OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Classics: Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 H442**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H042**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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:

Candidates once again have shown a good grasp of the specification and there have been a full range of responses. In very many cases candidates were able to respond effectively to the questions set and demonstrate the extent of their knowledge effectively within the time allowed. The return to an open-plan answer booklet did allow a relatively small number of candidates to devote too much space (and time) to questions in Section A (particularly the (a) question), and so reduce the time available for the extended essay in Section B; those who included evaluation in (a) and (b) questions were also at risk of unbalancing their answers. Most candidates, however, had been effectively drilled in how to approach a paper of this sort, and so covered the questions at appropriate length. There were relatively few very poor answers.

The vast majority of candidates worked through Section A in order and then went on to Section B. There are a few who prefer to deal with the essay first (it is no longer easy to tell if this is a centre preference) and then move through Section A, sometimes in the order (c), (b), (a). In a very small number of cases this resulted in the omission or curtailment of (a). More importantly, the questions in Section A are designed to be answered in the order set, and any development from one question to the next is designed to work in that order. If candidates wish to adopt a different approach, they should make sure they understand the precise demands of the Section A questions. They must also observe the level of demand: the (a) question is focused solely on the passage; the (b) question is more demanding as it requires recall of material not on the paper (and the passage itself cannot form part of the answer); the (c) question is a mini-essay which needs to be kept within bounds. There are still candidates who get carried away under exam conditions and fail to organise their time correctly. Some candidates also need to concentrate on the actual question asked. There are also some candidates who still use the given passage(s) in question b). However, the vast majority are well-prepared for the demands of the paper and organise their time effectively.

Evaluation of sources continues to present some challenges. Some candidates failed to address this at all, while others provided a very general and unclear evaluation which did not closely relate to either the source or the question. There were some impressive uses of quotation to support answers, but short, sometimes single word, quotations with a source name appended often contribute little to an answer.

The answer booklet requires the candidate to show which questions they are addressing. This worked well in the majority of cases, but there were some candidates who did not make clear what they were doing, and a few who misdirected the examiner by putting the wrong question number against their answer. In most cases this was easy enough to deal with at the marking stage. A 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 some cases these candidates have been diverted to present their answers via a computer and this is helpful. Where candidates are likely to present problems on paper, they should be reminded of the importance of using black ink 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.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

Where candidates are using a word processor, it can be helpful 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 would also be 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 relatively few candidates who do not do what is expected of them. The (a) question demands selection from the set passage (or passages), and does not invite a general exploration of the topic of the question. There are still a few candidates who fall into a more extended discussion which cannot be rewarded. The (b) question requires a selection of relevant issues drawn from the sources studied: the questions are fully answerable from the sources listed in the specification, but credit is given for other sources where appropriate (a different inscription or a non-specified passage of Thucydides). There is no need for evaluation in the (b) question, though examiners will still reward it; but these questions are looking for interpretation of the material selected from memory, and it is pleasing to see that most candidates are very clear about how to address this question now. Some candidates spent far too long on the b) question leaving them short of time 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.

In Section B, the majority of candidates produce answers of reasonable length and depth, and cover the assessment objectives. It is worth restating that the bullet points are not designed as an essay plan, but should serve to remind candidates of what needs to be covered. One significant issue remains: the tendency of candidates to deal with the interpretation and evaluation of sources in rather a general way, separated from the material they have drawn on to support their essay. One of the characteristics of successful essays at this level is that the candidates integrate their discussion of the sources at relevant points in the essay, and they make what they say relate to their argument. Weaker responses still incorporate too many generalisations, often martialled together in splendid isolation at the end of the essay. 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 very clear what contribution such approaches make to answering the question, 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 the more popular of the two Section A questions. Most candidates made use of both passages in (a), though generally the Aristophanes passage proved more challenging, and candidates were not always able to identify relevant detail; relatively few discussed the significance of Cleon here. In (b) there were a range of different sources used, though other sections of the Old Oligarch proved popular and there was some use of Thucydides. Some candidates confused the issue of wealth with that of class and used Cleon as an example of a poor man. The issue of change over time was not always addressed in (c), and relatively few candidates made reference to the oligarchic coup of 411 BC (or the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War).

Question No. 2

This was generally answered effectively. In (a) the majority of candidates could draw from the passage the contrast between Pericles and his successors. Most candidates were able to use the example of Pericles in (b), though there were also discussions of Cleon and Thucydides, amongst others. Some also pointed out that military success was not the only means of winning popularity – such as Cleon's career before Pylos. Weaker responses rather lost sight of the change over time element in (c), though there were some outstanding responses which picked out relevant comparisons and drew interesting conclusions. The ones who did this well concentrated on the period required and raised many of the issues anticipated in the mark scheme (though awareness of the oligarchic revolution of 411 was fairly uncommon); some attempted to answer the question they wanted to do either on Pericles or, by basing their answer on the period before Pericles' death, avoiding the requirements of the question.

Question No. 3

This question proved overwhelmingly the more popular, though in some cases candidates focused on 'rhetoric' without relating public speaking to control over decisions of the democracy. The best answers drew on some good examples of assembly meetings, and were able to identify speakers and their impact; there were some good discussions of Cleon as a performer in the Mytilene and Pylos debates, though some candidates seemed unaware that Cleon's influence on the debate was subsequently overturned; many candidates were able to make much of the way Pericles is presented in the sources. The best responses were able to make effective use of the Old Oligarch and Aristophanes by backing them up with actual examples from Thucydides and Xenophon. The trial of the generals was well-known and candidates made reference to Theramenes, Callixenos and Euryptolemos manipulating the assembly. Weaker responses did not use specific examples but relied on making vague comments about decisions influenced.

Question No. 4

The examiners were surprised that this question proved so unpopular, as questions about institutions have usually allowed considerable scope for excellent responses. This may be because there are limited sources dealing with the role of the *boule* in the specification, though the topic is clearly central to an understanding of the way Athenian democracy worked. The best responses made good use of the Old Oligarch and the *Ath.Pol.*, and some candidates were also able to use the wording of decrees and Aristophanes' *Acharnians* to support their answers. There were also some weaker responses which largely ignored the role of the *boule.* Some candidates turned their response into a general essay on the elements of Athenian democracy with limited reference to specific decisions.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

Question No. 5

This was the less popular choice in Section A. Most of those who attempted this question were able to make good use of the passages in (a). Most candidates could draw on a range of examples from the period 478-446 BC in (b), though some discussions assumed that the Old Oligarch was directly relevant here, and some candidates trotted out lists of revolts from after the cut off without explanation (e.g. Samos, Mytilene). There were some excellent answers to (c), with good use made of the Methone decree; weaker responses tended to make vague comments about garrisons and cleruchies without specific examples.

