative without use of sources at all. However many were able to attribute detail to the correct source and discuss the limitations of our understanding of what happened within Sparta to good effect.

Question No. 12
This was less popular than Question 11. There were a number of relatively brief essays that concluded that we learn nothing from the *Lysistrata*, but most candidates who attempted this question were able to build on the depiction of Lampito as very different from her Athenian equivalents. Many candidates stressed the importance of *Lysistrata* for giving us a fifth century Athenian view of Spartans, and were able to relate the detail they drew on from the play to the other evidence they had studied. Much of this revolved around the status of women in Spartan society, but there was also some discussion of the importance of courage as a key element. The very best answers kept a balance throughout, drawing on the greater range of evidence available in other sources but relating this back to what was in the Aristiophanes play. There were also some sensible discussions of the problematic nature of Aristophanic comedy. Some answers focused almost entirely on women in Sparta and did not develop the discussion beyond this.

F392 Roman History from Original Sources

General Comments:

This year the majority of candidates were able to respond appropriately to the questions set and showed clear knowledge and understanding of their chosen option within the time allowed. There were very few rubric errors, although a number of answers once again made use of the passage in Qb which received no credit.

Misattributions were less common than previous years, however, the stock paragraph of evaluation sadly featured in a large number of answers. Centres must be aware that very little credit will be given to statements such as 'Suetonius is a gossip' or 'Tacitus hates emperors'. Equally there is little point in condemning an author just because he was 'non-contemporary'. Evidence should be evaluated when there is a clear issue of reliability. Evaluating author's opinions rather than established fact is more likely to lend itself to a coherent argument.

This is a history paper and dates are important. Answers which were aware of the chronology of the fall of the republic, Augustus's principate and Roman Britain tended to score higher. Option 2 and 3 referred to specific dates in the questions and too often these were either ignored or simply not understood. It is important that answers stick to the precise terms of the question.

The context questions, on the whole, were well done by the 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. Qa responses seemed appropriate in length although literary material was mined with much more success than the numismatic evidence in Q10.

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 or use direct quotations.

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. It was 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 bullet points in the essay questions are there to give guidance to candidates on 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. 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.

The standard of written English was generally quite good with very few examples of illegibility. Spelling was generally very good although the spelling of Catiline (Cataline) continues to be poor and Caesar has a number of spellings. In general answers were quite well structured into paragraphs.

The majority of answers dealt well with the demands of the paper and examiners were confronted with some very thorough attempts to analyse and evaluate the nuances of the essay questions.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

Question No. 1
Q1a was overall well answered, with good understanding of the context.   Most candidates identified the main theme of tribunes and knew something of their role in supporting Pompey. The best answers made specific references to the growing power of the Optimates.

In Q1b although there were many good descriptions of a tribune's role, some candidates struggled to find evidence from the sources on tribunes. Clodius was the tribune most discussed, as well as Manlius. Pompey's use of tribunes to push through legislation was also mentioned frequently.

In Q1c, the better answers struck a balance between the differences and similarities of the two factions, using examples of the behaviour of individuals, recognising that very few individuals stuck to one faction in their political life. Pro Sestio was a key source for this answer and most students used it- the Sallust source for 1a was key for balancing this out. A number of candidates took individuals to represent each group, so applied the behaviour or politicians like Caesar to stand for all Populares. The best answers identified that there were many similarities between the two groups.

Question No. 2
Q2a was very popular and answered very well by most candidates. Nearly all had a clear understanding of Caesar's motives on returning to Rome and used the passage well to support their answers. The best answers stuck to the idea of Caesar's aims and used this to shape the points made. This was the first time two sources had been used in this option and may require a more organised approach in order not to repeat identical points made in both sources.

In Q2b there was a good understanding of political friendship. Atticus was often used as an example but the best answers recognised that this was a different type of friendship, which nevertheless had shades of political friendship. Some candidates listed different friendships, but for good A02 marks it is also necessary to address the idea of their importance. Many students also discussed other attributes which politicians might use for success (bribery, oratory etc.) but this was only relevant when it was linked directly back to the importance of political friendships.

In Q2c the better answers focused on 'to what extent', showing balance. Less successful answers repeated much of their information from Q2b. The triumvirate, Catiline and Cicero, Pompey and Cicero, and Cicero and Atticus were the most discussed friendships. Some students believed that Cicero had defended Catiline in court, which he did not in the end. Some students successfully used their knowledge of the end of the republic and the civil war to support their answers on the triumvirate. Many answers used the example of the triumvirate, especially the relationship between Pompey and Crassus, as the main example. Many also used Cicero's changing relationship with Catiline. Sources were used well to support most answers, especially Cicero's letters.

Question No. 3

There were surprisingly few responses to Q3 in comparison with Q4. Those who did answer it did so well and most made good use of Cicero's Speeches against Catiline and Sallust. The debate on the fate of the conspirators was frequently mentioned to show how serious the threat was. The reference to Cicero's breastplate was also often mentioned. The emphasis of the answers tended to be more on the events of the conspiracy rather than the reliability of the sources, but most attempted some evaluation. Discussion on reliability reached the highest marks when candidates were able to link their argument specifically to a reliability point, rather than write a 'set piece'. Many candidates also wrote long descriptive paragraphs on the threats, e.g. the five groups of Catiline's supporters where a more succinct description would have given more time to analysis and evaluation.

Question No. 4

In Q4 most candidates were able to successfully identify a variety of means by which politicians achieved success. The best answers used the key words in the question to focus on the extent that the sources helped to understand this. Students either chose to answer by theme or by individuals, both of which worked well. This was the more popular essay but some students simply listed the different ways of achieving political success. The vast majority of candidates identified the key methods of rhetoric, bribery, violence, military success and amicitia. The example of Cicero was most often used. Many candidates made good use of the Pro Murena to support their answer.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

Question No. 5

The majority of candidates in Q5a had a clear understanding of how the passages show the relationship between Augustus and the plebs but some answers included other groups such as provincials. The better answers used succinct quotations in their answer to explain both the support Augustus gave the plebs and the honours they bestowed on him. Less successful answers included more lengthy quotations devoid of explanation and a minority of candidates made little reference to the passages and simply explained the relationship between ruler and subject. When multiple passages are set candidates should refer to both sources for higher marks. Some candidates wasted time which could have been focused on the question in evaluating the Res Gestae. The a) part questions do not require source evaluation.

Some answers in Q5b were not precise enough about the meaning of plebs, but most successfully identified a range of methods, particularly under the theme of bread and circuses. Some candidates struggled to show how the action of Augustus would actually win support from the plebs, and a number put too much emphasis on the role of poetry as a way of winning them over. The range of answers given reflected the range of possible material which exists for the relationship between Augustus and the plebs. A significant number of responses included precise quotations from a range of ancient sources. However, even in the strongest responses, there was limited use of other parts of the Res Gestae which is surprising given the range of possible material.

Q5C was answered very well by most candidates. Many responses included detailed an explanation of the various plots against Augustus (as detailed in Suetonius and Velleius) and discussed this with the more favourable picture of Augustus given in the Res Gestae. Weaker answers repeated what they had said in part b without considering other classes and specific examples where Augustus received powers or titles. The scope of the question allows candidates to analyse the view of Augustus during his reign from the point of view of groups other than the plebs. Nevertheless, there were many very successful responses to this question. These responses clearly understood the historical context surrounding Augustus and used this knowledge alongside their evaluated source material.

Question No. 6
Q6a was on the whole less well answered than Q5. Most identified the references to religious decline and civil war, but fewer identified the references to problems in the empire. The references to moral decline appear to have confused a number of candidates. Some struggled with the poetic language and misunderstood the reference to disaster's flood, referring to actual floods in Rome. However, most were able to point to the problems of neglected religion, and civil war, fewer to foreign incursions (Parthians).

In Q6b many struggled and answers were quite general in the references to problems. There was a wide interpretation of early years of Augustus' reign. A significant number focussed their answer predominantly on Actium and the problems faced before at Philippi and during the Second Triumvirate. Whilst it was pleasing to see the detailed knowledge candidates have of the battle of Actium, it is important that take care to tailor their responses to the question set and consider other problems faced by Augustus. Problems identified seemed to vary from Varus (hardly early years) and Julia's misdemeanours – again hardly early. This is an example of where an understanding of chronology really is important to underpin answers. .

Answers were better in Q6c than in 6b, as they identified the successes of Augustus as proof that the problems were solved – especially through bringing peace. Many candidates identified detailed sources to support references to building works and marriage laws. And there was good use of the Ode. However answers to this question tended to be less successful than for Part 5C.

Question No. 7
There were good responses to Q7 where most candidates provided detailed use of Tacitus' account – vital for this question and contrasted/ compared well with Res Gestae, Velleius and the poets. Those who scored less well did not have the basic knowledge of Tacitus, which was clearly the grounding for this answer. Even weaker answers understood something of the historical context of Tacitus' writing during the reign of Domitian and the impact this may have had on his work. Other candidates attempted a similar approach but got muddled by stock evaluation and this limited the effectiveness of the conclusions reached.

Question No. 8
Few candidates in Q8 seemed aware of the issue of restoring the republic – even fewer took any notice of the date 27BC. The words in the first bullet point 'reform the constitution' were either ignored or not understood with many candidates citing restoration of buildings and aqueducts as evidence for Augustus restoring the republic. Reform of the senate was valid and made many appearances, but few candidates knew enough detail about the events of 28-27 or even his constitutional position from 33BC onwards. The best responses had a clear understanding of the concept of the Roman Republic and the extent to which Augustus had restored it by 27BC. However, even in strong responses, candidates demonstrated a limited chronological understanding of the period i.e. they could deploy passages from Velleius but had little idea of why 27BC was a significant date. It is important that candidates are aware of the key dates 31/27/23 BC at the least.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

Question No. 9
Q9a was mainly well answered with candidates selecting appropriate quotations from the passage, showing the difficulties for Ostorius Scapula after the capture of Caratacus. There was some material on the events which led to Caratacus's capture but this was outside the passage so gained no credit.

Q9b was not very well done on the whole as most candidates did not seem to know where Wales was, and which tribes were there, let alone discuss the difficulties Rome had in conquering it. Better answers pointed to terrain, distractions and stubbornness of the Silures. Those who knew Tacitus' accounts did well. Chronology was also a problem Agricola vs Ordovices and Frontinus vs Silures were, of course, well outside the specified period. It is important for candidates to focus on the geography of Roman Britain as well as the political or military side of the occupation.

In Q9Cn those who know their Tacitus fared well and were able to discuss different governors. Some thought Julius Caesar was a governor and discussed his invasions, some went past the causes of Boudicca's revolt. In both cases they could not gain credit. Plautius and Scapula were the most frequently discussed governors but too often in general terms. Specific incidents such as the disarming of the Iceni and the defeat of Silures gained good coverage. Evaluation was limited to Tacitus downplays the achievements of all governors who were not Agricola.

Question No. 10
In Q10a the better answers were excellent and referred to both the Caesar passage and the coins. Some very insightful answers discussed the chronology of the coins, the metal used and the iconography. Occasionally answers did not discuss the coins at all.