Question No. 6

(a) was generally answered effectively: candidates were able to draw relevant details from the passage, though there were some misunderstandings and weaker responses were confused by the reference to Perdikkas. Candidates were generally able to come up with relevant examples for (b), but in some cases the examples chosen were not obviously benefits to the allies (sometimes even referring to benefits to Athens) – this was credited provided it was clear what was being argued. The majority of candidates were able to make further use of the passage in (c), and there were some interestingly different interpretations of specific examples (e.g. the Standards Decree). Very few candidates discussed whether the Athenians were 'reasonable' in their reactions to revolts, though some of the best responses did suggest they were. There was also a fairly common reference to Melos as a revolting ally and the unfairness of her treatment in this respect.

Question No. 7

It was perhaps not surprising that this essay proved significantly less popular than 8, though there were some excellent responses that drew on the details of inscriptions (both those in the specification and other examples). A few candidates were confused about what 'inscriptions' were, and not all were able to articulate what is valuable about them or what problems of interpretation they pose.

Question No. 8

This proved a very popular question. The majority of candidates were able to document effectively the means of control, but in some cases 'to what extent' was overlooked, so that there was little discussion o0f the effectiveness of Athenian control. Relatively few candidates were comfortable dealing with the later stages of the Athenian Empire, and it is important to ensure that those taking this topic are clear about what happens after the 420s BC. Very few candidates were able to comment on the use of garrisons, cleruchies or the various officers Athens sent out to the allied cities (with reference to *Birds*). Where cleruchies were mentioned, candidates did not always explain what they were.

Option 3: Politics and Society of Ancient Sparta

As in previous years, this was overwhelmingly the most popular topic. Some candidates really do need to be told that <u>nothing</u> which is in the film *300* should be relied on in any way as evidence.

Question No. 9

This proved significantly less popular than Question 10. Those who attempted this question were usually able in (a) to deal effectively with the relationship between Sparta and Athens, and, by implication, the other states who were involved. Some also discussed the relationship between Sparta and the Messenians, and most, but not all, picked up on the significant reference to Argos. (b) proved more challenging, though there were some interesting discussions of Athens, Corinth, Argos and, in some cases, Tegea. Some weaker responses focused instead upon Spartan attitudes to other states. There were some excellent responses to (c) where candidates focused on 'consistent policies' to good effect (and made use of the passage to do so), including references to consistency towards Messenia; this was given due credit. Weaker responses presented a narrative without focusing closely on the question set and missed the point about 'consistency' altogether simply citing examples of Sparta's policies towards other states. Good answers picked up on the fact that in the Persian wars Sparta and Athens were united but ended up fighting each other in the Peloponnesian war and Sparta fought Persia at the start of the century and then borrowed money off her at the end.

Question No. 10

This proved a very popular question. (a) was generally answered very well, with a good range of detail taken from the passage. There was some misinterpretation of 'no less than young men' taking it out of context and using it to show equality. There were also some excellent responses to (b). Responses here ranged effectively over marriage customs (though the detail was not always well understood), the importance of *syssitia* (though only the best responses saw the effect this might have on relationships with women), and wife sharing. However there were some unbalanced discussions of *Lysistrata* which appeared to treat the source as documentary evidence of life in Sparta rather than an Athenian comedy and a fantasy and treated the sex-strike as an actual event. Gorgo was also used as an example by many candidates, though there was scope for greater critical evaluation of her role as portrayed in the sources. The best responses were able to give specific examples, but weaker candidates all too often confused the names of individuals or gave an answer more appropriate to c) rather than focussing on relationships with men. The main problem was a failure to stay focused on the actual relationship between men and women whether it was happy, balanced, loving, functional etc. Too many candidates just produced a list of what the sources say about women rather than answer the question. There were more issues with candidates referencing the passage from a) in this answer. Some candidates discussed treatment or importance rather than relationship. There were some excellent responses to (c), though some of the confusions noted in (b) were repeated (e.g. the value of *Lysistrata*). Weaker candidates tended to use the same examples for b) with a different slant. Sometimes this worked, sometimes it didn't – such as Gorgo (not enough evaluation of the fact that she was from an unusual background) and Kyniska again. Better candidates concentrated on child-bearing, inculcation of Spartan values, land ownership and management; many commented on the negative view of Aristotle. Some tried to make an argument about the beauty of Spartan women as being an important contribution either based on the story of the 'ugly baby' or on comments made about Lampito.

Question No. 11

This question was significantly less popular than Question 12. Most responses identified the significance of the earthquake in the 460s and the importance of the helots in restricting the scope of Spartan foreign policy, but only stronger candidates were able to address the issue of Spartan numbers effectively. There were some interesting discussions of the use of helots in the army during the Peloponnesian War among the best responses, and not all candidates were aware that Sparta came out on top in that encounter. Not many seemed aware of the use of *perioikoi* or that things might have changed during the fifth century. Only a very few candidates referred to the 'Brasidiai'.

The constituent parts of the Spartan population such as the *perioikoi* were barely mentioned though helots were a great deal, or even achievements apart from Thermopylae and the Peloponnesian War. Few tackled the issue of lack of information, by valiantly making up numbers; however, there were a few responses which displayed an impressive knowledge of troops at the battles of Plataea and Mantinea. Some few thought that the Spartans only had 300 anyway and did very well considering. Very few picked up on the fact that the helots limited Spartan foreign policy and very few discussed what other factors might have limited Sparta.

Question No. 12

This proved a very popular question, and the majority of candidates were able to explain the office of *ephor* clearly, though some did not make the details very clear. A number confused the *ephors* with the *gerontes* in the *gerousia*, and not all were able to list what the *ephors* actually did. But the best responses were able to draw on the sources to good effect, and argue a case for their importance. Many candidates used the account in Thucydides of the debate in 432 BC where Sthenelaidas (variously spelt) effectively outmanoeuvred the Spartan king, Archidamus, though some candidates seemed to think that Sthenelaidas actually over-ruled Archidamus,

unaware that there was a vote and thought that the ephors decided whether or not Sparta went to war; the role of the ephors in the overseeing the *agoge* was less often mentioned. Several candidates seemed to think the ephors prevented Leonidas talking more men to Thermopylae, though there is no reference to this anywhere in Herodotus (candidates should not rely on the film *300*). Some of the very best candidates were aware that Herodotus says that it was the ephors who delayed the sending of the army to Plataea and then authorised it. Again, only the very best candidates were able to draw the conclusion that the influence of the ephors might have increased over time. The best answers looked at other elements of the government, assessing their role within the system (e.g. Diodorus on the debate about Athens with no ephors mentioned). The very best tackled the issues raised by inconsistencies between the sources.