Q10b was in the main well done. Although some answered why Claudius and Caesar invaded, which is not quite the same question. The best were able to point to a variety of attractions (and non-attractions) citing plenty of sources. There was inevitably focus on the economic attraction of Britain to the Romans using Cicero, Strabo and Suetonius. There was discussion of the personal glory that might result from a successful invasion of Britain for Augustus, Caligula and Claudius.

Q10c was a wide question and gave a wide range of acceptable answers. Those who were familiar with their sources excelled, discussing client kingdoms, opposition, trade and even changing relationships with the same tribe eg Iceni. The Catuvellauni, Silures and Iceni were depicted as being Rome's main adversaries whereas the Atrebates, Brigantes and Regni were shown to have benefited from Roman rule. Answers focused on archaeology such as the coins, the arch of Claudius and Fishbourne Palace as much as the literary record. Evaluation was a little better than

Question No. 11
This question was done very well whenever the candidates kept within the constraints of the question. It appeared that many did not read the question properly and answered about Boudicca and Agricola rather than the time between the two. Those who did this scored very low marks as little of their answer was relevant. A few answers knew the period very well and were able to point to consolidation/ calming down in the 60s, followed by expansion /action under the Flavians. Some discussed whether there were changes of 'policy' or necessary responses to changes in leadership in Rome. Candidates must be wary of simply seeing the name 'Boudicca' and regurgitating the standard narrative of the events of AD60/61 which seems to occur every year.

Question No. 12

Q12 was by far the more popular essay with some excellent answers that discussed the significance of Agricola's governorship. The basis of these answers was Tacitus' Agricola – most could point to the obvious evaluation, but many did not know the details of the governorship well enough to score high level 4 or level 5 marks. The Chester lead water pipe was not well known and if used misunderstood – this does not point to Romanisation, as it comes from a fortress site. Most candidates used Agricola 21 on Romanisation and knew the basic plot of Mons Graupius. Little seemed to be known of Agricola's initial actions upon arrival in Britain as well as the geography of Scotland. Plotted biographies of Agricola without an assessment of 'how significant' was the modus operandi of some answers to this question and once again candidates are urged to read questions more closely and respond within the precise terms

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

General Observations

Whilst the examiners enjoyed reading the majority of the scripts, the standard of handwriting in some places detrimental to the flow of an essay and hampered the candidates' capacity to communicate their arguments effectively.

Option 1

General Points
There were still some problems with candidates trying to write a pre-prepared essay rather than answer the question set. The best answers kept referring back to the key words in the question and kept on answering the question set directly. Some candidates still tack on a standard paragraph of evaluation either at the start or the end of an essay which does not produce effective evaluation. The best responses quote from a source, say how the quote helps answer the question and then evaluate the specific quote. When candidates are discussing Herodotus' belief in the gods, nemesis/hubris etc they need to be clear about whether this can be considered valid in the 21st century.

Question 1
To answer this question well candidates needed to know in detail the relatively little that Herodotus actually tells us. The best candidates covered the actions of Aristagoras and Histiaeus, the contributions of Athens, the revolt on Cyprus and the battle of Lade and discussed whether it showed that Aristagoras and Histiaeus had been organised. Not enough candidates stayed focused on the word 'organised'. Better answers then considered whether actually the failure of the revolt was down to the strengths of the Persians, especially their ability to divide the Greeks with bribery and the huge resources at their disposal. Some answers tried to separate Greek unity and organisation with mixed success.

Question 2
The best answers distinguished between Herodotus' main theme of the Ionian revolt and subsequent need for revenge and other information which he includes but does not explicitly make part of that main explanation eg the bedroom scene with Atossa in book 3, Athens having already given the Persians earth and water, the Persian request to accept Hippias back, the murder of the Persian envoys by Athens and Sparta in 491, the establishment of democracies, arbitration and tax reassessment after the Ionian revolt. Again there was not enough focus on whether Herodotus was actually explaining the conflict successfully – brief mention of other sources which corroborate Herodotus or highlight what he has failed to mention worked well BUT some candidates spent far too long concentrating on sources other than Herodotus.

Question 3
The best answers showed a detailed knowledge of the actions of Miltiades, Themistocles and Pausanias at Marathon, Artemisium, Salamis and Plataea but also compared their success with Persian weaknesses both in equipment and leadership as well as other factors such as the weather. Very few candidates explicitly identified what the strengths and abilities of the Greek leaders were – there were a lot of generalised comments on bravery and tactical brilliance without analysing what this meant in greater depth. Some candidates unsuccessfully tried to fit the events of the Ionian revolt into their answers. The best answers were able to explain how Leonidas' leadership at Thermopylae, although a defeat for the Greeks, was a psychological victory, which contributed to later Greek victories and encouraged other Greek states to fight. The stronger answers also included a discussion of Cimon's achievements post 479.

Question 4

This was the essay done by fewest candidates, and many failed to remain clearly focused on the issue in the question. The best answers picked up that the sources paint two very differing views of the Persians: one shows them to be tolerant and to allow a great degree of self-rule; the other shows them enslaving and burning cities to the ground. However hardly any candidates discussed whether by giving earth and water and benefitting from benign Persian rule they could really still consider themselves to be free. The better answers appreciated that once the Delian League was established some Greeks had to eliminate the threat of Athenian rule to maintain their freedom. There was some very good discussion of the aims of Darius and Xerxes and especially pertinent was reference to Mardonius' offer to the Athenians to rebuild Athens etc just before the battle of Plataea. There was a good use of Persian sources e.g. Bitisun inscription, Cyrus Cylinder.

Option 2

General Points

Three of the questions involved "conflict" – candidates were rarely strong at pulling apart the difference between causing, prolonging and the outcome of it. An explicit focus on these words would improve many answers at this level. The more general approach taken by many candidates also resulted in a fair number of scripts writing about what they thought was important to conflict without really focusing the evidence on the questions set or picking the most appropriate evidence for that question.

As well as failing to explore the difference between the concepts 'cause', 'prolong' and 'outcome', many candidates seemed to assume that "conflict" was synonymous with "the Peloponnesian War". In preparing for this examination, it would be helpful to spend some time exploring the different types of conflict – military, political etc. as well as the difference between battles, wars, diplomacy and campaigns.

The questions each had at least 3 elements which needed to be engaged with in order to answer them effectively - e.g. outcome, strengths and weaknesses and leaders OR caused, imposition and political systems. Candidates seemed to be able to deal with 1 or 2 of these elements (e.g. caused by political systems) but in the main failed to handle explicitly at least 1 element (e.g. imposition).

The number of candidates who have little to no dates in a history essay is striking. Not only does it affect their A01 mark for detail, it can also make it very difficult to decipher what they are talking about. For example, there is more than one revolt of Euboea.

Question 5

This question proved particularly popular, with much of the relevant material well known by candidates. However, a significant number of scripts answered questions on the "role of individuals" or "importance of leadership" rather than strengths and weaknesses of leaders. A close reading of the question would be advised.

Question 6

This question was also popular, but the candidates' knowledge of political systems of the 5th century was less well-grounded. Very few described the ideologies of the two hegemons. Many have a rough knowledge of events that involve an element of political ideology and conflict – but the detail of their knowledge was mostly poor. Very few are aware of which state has which political system when – which combined with the vague level of their knowledge on this topic made for some confusing answers. There are a fair number who claim that oligarchy was imposed on Lesbos in the wake of the revolt in 428, which is not supported by Thucydides. The candidates' knowledge of the order of events at the Samian revolt of 441/0-39 is likewise poor. There is a strong tendency to assume that every revolt resulted in the imposition of democracy

(and that likewise every punishment decree imposed it).

Question 7
This question was less popular. The main issue here was candidates' failure to discriminate prolonging conflict from causing it.

Question 8
Again – this was less popular but often well handled by candidates. Most tried to engage with the idea of "individuals" with varying degrees of success and the vast majority explicitly and repeatedly explored the value of the sources for this topic. Sadly not many explored the positive effects of conflict on Athens.

Option 3

General Points
The questions in this section often require candidates to look at a topic in a particular context – e.g. sophists and their *effect* on Athenian society or religious festivals and their *impact* on people's lives. All too often candidates chose to narrate what they have learned about the topic, but then failed to relate it to the wider question. It was also noticeable that candidates seemed keen to rehearse a previously studied argument, rather than answer the question set.

Question 9
Some candidates had a strong and detailed knowledge of the workings of Athenian religious festivals, however many chose to write more generally about religion, and did not focus clearly on the festivals. That said, there were some excellent treatments of the Panathenaea and the Great Dionysia, which were used to demonstrate the impact on the lives not only of Athenian citizens but also on other sections of Athenian society. Many candidates chose to mention the *Thesmophoriazusae*, but appeared to have little more than a passing acquaintance with its content.

Question 10
Some candidates had an excellent eye for detail in dealing with this question, and were able to discuss not only the archaeological evidence, both within Athens and beyond, but also the literary evidence – principally Plutarch and Pausanias – to support their analysis. All too often, though, the detail of the buildings was not known, and the analysis of the sculpture in particular was less than satisfactory. A number of candidates seemed confused about the function of the Acropolis – in places seeming to confuse it with the Pnyx – and also attributing comments to Thucydides which were not of his making.

Question 11
This question was popular, but very few candidates seemed to be aware of sophists other than Socrates. Some had a vague notion that there were other teachers, but the focus on the question of rhetoric was often ignored and the names of these other sophists merely paid lip-service to. The best responses made a clear effort to link the sophists' teaching of rhetoric to wider Athenian society, discussing, most notably, the impact on the workings of the assembly, influential leaders (especially Pericles and Cleon), the potential 'conflict of generations' and, in some cases, the erosion of religious belief. Some candidates also suggested that the effect of the sophists was minimal, especially in their impact on religious belief. Those studying this topic are, however, to be reminded of the importance of looking at a range of the sophists, and being cautious in their approach to the sources which are used.

Question 12
This question led to some excellent responses, but other candidates however did not address the specific question and instead discussed whether or not the Athenians saw themselves as superior to other Greeks. That said, those who were able to recall and use the Funeral Oration effectively often discussed the idea of an example to great effect. There were also some effective treatments of scenes from Euripides' *Medea* and some intelligent use of the buildings and sculpture from the Acropolis. Candidates should, however, be reminded to ensure that their examples are clearly tied back to the question – all too often the examples were valid, but then left 'hanging' without a clear explanation of how they supported the candidate's argument.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

General Comments

The Examiners welcomed the knowledge and enthusiasm for the subject shown in their responses. The candidates have responded well to the continued high standard with which this unit is taught in Centres.

The seriousness of illegibility cannot be understated. These are candidates who spend their entire study periods using laptops and only write by hand in the examination. Examiners spend a great deal of time trying to decipher a growing number of scripts in order to give the candidate the grade they deserve, but this can be very challenging and time consuming where handwriting is extremely bad. Additionally writing down the margin is not the best way to add a new thought, especially now that marking is on line and not on a paper script.