F392 Roman History from Original Sources

General Comments:

There were very few rubric errors this year which should not come as a surprise as the specification is in its sixth year. The trend in recent years of some candidates to provide stock evaluation, in the form of one bolted on paragraph at the end of the answer, was much less common and on the whole Centres should be congratulated for getting the candidates to evaluate the specific evidence used in their answer, while avoiding generic sweeping statements on particular authors or types of evidence.

The standard of written English was generally quite good with few examples of illegibility. Exaggerate, Caesar, Catiline and the names of the British Tribes were the most common spelling errors. Very few candidates were penalised for the quality of their written communication.

In general, (a) questions were answered well, with good use of the passage/s. There were some answers which did not seem to know the context of the passages and others which elaborated on it too much, producing unnecessarily long answers which were not focused on the specific question.

Longer answers were mostly quite well structured into paragraphs with introduction and conclusion. (b) questions were often answered in the form of a number of paragraphs citing a particular source with discussion before moving on to the next source. As (b) questions are focused on what other sources tell us, this seems a good way of structuring an answer to the specific question.

Fewer candidates include essay plans every year, but once again, those candidates who did tended to produce far more coherent and analytical responses. A significant number of candidates decided to answer the essay question first, which is fine but candidates who answer parts c through to a in that order do not benefit from the intended structure of the question designed to make use of the printed passages in (a), their own sources in (b) and a wider theme being discussed in (c), making use of elements from (a) and (b). Such candidates tended to make little use of the passage in their part (c) answer and wrote relatively brief commentaries for part (a).

Timing in an examination of this sort is crucial. There are 100 marks available in 90 minutes and this should act as guidance. Some candidates wrote more for (a) than (b) or (c) and, on occasions, more for (c) than the essay. Although it would be crude to give an exact time for candidates to spend on each question, it is naïve to ignore totally the amount of marks available.

Most candidates were able to use the ancient sources to clearly support their line of argument. Misattributions were common with Plutarch, Cicero's letters and the Res Gestae. Some candidates were able to quote from the ancient sources verbatim, with others able to provide the exact reference also. Candidates must remember that they need to interpret any quotation or reference to gain maximum credit in AO2.

Happily, though, there were many candidates who wrote carefully considered responses which demonstrated an excellent understanding of the Roman world. By contrast, some offered pockets of analysis but ultimately failed to address the question set. It is important for candidates to read the question on the paper and not just rehash a standard Augustus and the Senate or causes of Boudicca's rebellion essay.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

Q2 and Q4 were answered far better than question 1 and question 3. In both commentary questions certain candidates frequently failed to provide a 'range' of reasons and instead relied on generic source evaluation rather than responding with an argument/discussion.

Question No. 1(a)

This question was answered well, on the whole. Everyone got that the jury was bribed; most that Hortensius made a mistake; less realised that Cicero opted out and the 'law' was not clearly understood. The passage was well mined by the majority of candidates.

Question No. 1(b)

It was surprising how many candidates failed to make use of any of the key trials of the rather limited period. Students frequently used the execution of Catiline and his conspirators as a trial when the whole significance of the case was that there was no trial; Sallust makes it quite clear the debate is not a trial as does Plutarch *Cicero* 19.

When done well, 'importance' was discussed in terms of gaining a reputation (Cicero – Pro Murena, In Verrem etc), establishing clients or those obligated; ruining opponents e.g. prosecution of Clodius; making a point as with Pro Sestio.

Question No. 1(c)

Methods discussed were bribery, violence and oratory- mostly well done with suitable examples as in (b) - spelling of oratory, rhetoric and bribery seems to be a problem for some. Discussion of Clodius' and Catiline's trials was popular, supported well with references to Letter 10 and Letter 3 and 4. Like (b), some candidates irrelevantly used the debate between Cato and Caesar to discuss methods.

Question No. 2(a)

Those candidates who answered this question seemed much more certain in their use of the passage than the corresponding candidates, with the passage in question 1. Overall, most candidates mined this passage fully, with many scoring full marks.

Question No. 2(b)

The vast majority of candidates could analyse the motives Cicero had in gaining the support of Pompey; the problems in this question were with answers which did not identify sources very well. Most candidates managed to discuss Letter 7 to Pompey in some form, although there was confusion with its context and the chronology. Letter 3 mention of Pompey was rare. Pro Murena was claimed to be in favour of Pompey because it praised military success, which gained some credit. There were also some references to Cicero's attempts to get support against Clodius in the Letters but this was not always well discussed.

Question No. 2(c)

The word 'actually' was not always noted. There was a lot of 'might have been of use' about the period before his election. His help with the recall from exile was generally noted although not supported by sources, perhaps because this section of Plutarch is not in the prescribed material. However, material on his attempts to get help before exile is clearly on the specification and was not well used. Some candidates argued that he was of no use to Cicero once in the triumvirate.

Question No. 3

Many candidates struggled to form an argument of occasions when rivalry between the Populares and Optimates was so obviously important and answers often became narrative in nature. Definition of the Optimates was generally quite sound while the definition of Populares was understandably more vague. Often candidates relied on Cicero's own definitions in Pro Sestio, which were taken at face value and not explored or analysed to any meaningful degree. Evaluation of sources was generic and often disconnected from the essay especially.

The best responses discussed the rivalry over Caesar's consulship, the triumvirate generally, and the debate over the conspirators. Various members of each group were discussed – namely, Catiline, Caesar, Clodius for populares; Bibulus and Cato for optimates; Cicero and Pompey were one or the other. Assessing the importance was less successful with assumptions rather than argument about the effects on politics.

Question No. 4

Knowledge of the cursus was limited in a lot of responses with few able to list the magistracies and the regulations about ages and years between. The tribune was often placed in the cursus.

Some responses only focused on the consulship.

Better responses focused on Pompey as an example of not following the cursus yet still being successful.   Caesar was often said not to have followed it (although he did) but became powerful. Clodius was often discussed as tribune, with some arguing he did use it, while others argued he did not. Cicero was generally known to have followed the normal route but because he was *novus homo,* he did not follow the cursus which only aristocrats could use.

Better responses saw a distinction between the use of the cursus simply to get ahead in politics and power which came from elsewhere. Responses were not readily supported with source material and evaluation was at times basic.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

Question No. 5(a)

Most candidates understood the meaning of the passage from Virgil's Aeneid and were able to cite relevant sections in support of their ideas. By contrast a significant number of candidates did not make maximum use the passage from Strabo and felt it simply showed that Augustus was a harsh man who imposed a high degree of taxation, with only a few candidates mentioning how the provincials must have regarded him as approachable/sympathetic, or at least, potentially so.