The most common error was failure to address the terms of the question especially where the terms included 'evidence' or 'sources'; the responses often ignored the issue or offered no conclusion on it. More often, the response was a pre-prepared one which bore limited relevance to the actual question. At the same time, many candidates grasped the essence of the issues and deployed excellent knowledge of the periods producing well-organised arguments. By referring back to the terms of the questions, better responses answered the question clearly and coherently.

Evaluation of the evidence continues to improve. There are still some generic and repetitive passages unrelated to the argument or the specific evidence. It is of little worth to recite a series of facts from a source and then to suggest that it is unreliable**.** Repeated evaluation in a response often adds little to the argument and serves only to indicate that the candidate has not examined the specific evidence. Quotations from texts need to be relevant to the issue and the question. It is important to be precise about material evidence: coins or inscriptions should be given their contexts and description. Out of context evidence is often unhelpful. Where the candidate has no idea of the context, and knows only the quote, never having read the author to any extent, the interpretation suffers. General statements about sources do not help the judgments or the interpretations which are the foundation of clear arguments.

It is said every year but it is worth repeating: chronology matters. Good rather than partial analysis places an event correctly in the series of events. Accurate chronology can help the candidate to understand change within a period; it avoids glaring errors over dates and sequences. Candidates must also be reminded to stay within the period unless they can indicate events outside have a bearing on their analysis of the set period. Some responses tend towards lengthy narrative which helps in A01 but not A02, often where the extended detail is really not the issue.

Option 1

Question 2 was more popular than Questions 3 and 4 with Q.1 being the least popular. Candidates need to be aware that each question focuses on particular concepts e.g. Q2 'the validity of evidence', 'corruption' and 'all' or Q 3 'provincial command', 'essential' and 'success'. The majority of responses focused on the first half of the period even though questions routinely indicate that the whole of the period should be employed in some form. There was much 'according to Plutarch/ Sallust/Cicero' without identifying the precise reference, sometimes to disguise a lack of knowledge. The candidate presumably considered that Plutarch said something on these lines somewhere in his vast corpus. 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. Dio Cassius, Appian and Velleius were more noticeable

this year. Some candidates discuss individuals and events which, strictly speaking are outside of the period - notably the Gracchi and Marius' army reforms.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

Responses should provide specific factual knowledge and evidence of institutions: assemblies, senate, magistracies; detailed knowledge of the period with clear focus on the role/purpose and effectiveness. Responses should show coverage of the period but answers will use well-selected examples appropriate to the question. Responses should show detail of various institutions and accurate understanding of the roles including Assemblies, magistracies, the Senate and courts. Responses should develop an analysis of the roles of various institutions and their effectiveness during this period. Responses should address '**did not do what they were supposed to do'** as an issue. Responses should evaluate and interpret the relevant evidence. Responses might deal with, amongst others, the failure of institutions, challenges to them, inherent problems in the Republic and the role of individual politicians.

Knowledge of the nature of institutions and their roles was essential for the better responses. Many focused only on the Senate and its responses to various challenges. Better responses included the tribunate, other magistracies and the assemblies; even the courts were included. The best responses had a clear idea of what these institutions were meant to do and how they did or did not succeed. There were some very good discussions of the underlying problems of the Republic. There was much discussion of how the Senate dealt well with Catiline (eventually). Their failure to control the triumvirates or Clodius, and the over-powerful generals was evidence of the institution failing. Some went further to show that these institutions failed because of the deep-seated 'moral decline' (Sallust) of the Republic. Weaker responses showed a marked lack of knowledge of the workings of the republic, thinking, for example, that the assemblies were not acting correctly if they passed laws that the Senate did not like.

Question No.2 Responses should identify and provide factual information on politicians who did/did not use the various types of corruption; examples should be precise and detailed, and supported by detailed evidence. A variety of forms of corruption may be developed: bribery in elections or the courts, violence in various contexts, threats and manipulation, the use of patronage, military force and illegal actions. Responses should analyse the extent of corruption and the range of source-support for the statement. They should offer a balanced argument which includes interpretation and evaluation of the evidence.

This question really suffered from lack of range detracting from the synoptic nature. Factual knowledge of the dates of events and the order of events was weak even in some good responses. Better responses had a good range of corrupt practices and the evidence to support it. Some candidates noted that a "corrupt" politician is not always corrupt and equally an "honest" one not always honest. It was interesting to see candidates argue that politicians were corrupt because they had to be to succeed in Late Republican Rome. If you were not corrupt, you simply did not succeed. Cicero and Cato were clearly not corrupt, although some pointed out that executing without trial, for example, is not quite legal and may be corrupt even if it was to save the Republic. Equally, the extent of their success was sometimes developed. Pompey and Caesar were cited as never using corrupt means to gain power. Weaker responses generalised and failed to offer precise or accurate examples. Evidence tended to be snippets of Plutarch or Suetonius, sometimes taken out of context and so not clearly relevant. Most commonly quoted were Cicero (on Verres) and Sallust (moral decline). Few, however, went on to develop how far this evidence proved the issue in the question. Weaker responses seemed to argue that, if corrupt action was designed for the good of the state, that made it acceptable, and not really corrupt.

Question No.3

The focus of the responses should be on examples of provincial commands held by politicians and evidence of commands affecting the success/failure of the politicians. They should include major figures such as Pompey, Caesar, Crassus, Cicero, Cato, Clodius, Octavian, Antony and others. Responses may include 'pro-magisterial commands' not involving an 'area' e.g. Crassus' command against Spartacus, Pompey's corn command in 57 BC. Responses should include other factors in order to assess success e.g. political alliances, oratory, bribery etc. but a response should focus primarily on the issue of 'commands'. Responses should discuss **to what extent** and take into account the notion of '**essential**' in the discussion of the relationship between provincial commands and success. Responses should provide some analysis of the factors leading to success.

The main problem here concerned those candidates who provided a range of other factors while barely dealing with 'provincial commands' in any form. It was not a question phrased on the lines of 'How did politicians achieve success', a question which candidates clearly wanted to answer. Weaker responses simply did not read the question properly, saw "commands" and launched into a discussion of military power and civil war. The limited understanding of the term 'provincia' meant that candidates often made distinctions between various commands. Pompey's commands in the 60s were not seen as 'provincial commands' but military commands. It was argued that armies were needed for success but not provincial commands, as if somehow the army came as a separate package. Crassus' command against Spartacus was not a 'command' of any sort, so his success in the 60s/50s came without any command. It was stated his first such command was against Parthia. A good number did not understand about Caesar's initial 'province' before he acquired Gaul. Better responses not only had a clear idea of the concepts but also had a balanced argument dealing with other ways to success. These often included Cicero's reliance on oratory and patronage. Even here the extent of his success was rarely examined, with candidates assuming his consulship was sufficient. They failed to go on measure his success later against those who had provincial commands and resources that went with them. Candidates seemed unclear as to what constitutes a successful politician - Clodius, Cataline (sic) and Verres were offered, the last because he managed to plunder so much from his province. As in other questions, responses rarely did more than nod towards events post 50 BC.

Question No. 4 Responses needed include the evidence for a range of problems and action (or not) by politicians designed to deal with them. Responses should include specific information and evidence. Coverage of the period was needed for a full response. Problems which might be covered include: the control of the army, power of individuals, general corruption, exclusiveness of the optimates, land, debt and food issues, the nature of politics and the institutions. Responses should offer an argument concerning the sources in relation to the statement. Some balance might be expected in terms of the relative importance of particular problems. Responses should show some analysis of the problems and the extent to which politicians failed to deal with them.

Identifying the problems and the sources to support them was the main issue for candidates. A common argument was that the politicians themselves were the problem. Weaker responses got no further than this. Better ones offered the bribery and corruption of the politicians (as well as their build up of power), the malfunction of the courts, the tribunes, the land problem, plebs, grain, food shortage and pirates - not necessarily all of them. Better responses noted that there are repeated references across the decades to land problem and food shortages, implying a failure by the authorities. As in Q.1 responses tended to turn into an analysis of the failure by the Senate to meet the challenges of the period. Efforts were made to suggest that Sulla tried (and failed with the constant refrain that all his reforms were removed by 70 BC). Others suggested Caesar made some headway but most could not give chapter and verse (or sources) for what he did. Arguments were made that nothing was ever done about bribery because politicians were

too self-interested. These, and others, were valid approaches and some made good use of their knowledge. However, a number simply did not have a secure grasp of the facts and sources to produce a clear, well-argued response.

Option 2

Questions 6 and 7 were the most popular, 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. It is not the case that a good response needs to cover each emperor equally or every emperor; however, 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. The Flavians were given limited space in a number of responses to questions. Sources other than Tacitus and Suetonius are being used more widely, but we still appear have some candidates who have their own copy of Tacitus' sections on Gaius and the final days of Nero.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 5

Responses need to include information about the power of the different emperors with reference to evidence in support. The responses should have covered a range of emperors and their powers; this should also include levels of power and involvement of others in government e.g. family and supporters, or the Senate or the magistrates and prefectures. Analysis should address the issue in the quotation using specific examples from selected parts of the period and provide analysis of the sources for or against the view. Arguments should show some balance in the assessment of '**aim**' of the emperors to concentrate '**all power**' and how far it was '**throughout'** the period.

Better responses dealt clearly with the concepts in the question: 'aim', 'power' and the concept of 'concentrating in their own hands'. There were some which focused on the 'succession' as a way of concentrating power (in the imperial family at least). A number of responses turned this into a question on the working relations between emperors and Senate. Thus the responses discussed the powers of the Senate or the lack of them. This focused the responses on Gaius and Nero. Gaius humiliated the senators; Nero wanted to kill them all and replace them with equestrians. All responses started with Augustus and the better ones knew precisely what had occurred during the settlements and what powers he had acquired after 23 BC. Better responses developed the idea that emperors tended to start by claiming a desire to share power but then behaved differently as the reign progressed. Very good responses were aware of the specific powers emperors took upon themselves during the period. Those with a good range had material on the Flavians including knowledge of the lex de imperio. Domitian was the least well developed (or not mentioned at all).

Question No. 6 The focus of the responses should include detailed information on the imperial cult, with examples of worship of both living and dead family members and specific examples of evidence relating to worship in Rome. Responses should compare and contrast the approaches of emperors and develop an argument in terms of the change in the practice during the period. Analysis should address the issue of '**extent'** in terms of an increase in worship and differentiate between living and dead members of imperial families and offer a conclusion to the discussion. Responses should provided detail of some sources and include interpretation and evaluation in support of the argument.

As with Q5 the better responses set out some sort of understanding of the chronology of the period and focused on the issue of 'increase'. Better responses also were clear on the concept of 'worship'. Some candidates thought that being Pontifex Maximus meant the emperor was worshipped, and added a list of Augustus' priesthoods. Better responses dealt with the 'family'

and included the deification of wives, mothers and sisters where appropriate. They also made clear distinctions in worship between family members and the living and the dead. Good responses noted that temples may be built but it does not mean people worshipped, and that our sources for ordinary people are very limited. Many responses were far too generalised especially in relation to Domitian and Caligula. Suetonius was used regularly and evaluated on the lines that Suetonius had access to imperial archives and is therefore generally reliable. There were good analyses of the various imperial motives for promoting worship. Good use was made of evidence within the Empire, contrasted with the practice within the city. However, candidates need to be aware that lengthy descriptions of events in the Empire are not always relevant or helpful, especially when evidence from within the city is omitted or ignored. The actions of Gaius, Nero and Domitian were often attributed to the wrong emperor.