Question No. 5(b)

There was an impressive range of evidence deployed by candidates to explain how Augustus presented his image, a lot of it not specified sources e.g. Ara Pacis, his Forum and the Prima Porta and Via Labicana statues. The best responses were able to synthesise a range of both archaeological and literary evidence in support of their ideas. There was, in some cases, some relevant material from the poets but not always made clear that this was how Augustus wanted himself to be presented. Use of Suetonius/Tacitus was often irrelevant to the specific question.

Question No. 5(c)

The term 'age of gold' was generally interpreted sensibly as bringing back peace, providing food and games etc, maintaining stability, and even restoring the Republic.

There were many excellent arguments advanced on the degree to which Augustus brought back an 'age of gold' to Rome. Most candidates made use of part of the Virgil extract and at least one or two of their own examples in support of their argument. Tacitus was frequently cited as evidence against the claim and often compared with Velleius Paterculus's assessment of Augustus's reign.

Unfortunately, some candidates limited their answer to Augustus' building programme or his social reform, which cannot be considered a full assessment of the question. Defining precisely what they understand by a 'golden age' would have helped certain candidates to write a more balanced answer.

Question No. 6(a)

The passage was well understood by almost all candidates, apart from the reference to Tiberius going on campaign at the start. Very few failed to get the key parts about 'safe hands', 'beloved' and 'less laboured'. Responses to this question were often quite wordy with some candidates reproduced large parts of the passage without considering what it actually meant about the relationship between the two men - shorter, more considered use of the passage, would have helped here.

Question No. 6(b)

While most could name the members of the family it was less easy to give examples of them in posts 'ruling the Empire'. Marcellus as aedile, Gaius and Lucius as designate consul were common and Agrippa as co-tribune was mentioned; Tiberius and Drusus on campaign or holding office were less frequent. There were irrelevant references to Julia's marriage, and adultery. It became clear here that Augustus's family tree was known well but the actual roles adopted by his family seemed unclear to most.

Question No. 6(c)

A significant number of candidates misunderstood the meaning of 'keeping power within his family' and this resulted in slightly confused responses which focused solely on power outside of Augustus' family! Many candidates used answers from their part (b) answer but generally these responses were simply reinterpreted in the context of this question and with support from the Velleius passage.

It was quite common for candidates to supply a simple narrative on succession without dealing with methods used by Augustus to ensure that power was kept within the family and 'how successful' was often ignored by candidates. This was the least well answered question on the paper.

Question No. 7

This was the most popular essay question and led to many excellent and carefully considered answers. However, more often than not, the detail of Augustus's 'tight grip on government'; was omitted for a focus on conspiracies.

Detail of Suetonius *DA*19 was generally accurate, although the individual plots were not always developed. Lepidus in Velleius was common and Cinna from Seneca identified as the 'last' piece of opposition. Augustus' success in dealing with these (while not always explained) was used as evidence of his tight grip. The better responses examined Augustus's constitutional position and powerbase but even these occasionally showed confusion as to 'imperium maius' and the 'tribunicia potestas' (only the latter being mentioned in Res Gestae).

It is important for candidates to be encouraged to think about the precise wording of the question and not to simply jump in and regurgitate a set answer to a previous question.

Question No. 8

Better responses developed the relationship over time referring to his negative relationship during the 40s and how it changed once he became princeps. The Res Gestae was used as evidence (the privileges and honours given by the Senate) and contrasted with Tacitus' claim of being 'seduced' or servile', along with the evidence of Suetonius on the 40s.

Many used instances of his revisions of the roll of the senate and senators reactions to them quoting Velleius and/or Suetonius. Examples of opposition were also deployed to show a negative relationship, although placing them in a chronology exactly was a problem. Not everyone realised that Tacitus' comments in *Annals* 1.9 and 1.10 are framed as the opinions of people at the time. Most essays were narrow in time frame often not going beyond the 20s.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

Question No. 9(a)

Candidates needed to show overall familiarity with most of the sources to gain maximum marks. Few candidates could identify the Tacitus extract correctly and what it suggested about value. Tibullus' extract also was not well explained. The Cicero and two Horace passages were understood and used well but, the 'Caesar' mentioned was usually taken either to be Julius or Claudius rather than Augustus.

Question No. 9(b)

This question was on the whole, answered very well. Most candidates used Caesar and Claudius well and provided a good discussion using these two. Some included Gaius' aborted attempt. Most were aware of Claudius response to V(B)erica (in Dio, not Tacitus), and/or his need for a military triumph (Suetonius).

Caesar's reasons again were well documented using his own works (though not often specifically cited), but with some good background on the political situation contrasted with his stated reasons. These included the help given by the Britons to Gaul, support for Mandubracius as well as reasons inferred from his actions and the information in Strabo and Cicero.

Question No. 9(c)

As in (b) responses dealt successfully with a good selection of both emperors and generals without covering all of them. Caesar and Claudius were successfully discussed, with the addition of Vespasian, Agricola and Suetonius as generals. The printed extracts were usually used to support the argument.

Value often meant military prestige and some resources (Mendip lead pig for example). Supporting evidence was gained from Strabo, Cicero, and material evidence such as coins and material from Celtic sites.

Questions with such a large scope should be embraced by candidates and not feared. For marks in the highest levels, candidates should look to provide a range of examples from the sources to support their arguments and should not feel that they have to cover everything. Examiners met lots of different responses to this question, which gained maximum or near maximum marks for AO1.

Question No. 10(a)

The Suetonius passage was used well; from the Tacitus extract often only the reference to flat-bottomed boat and the speed of the victory were developed in any way. The Vindolanda extract was often only briefly referred to. There was usually a good understanding that the Suetonius extract did show that the Romans achieved a lot but that the number of towns and forts meant that it was not easy; also the Tacitus extract showed that special arrangements had to be made and, initially, it did not go that well.

Question No. 10(b)

Most responses had sufficient examples of 'short-term success', with the term being understood by the vast majority of candidates. These included Boudicca's successes against the legion sent against her and the towns destroyed (Dio and Tacitus); also discussed were the problems caused to Caesar's and Claudius' expeditions initially (Caesar and Dio). Some candidates made mention of Scapula's problems with the Iceni and Silures in Tacitus; occasional use was made of the hints in *Agricola* that Agricola did not always succeed. Weaker responses focused entirely on Boudicca or Caesar with not much more than a narrative of events.

Question No. 10(c)

Generally responses covered the topic well. Comparison was made between Roman armour and weaponry and Celtic lack of both to some extent. Further Roman technology (ballista bolts at Maiden Castle) and superior organisation (testudo) were given as reasons.