Question No. 7

Responses should provide examples of both art and architecture covering a range of emperors; candidates may choose any examples from the period. Responses should include some knowledge of the political context of the examples chosen. There should be a range of emperors discussed from the whole period. Evidence for the use of art and architecture as promotion of the emperor should be included and responses may include material evidence such as coins. Responses should address the issue of the purposes for which the art and architecture was designed, and develop analysis of the various factors in terms of the issue in the question. Responses should argue the extent of self-promotion and the various ways this was accomplished. There should be analysis of the issue of '**solely**' and a conclusion developed from the evidence relating to this.

The best responses provided a range of buildings and artwork from across the period, with specific details on these as opposed to simply listing them. When the question does not specifically mention the sources, it is still important to analyse and evaluate each source carefully. Naming of coins or buildings is partially relevant, but detail is needed for better responses, as well as some evaluation in terms of the concepts in the question. Art was not the 'arts' and did not include Nero's dramatic performances. Gaius' bridge of boats was not in Rome and not architecture as such, although it was a way of promoting himself for a couple of days. Naturally there was much on Augustus' buildings and statues - the Ara Pacis (or Parcis), the Augustan Forum, and aqueducts were the most common examples. However, precise details of these examples were often lacking, or even mistaken. The Ara Pacis does not show Augustus to be a god. For example, the range of statues in the Forum and Augustus' relation to them was present only in the better responses. Tiberius was simply not interested. Rarely did candidates consider the reasons for this might be sensible - Augustus had built so much, there was not the money, other matters were more important and he was not concerned about PR in the way Augustus needed to be. Vespasian also was often represented by the Colosseum alone. Domitian again got limited treatment - he liked to put his name on buildings. The best responses used a range of examples from emperors across the period (not all of them) with detailed support and analysis, developing a variety of motives.

Question No. 8

Responses should include sources for a variety of aspects of administration e.g. provision of amenities, law and order, safety and security, organisation of day-today activities, specific events, the magistrates and officials involved. Evidence is needed for the analysis of the effectiveness of the administration. This may include both literary and material evidence. Responses need not include all emperors from the period and may be limited in the range of administrative elements. Responses should address the issue of the **adequacy of the sources** in relation to the issue of effectiveness. There should be some discussion of the how effective aspects of the administration were in the city of Rome. Discussions may focus on some aspects of the administration in detail but not cover all aspects of the administration.

The better responses covered the administration clearly and with evidence for its various aspects. They dealt with the concept of 'effective' and what we can understand from the evidence. Better responses dealt explicitly with the accuracy of the claims made by the ancient sources regarding administration, and made clear and consistent judgements on 'how effective' imperial measures were based on careful evaluation of the sources. Several responses showed a misunderstanding of 'administration' and also failed to focus exclusively on 'the city of Rome'. Most responses dealt with a sufficient range: the food supply, water, security, provision of games and specific events, employment, transport around the city, and so on. Responses displayed less secure knowledge about the various officials and prefectures/curators who managed much of this for the emperor. Most responses focused on the activities of emperors and how they dealt with the various crises which struck the city: Tiberius' response to the Caelian Hill fire, Claudius' response to the shortage of grain, Nero's actions after the fire in AD 64. Juvenal was employed as evidence of a lack of effectiveness in the security of Rome and fire prevention. Much of the time it was assumed that the measures emperors took worked with little evidence to show for it. Weaker responses generalised - emperors built aqueducts (no names), made regulations for the design of buildings, provided a police force (the praetorians) and so on.

Option 3

Q.9 and Q12 were the most frequently attempted, presumably because candidates thought these gave a chance to narrate the Boudicca revolt. Material evidence is used widely but not always sensibly nor precisely. There must be some specific identification of evidence clearly integrated into the discussion and/or analysis. Many responses used material from the beginning and end of the period. Some candidates failed to provide a balanced and coherent response by focusing too heavily on Roman Britain. Candidates often did not deal with the full range of concepts and issues in a question: for example in Q.9, the issue of 'success' and what this meant to both emperors and provincials, the issue of 'imposing' and the concept of 'way of life'; in Q.12, 'good relations' in the view of emperors or provincials, the extent of 'achieving' good relations and the nature of the evidence. Better responses were fully aware of the limits and limitations of the evidence for much of the Empire and made good arguments about this. They were not afraid to state that we do not know in some cases.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 9

Responses should include a range of evidence covering some of the areas of Romanisation and extent of success. These include the role of the army, colonies, industry and the economy, citizenship, building and urbanisation, the role of leading citizens, the imperial cult and the spread of Latin. Evidence for success or lack of it should be included and evaluated. The issue of the limitations of evidence is important and should be addressed. Responses should analyse the means of Romanisation and provide judgments on the extent of Romanisation in the provinces. Thorough analysis should include a detailed interpretation and evaluation of the evidence exploring specific examples.