The Vindolanda letter was used in support as were Tacitus' flat-bottomed boats. Weaker responses again narrated a battle or a campaign with little evidence and discussion. Good use was made of the fact that the Britons were not united and so could not fight as cohesively as the Romans. The support for the Romans from Cogidubnus and Cartimandua was provided as examples, as well as the tribal differences but often there was a lack of support from the sources. Better responses also made the point that it was not always easy such as legions being waylaid during the 50s and Caesar's army being ambushed while foraging.

Question No. 11

There were detailed and full accounts of the incident which led to the rebellion, from both Cassius Dio and Tacitus (although a number confuse the information and seemed unaware who said what). Fewer were able to detail incidents before AD 60 which might have contributed to the resentment among the tribes. The earlier disarming of the tribes by Scapula was sometimes mentioned.

The various speeches of British leaders were used as evidence of discontent especially Boudicca's and Calgacus' (although the latter was somewhat later than AD 60). Some argued that mistreatment was isolated and not a reason given that most tribes did not join in and some actually welcomed the Romans – the client kings for example and *Agricola* 21 (though again somewhat later).

Question No. 12

The main issue was the amount of detail included in responses which was sufficient to argue the various possible purposes. Very general descriptions of the Walls provided little on which to base an argument. Better responses referred to the changes in Hadrian's Wall, the movement of forts, the addition of the vallum and specific examples of forts and mile castles. Some referred to forts north of the Wall and the communications network supporting it. The Antonine wall was very often left to a single brief paragraph at the end.

Although literary evidence is limited, few made any use of it. Better responses used the few coins available which suggested problems as also some material evidence such as tombstones of participants in events. Dividing the Brigantes, collection of customs dues, control of the area north and south were offered as alternatives usually with sound discussion.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

General Comments:

This year the standard of the scripts seen remained similar to that seen in previous years. Candidates were clearly aware of the demands of the examination, with the majority making good use of the sources to support their answers. However, there was a noticeable trend for candidates not to address the issues in the questions fully – sometimes tackling one area to the exclusion of another. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of reading the whole question, and addressing all areas rather than selectively choosing parts. There were more scripts this year where legibility was a significant issue.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1

Generally good candidates remained focused on the question throughout their answers but there were too many candidates who were trying to answer a question of their own devising - it sometimes seemed as though they were rewriting an essay they had already written. Candidates were often repeating sources, quotes and evaluation from their first essay in their second essay even if they did not fit in with their argument and answer. Candidates would really benefit by coming back to the key words and ideas in the question in each paragraph, explicitly. It is also disappointing that candidates confused dates and major battles – for example, talking about Artemisium when they meant Salamis. It is also disappointing that some candidates seemed to think that the film 300 was historically accurate.

The best answers followed the simple pattern of quoting from the sources, saying how this quote helps answer the question and then evaluating those quotes – those who followed this every paragraph generally produced stronger answers. Generalised or learned paragraphs of evaluation tacked on the end of an answer are not nearly so effective, because they do not then apply that evaluation to the argument.

Question 1

The best answers appreciated that Greek city states included those in Ionia, those on the islands, those in Thessaly and Macedonia as well as those further south. They then discussed Darius' different approach to those cities which medised and those that didn't. Very good candidates picked up on the introduction of democracies and reassessment of tribute and solving disputes through arbitration to be a sign of benevolent government by Darius. Very good answers also balanced the threats to Athens and Eretria as clearly stated in the sources with the fact that elsewhere there were clearly other pressures on Darius to expand the empire - the bedroom conversation with Atossa in Book III was especially useful. The Scythian expedition of 513/12 and a discussion of why the invasion of 492 went via Thessaly and Macedonia but the 490 invasion took Naxos and then island hopped to Eretria and then was heading to Athens were also good and valid points. The treatment of the envoys in 491 by Sparta and Athens was also good evidence to suggest those cities might have been more in the firing line. Candidates generally were not very strong on evaluating Herodotus, especially his focus on building up Darius for a massive fall and lots of candidates mentioned the Behistun inscription but were not very effective in their evaluation of what it revealed about Persian kingship and the threat it might have posed to all states. Too many candidates wasted time on giving a narrative account of the Ionian revolt, often in great detail but in a way which was not answering the question or strengthening their argument.

Question 2

This question was done the least well by candidates largely because they struggled to deal with both bias and whether that gave a balanced account - too many just wrote about Herodotus being biased and did not really distinguish between bias towards the Greeks/ against the Persians and bias against other Greek states. Lots of answers fell down because their analysis of the sources stopped at 'and this is biased' rather than discussing why something might be biased and then unbalanced. Quite a few candidates tried to turn the question into one about Herodotus' focus on individuals but did not discuss whether this was biased and imbalanced or actually correct considering the political systems in place at the time. Lots of candidates wasted time in long discussions about Herodotus' birth and life and why he was actually a very useful source. Good answers appreciated that Herodotus is actually very inconsistent in his portrayal of the Greeks and Persians depending on the slant of the story he is telling. Good answers used Herodotus' opening statements about why he is writing his histories as a starting point - though it was a shame when they misquoted it.

Question 3

The best answers appreciated that the Greeks' view of themselves in relation to the Persian changed over time, the very best answers examining the evidence for the way in which the Delian League took the fight to the Persians right down to 449. Good answers also looked at states who medised and those who did not as evidence of a feeling of superiority or not. Again lots of candidates did quote relevantly from the sources but their analysis of whether this showed superiority or not was very simplistic or not there (eg why did Herodotus' description of the battle of Thermopylae indicate that he thought the Greeks were superior to the Persians?) Some candidates decided to write about the Persians seeing themselves as superior to the Greeks and other candidates went wrong because they did not start with what the sources said and some had trouble interpreting how to extract the Greeks view of themselves from the sources.

Question 4

The best answers interpreted the sources to draw out reasons for opposition or not (ie Ionians did not because they had got democracies from Darius and therefore judged it was in their best interests to fight with him). They also looked at geographical factors, previous events eg throwing Persian envoys in a well and the political systems in individual city states eg democracy in Athens. Good answers used the example of Aegina who initially medised but then led the charge at Salamis. Very few answers stated the obvious that each city state was trying to work out what was in their best interests and whether they had any chance of resisting the Persians. Good answers pointed out that the treatment of Miletus, Naxos and Eretria made it very clear what the price of resistance would be. Analysis of Argos' neutrality and Corcyra's sitting on the fence were effective in proving this point as was analysis of how the relationships between city states might have affected their decision over whether to resist or not.