Responses to this question varied depending upon the extent of candidates' range of examples, covering the period and the Empire. The use of the sources was indicative of the candidate's secure grasp of the issues. Many narrated a general overview of Romanisation with few examples to support their assessment. Tacitus *Agricola* 21 was paraphrased extensively, but few could support it with any material evidence. Generic evaluation usually followed – that Tacitus was exaggerating to please his father-in-law. However, this did not prevent many from stating what Tacitus says as definite proof of success. Very few mentioned archaeological support - The St Albans' forum and the Chester water pipe. Even then the fact that the pipe is part of a Roman army camp was rarely mentioned. Better responses moved away from Roman Britain to discuss Gaul, Spain and parts of the eastern Empire. Here Pliny was used well with more appropriate material evidence from places such as Aphrodisias. Evidence of lack of

success involved recitals of revolts in Britain (again) and Judaea. Gaius' statue incident was popular if not always understood – it did not cause the revolt of AD 66. Details of various revolts were carefully assessed in the better responses, noting that mistreatment or high taxes were more often the cause than a dislike for the Roman way of life. Weaker responses equated the Roman way of life with Roman rule and it would have helped if they had defined what they understood by these terms.

Question No. 10

Responses should show factual knowledge of the ways emperors and others contributed to the stability/survival of the Empire. Responses should detail specific examples of emperors' actions, policies and interference in the running of the Empire. In addition there should be specific examples the role of those who served the emperors, covering governors, procurators, freedmen, army personnel, and local officials. There should be support from the sources, literary or material. Analysis and interpretation should focus on the role played by the emperors and those who served them in the stability of the Empire. Responses should offer a conclusion on the issue with a balanced argument relating to both emperors and others. This may include discussion of the differences between emperors and provinces

Better responses based their argument on specific examples and precise comparisons between emperors and other parts of the imperial administration. These linked the actions of the officials with the security, survival and/or success of the Empire. Pliny's *Letters* were commonly the main source material along with elements of Tacitus *Agricola* for governors, and partially for procurators and freedmen. Only the best responses had detailed and specific examples from these texts. The majority had a number of examples of the duties of governors, although selecting the appropriate ones from Pliny *Letters* proved a problem for some candidates: for example getting citizenship for a friend is not part of the role of a governor; it is patronage; ensuring loyalty to Trajan through oaths and festivals is more likely to contribute to the survival of the Empire. Better responses differentiated between Agricola and Pliny well but had less material on the former. Chapter 21 was cited as part of his role. Other groups included the army and local officials, although the evidence for these was often limited. Better responses knew inscriptions detailing the actions of local officials and used them well in order to show their contribution. Instances of imperial interference were mostly relevant and detailed: Tiberius' aid to Asian cities, Trajan's involvement in Bithynia's problems, Claudius' inclusion of Gauls in the Senate, Nero's freeing of Greece; on the other hand there was Gaius' statue in the temple and the treatment of Boudicca to show that neither emperor nor officials contributed to the survival of the Empire. Better responses identified specifically who did or did not contribute and how this precisely affected the Empire.

Question No.11 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.

Responses uniformly compared Trajan with Claudius on the grounds that both had invaded and extended the Empire; however, discussion of 'approaches' or 'policies' rather than actions was less well done. At the same time evidence for both actions and approaches varied from the general 'according to Dio/Suetonius' to the acceptable paraphrase of what Dio/Suetonius say. There was, as always, incorrect reference to Tacitus' account of the invasion of Britain in his *Annals* but very little use of the *Agricola*. As a result the efforts at expansion or defence under other emperors was ignored by a number of candidates, most notably the expansion in Britain under Claudius, Nero and the Flavians and the period of activity in the East under a number of

emperors most notably Nero. Most responses saw emperors' policies as different from Claudius' and Trajan's. Thus the Flavians were consolidators in Germany, ignoring the events in Britain and Dacia. Better responses had a clear knowledge from the sources of Trajan's campaigns and the motives for them, as well as how they contributed to defence. Better responses also made precise comparisons based upon the evidence, focusing on the 'approach' or aim rather than the actions. Weaker responses produced stereotyped assessments of Tiberius or Gaius as doing nothing and having no policy towards defence.

Question No. 12

Responses should provide a range of information might include examples of good and bad relations for a range of emperors. There should be a balance of information to answer the question. The evidence should be interpreted and evaluated as part of the comparison in order to develop an argument in terms of the question. There should be some assessment of the limitations of the evidence in certain areas. Responses may include difference between East and West, the evidence for the elites and ordinary people of the provinces, evidence for support for emperors in the provinces and the reactions by provincials to Roman rule. An analysis should include a discussion of the extent of good relations between emperors and provincials and an assessment of the issue '**only a few'** in the statement. There should be some conclusion on how '**fair**' a view this is.

Better responses provided a balance between the evidence for good and bad relations and assessed the relative success of emperors across the period. They employed a range of examples, going beyond the narrative of revolts in Britain, Gaul and Judaea (although few mentioned the later problems under Trajan). Weaker responses provided extended narratives of revolts which did little more than repeat what the sources have to say. Better responses were aware of the limited evidence for the views of provincials and very good responses could provide some of that limited material especially from inscriptions. There was appropriate evidence of the imperial cult from Gaul, Spain and the East, as well as the use of Pliny *Letters* to show his accounts of provincial attitudes towards emperors. There was some sensible evaluation of Roman accounts: Pliny, Tacitus' *Agricola,* Cassius Dio's version of the Boudicca revolt, Josephus on the Judaean revolt as well as parts of Suetonius on Gaius and Nero. Weaker responses tended to assume good or bad relations on the basis of the behaviour of the emperor so that 'mad' emperors had bad relations all through their reigns. Better responses noted that relations varied during reigns and that even 'good' emperors had incidents in which provincials were less than happy. It would seem unlikely that the Jews were totally content with the Flavians despite Vespasian's good relations elsewhere in places such as Spain. Weaker responses simply generalised from one example.

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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001