Option 2

General

Some very impressive responses were seen to all questions on this option, with most candidates clearly having some sense of the period as a whole, and a framework within which to place the events which they were considering. Almost all candidates made reference to the sources, and those who did not were few and far between. Candidates should, however, be reminded that effective use of the sources also requires that they are evaluated, and that this evaluation is used to support the conclusions for which the candidate is arguing. There is generally a very good knowledge of the work of Thucydides, who is cited accurately by most candidates – although some candidates seemed to have confused Thucydides with Xenophon, and think that

he lived in Sparta for a time. There was, however, a notable lack of inscriptional evidence from many candidates, even though this would have been particularly useful for some arguments. A lot of candidates referenced Thasos, Naxos, helot revolt in Qs 5 & 6 which are all pre 460 and many made little attempt to makes these directly relevant. There were also other pre 460 references across the questions which seemed to be inserted for no obvious reason eg Anaxandrides of Sparta, Cleomenes of Sparta, Cleisthenes of Athens, Solon's reforms in Athens, the Persian Wars, Hetoimaridas debate. This is a strange issue – there is so much in the period that is relevant – why do candidates stray out of period so often?

Candidates would benefit from having a better sense of chronology. For example they would not then believe that Pericles' death was pretty much followed immediately by the Sicilian Expedition – or alternatively would not suggest that Thucydides is reliable on the helot revolt because he was 'around in Athens at that time'

For all the questions, some weaker candidates completely ignored the question focus and simply offloaded information and knowledge with no sense of what was relevant and no real effort to make sensible links to the question. Use of slang seemed evident at times eg 'kicked out', 'the Spartan navy was nothing to write home about'.

Question 5

Many responses did not distinguish adequately (or at all) between political and military conflict. The weaker responses tended to describe aspects of military conflict without linking these descriptions to the focus of the question, and a considerable number of answers were descriptive without much sense of chronology. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of looking closely at the focus of the question, and ensuring that the information and sources which they include in their answers are relevant to the question. There was a marked tendency for candidates to write about how the states were weakened rather than to what extent – some of these responses really dealt brilliantly well with the material, but could not be awarded the highest marks because they didn't engage with 'to what extent'.

Question 6

This question called for candidates to have a clear understanding of the relationship between both Athens and Sparta and their respective allies, and use this to look at how both states used their allies to maintain their power. There was some confusion about the basic facts and chronology required for this question. Some candidates wrote that Thucydides wrote about the transfer of the Delian League treasury. A significant minority of candidates wrote about Persian aid to Sparta at the end of the war, but failed to recognise Persia was Sparta's ally in this situation. Conversely, a number of candidates believed that Melos was an ally and detailed the Melian Dialogue. It was possible to make this incident relevant to the question focus, but it didn't happen in many cases. Also a number of candidates wrote about the Northern campaign and perceived helots and mercenaries to be Spartan allies. There is an awareness of the need to tie comments to the question, but not all candidates were very successful at doing this with this question – there were some rather strange conclusions drawn.

Question 7

This question proved to be the least popular in this section. Many candidates saw this as an opportunity to write either about the causes of conflict or about individuals whilst not really engaging with the focus of the question. Candidates really struggled to engage all elements of this question – most left out at least one strand in their answers. The very best answers were able to address 'for so long'.

Question 8

Whilst the wording of this question included ideas and phrases which are used directly in the specification, not all candidates seemed to understand what ideologies are. In places there was confusion between democracy and oligarchy. On the other hand, many candidates were aware of the Aristotle reference to oligarchy and democracy, and used this sensibly as a starting point for their answers. Some candidates understood the causes of conflict very well, but did not really understand what ideology required them to look at – all sorts of interpretations of it were offered up eg differing views of Lamachus, Alcibiades and Nicias on how to tackle Sicily; Brasidas = oligarch vs Cleon = democrat. All too often candidates saw this question as an opportunity to talk in general terms about the causes of conflict, and chose to dismiss political ideologies quickly, before moving on to other causes, which were clearly more familiar to them. There was also a noticeable trend for candidates to treat this essay as an opportunity to talk about the causes of the Peloponnesian War, rather than considering other conflicts. This question, though, also solicited some outstanding answers, which engaged effectively with the connections between political ideologies and conflict.

Option 3 – General

This option proved popular with candidates, with a good spread of responses across the different questions. A general weakness of responses in this option was that they did not focus clearly on the background issues, and tended to look solely at one aspect of the question (for example, Socrates rather than Socrates in relation to the Sophists). Candidates would be well advised on all these questions to plan their answers thoroughly, and ensure that they have addressed all aspects of the topics under discussion clearly.

Question 9

This question was well answered by some candidates, who showed an excellent knowledge of a range of sanctuaries from throughout Attica and a good understanding of the role of religion on the lives of Attica's population. However, there were many candidates who chose to focus exclusively on the Acropolis and the temples on it, and often seemed to ignore the element of the importance of religion in people's lives, preferring instead to write about the temples on the Acropolis. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of looking at the range of the question, and considering both elements. They should also be reminded of the attention to detail and care needed when using archaeological sources. There was very little discussion of the sanctuaries as entities, rather than just the individual temples contained within them.

Question 10

Many candidates approached this question by simply writing all that they knew about Socrates, with varying degrees of success. Of these candidates, some showed good knowledge of the key sources: Aristophanes, Xenophon and Plato, although the evaluation of these authors as sources about Socrates' life and teachings were not always pertinent to the arguments which were being advanced. The best answers brought in other sophists, and gave some details about what they taught and the sources upon which our knowledge of their teaching is dependent. Some managed to contrast effectively Socrates' teaching methods (in particular the *elenchus*) with the teaching of rhetoric undertaken by the sophists, and make effective points about the differences between sophists such as Gorgias and Socrates. Plato's *Apology* featured heavily in many answers, with his description of the visit of Chaerophon to the oracle at Delphi forming a centre-piece in a number of arguments. In general, though, candidates needed to take greater care to ensure that they did not just write a Socrates essay, but addressed the key issue of the differences between Socrates and the other sophists.

Question 11

This question was well answered by some, but too many responses suffered from a lack of planning. Candidates would be well advised with a question like this to step back and consider what the different sections of society were, and how each could (or could not) play an active role in Athenian society. Beyond this, the best candidates also considered what was meant by an active role, with some very impressive treatments of the roles played by women in the raising of the future generations, and the significance of both metics and slaves within the society. The range of evidence cited by some candidates was impressive, with effective use of Aristophanes, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato and Lysias, as well as tragedies by Euripides and Sophocles. Some candidates gave full treatments of both Medea and Antigone, but failed to evaluate these effectively to support their arguments.

Question 12

This question led to a wide-range of different responses, with many candidates simply choosing to tell the story or key elements of plays. The main weaknesses in the responses were caused by candidates failing to consider what might be meant by the issues of the day. All too many answers tended to outline what happened in a play, and then add on a tag line about women or the development of the Peloponnesian War. Candidates would be well advised with a question like this to think carefully about what the issues are, and then look for plays which might be encouraging the audiences to think about them. Very few candidates addressed the issue of whether we can in fact know what the intentions of the playwrights were. The range of material used by candidates was strong, with some effective use of Aristophanes, Sophocles and Euripides. A number of candidates addressed the question of Aristophanes' presentation of the sophists in the *Clouds*, but very few then looked beyond the play to see whether or not this was a real issue in Athenian society at the time. A similar picture emerged in the treatment of women in the various tragedies that candidates chose. However, some candidates made excellent use of political references in Aristophanes and also Euripides' *Trojan Women*.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

General Comments:

The Examiners were again pleased with candidates' knowledge, facility with the source material and approach to writing a structured and organised response to the specific question. There was clear evidence that candidates had gained a great deal from their study, largely due to the enthusiastic and committed teaching they have received.

There was a noticeable improvement in the approach to evaluation where candidates made efforts to relate it to the specific material used in the response. There was less use of the generic evaluation on the lines of 'how could X know since he was not alive at the time' or 'X is inclined to exaggerate'. More candidates were specific about what they meant by exaggeration and where it applied. Bias remains a difficult term for some. However, there was also a marked tendency to be precise in the use of sources (although mis-attribution remains an issue). There are still those who place a lengthy and generalised evaluation at the start or end of the answer which had no obvious connection to the argument, and sometimes naming an author not used in the response. Some quoted quite a number of references but do not develop their relevance and importance for the issue. A number referred to the sources Suetonius or Tacitus might have used without giving a clear idea of what these might be. Archaeological sources were considered unbiased without explaining why this might be the case.

Chronology remains an issue especially in Option 1 for some reason. Confusion arose over the career of Caesar, placing his time in Gaul before his consulship, for example. Candidates are able to get the emperors in the right order even if the events in a particular reign can get muddled. Some, thankfully not many, confuse Gaius with Nero or Domitian. There is some tendency to stray outside the period; reference (and some lengthy discussions at times) were made to Marius and the Gracchi in Option 1 and Hadrian or beyond in Option 3.

Candidates largely had a good understanding of the contexts of the material and the concepts or issues in the questions. This is very important when quoting from a text or using an inscription. Out of context quotes can lead to mis-interpretation and analysis can suffer. This is especially true when evaluating the material. It is apparent in responses where the candidates has no idea of the context, and knows only the quote, never having read the author to any extent.

There was clear evidence of excellent knowledge of the periods and the material which was deployed in a controlled manner. Candidates produced well-organised responses which developed towards coherent conclusions, with fewer responses simply saying all they knew about a topic with no real focus.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1

Question No. 1 The question asked candidates to consider how far **all** politicians were motivated solely by personal ambition. Responses needed to provide specific examples of the actions of politicians supported by evidence and an analysis of the motives behind them. There needed to be a good range from across the period and detail both in the knowledge and the sources. As far as possible the analysis needed to include an interpretation of the extent to which the evidence provided understanding of the motives, along with an evaluation of the source material. Responses should have addressed the 'all' and 'solely' specifically in their focus.

This was a popular question. A variety of politicians were available to candidates and not all needed to be discussed. There was also a wide range of sources which could be used. The majority of the responses covered the 50 year period reasonably well, although a number seemed to feel that politics ended around either 59 BC or 49 BC. There were some who dwelt on Marius and the Gracchi. There was naturally a focus on Pompey and Caesar, with some intelligent use of Octavian. They were largely assessed as motivated by personal desires although better answers provided a more developed analysis. Pompey, for example, was seen as an opportunist, not necessarily motivated simply by ambition to be the most powerful man in Rome. Cato and Cicero were used as balance, as example of politicians motivated in other ways. While better responses provided analysis which suggested any action might have number of motives, for example Caesar's invasion of Italy – his stated intention to defend the tribunes or his 'dignitas', Suetonius' selection of reasons given in section 30 of his biography – others did not developed analysis beyond the obvious. Cato was entirely motivated by a desire to defend the Republic (undefined) and Cicero equally so. Crassus was motivated either by wealth or jealousy of Pompey, Catiline by a desire to be dictator. A wide range of sources was employed, usually appropriately. Some simply attached the phrase 'according to Plutarch' to their narrative without any explanation of which 'Life' or section. Better responses were precise especially in the use of Sallust's assessment of the period and Cicero's letters.

Question No. 2 required candidates to examine how far the sources supported the view that politicians needed the support of all parts of society for success. Responses needed to focus on the source material and provide a conclusion on this issue for a successful answer. Analysis of the extent to which support from all parts of society was necessary was also needed but within the context of the evidence. There was a range of material candidates could chose from for their response and a range of politicians such as Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Clodius, Cicero, Cato, Octavian, Antony, Crassus, Catiline etc. Responses needed to be precise about the evidence from a variety of authors- Cicero, Caesar, Octavian. Sallust, and later writers such as Plutarch, Suetonius and Cassius Dio. Responses need a good range of relevant evidence about support for politicians, sound analysis of the sources and a well- structured answer leading to a coherent conclusion.

Responses to this question were often of a high standard with a wide range of evidence soundly and at times thoroughly developed. Better answers focused clearly on what the sources had to say about support, whether by the army, the plebs (or groups of them), the Senate or other individuals. Support was considered also through the use of wealth, such as that provided to Caesar by Crassus, or amicitiae, such as the triumvirate, or even Caesar's support for Clodius. Better responses also identified that support changed during a career and was not always from one section of society. Some used Pompey as an example of this very successfully. Equally it was said that Pompey never had the support of the Senate, but only the plebs; that Cicero never had the support of the plebs; that Clodius was successful with only the support of the collegia, Octavian only with the army. Generally these statements were made without much support from the evidence. Responses, built upon the evidence, were more successful than narratives of careers. Despite the clear requirement to assess the sources, this was completely ignored by a few and was rarely mentioned by others.

Question No. 3 This question asked the extent to which economic problems were the cause of the fall of the Republic. Responses needed to identify and analyse some of the economic problems such as the effects of wealth as described by Sallust and Plutarch, the agricultural problems in Italy, the need for land for veterans, unemployment, debt (as shown in Catiline's conspiracy), urban/rural divide, the effects of wars and pirates on trade, the food supply etc, the equestrians and their demands as well as the money supply and interest rates. The analysis needed to focus on how these may or may not have led to the fall of the Republic. Other factors may well be used to develop the 'extent' aspect of the question.

Responses generally had a good understanding of the issues of land and food supply; there was tendency to discuss the displacement of the rural poor in terms of the 2nd century BC. The question of land for veterans and the problems that caused, for example Pompey and Octavian, produced some good discussion of the way it led to issues which affected the Republic and stability. There was some mention of the debt issue and a few were aware of Sallust's analysis of the effects of wealth. Occasionally unemployment and the inequality of wealth were alluded to. Some responses had detailed material on the pirate issue in the 60s. Others noted Caesar's efforts to reform some economic issues in his dictatorship. There some good responses arguing that they had little impact on the Republic's fall which was due more to political use of economic issues for their own advantage, for example Pompey's manipulation of the pirate issue and the corn supply in the 50s. However, these responses needed to have a clear focus on the economy as well as other factors. There was little use of the period after Caesar's death despite there being real issues for Octavian and Antony.

Question No. 4 required an analysis of how far the evidence enables us to assess the causes of military conflicts. Candidates were at liberty to choose any conflicts they wished, and need not cover all of them for a successful answer given the range of conflicts available. They could focus on civil wars or wars which were part of provincial commands, such as Caesar's war in Gaul, Antony's in Parthia , Crassus' in Syria or any of Pompey's wars from Africa to Spain to Asia, all of which could be said to have their roots in the politics in Rome. The focus, however, needed to be on the value of the evidence and the extent it allows us to assess their causes, not on a narrative of these wars. Successful responses needed to have an argument which led to a coherent conclusion on the nature of the evidence in relation to causes.

Most responses focused on Pompey and Caesar with some casting a wider net with Catiline, Octavian and Antony, or even Sulla. Some narrated Pompey's various wars at length to the exclusion of the causes for them (and the evidence for these causes). The evidence for Catiline was often well done with specific use of both Cicero and Sallust (and Plutarch in the knowledgeable responses). Catiline's speech was used well and evaluated strongly. Equally better responses discussed the cause of the war in 49 BC with a variety of sources from Caesar and Cicero to Plutarch, Suetonius and Dio, and developed analysis of the differing accounts with some intelligence and understanding. Octavian and Antony against Brutus and Cassius was quite well developed using Res Gestae as a foil to more objective evidence. Vaguer, less focused responses fixed on one cause in a general manner as the only reason, for example Spartacus because gladiators were mistreated, or Catiline because he wanted a consulship. Some attempted to include the violence of gangs in Rome as somehow relevant to 'wars'. Evaluation of the evidence was often detailed but occasionally did no more than repeat the source with a comment on when the author was writing.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

Option 2

Question No. 5 asked candidates to assess the extent to which the evidence would support the view that the principate brought about the end of the Senate as an effective force in government at Rome. Responses needed to develop the evidence for the issue as well as a sound understanding of the roles/duties the Senate had in government (for example in legislation, judicial matters and administration). This needed to be supported by appropriate specific examples covering a range of emperors over the period. There needed to be a focus on how far the evidence supported the view in analysis and argument. The argument could also develop the ways in which the roles changed with successive emperors and how far this affected the effectiveness of the Senate in dealing with issues at Rome.

Weaker responses did not have appropriate material concerning the roles and duties of the Senate and how they were involved in government; rather the responses developed the idea of the respective power of the princeps and the Senate. While relevant in some respects, weaker responses simply argued that the Senate lost all power and therefore did very little, while in reality the princeps could hardly have managed without considerable input from senators. Evidence often consisted of references to emperors being cruel to senators (Gaius making them run along with his chariot, Domitian murdered 'many' or Nero instituting 'terror') or being kind (Augustus gave money to impoverished ones). A few suggested that the Senate's effectiveness lay in organising assassinations. Better answers developed the evidence in a more balanced manner with specific examples of senatorial involvement, noting Tiberius' increased use of the Senate, and even Nero's wish at the start to involve the senators, supported by Tacitus or Suetonius or Cassius Dio. Analysis of the evidence was at times limited to generic statements about the pro-republican stance of Tacitus or Suetonius' use of gossip. Not everything in Tacitus is unreliable because he has a view about Tiberius or Nero that they were 'bad' emperors.

Question No. 6 concerned how far the emperors failed to maintain good relations with the ordinary people of Rome. Responses needed to develop an argument based upon evidence for the nature of the relations between the emperors and the ordinary people of Rome. Evidence for how emperors went about trying to maintain good relations was needed, and how far these efforts succeeded. A variety of areas could be covered such as the food supply, games, amenities (baths, water supply, roads etc), security, employment on projects and administration of Rome. Responses could develop how these affected the people and how the people responded with appropriate evidence. The evidence of the sources needed to clearly identified, especially where it represented the views of the upper class authors.

Responses were naturally focused on 'bread and circuses' (Juvenal) with many providing specific examples from Augustus to Domitian; there were detailed references to a variety of authors and archaeological evidence (Augustus' Forum, Coliseum, Theatre of Marcellus, Gaius' circus, coins celebrating events and achievements etc). Responses also developed specific examples of emperors responding to problems such as Claudius' responses to a lack of grain, or Augustus' response to famine and riots as a result. Some responses did not keep to the 'ordinary people' aspect and discussed the Senate's relations with emperors. Better responses made an argument based upon the responses of the people and the attitude taken to emperors as shown in the evidence. At times, it was simply assumed that if emperors put on games (or

did not in the case of Tiberius), this naturally led to popularity or unpopularity-the people liked them so there were good relations. So it was assumed also that if an emperor was 'bad' he was disliked. Gaius, Nero (whose games were popular according to Tacitus) and Domitian were taken to be unpopular, Augustus and Vespasian well-liked, without much evidence produced to support the claims. Better responses referred to such events as Augustus' return to Rome and the reaction to his presence, the demand for a dictatorship, the receiving of titles such as Pater Patriae as evidence of success or the time the people became anxious when rumour spread of Claudius' death. Equally responses noted the differences with the start and end of a reign, and the inconsistencies between sources. As always more convincing arguments rested on specific examples rather than generalisations. Some claimed the plebs disapproved of Nero's and Gaius' actions without evaluating the evidence as views of our sources rather than the views of the ordinary people. For example, in the case of maiestas generally the rich were targeted, so ordinary people would not have been affected.

Question No. 7 asked candidates to consider how effectively emperors dealt with the opposition from senators and equestrians. Responses needed to provide a reasonable balance between the two groups in the use of information. Arguments could develop along the lines of emperors dealing with specific examples of opposition whether by individuals or groups. Alternatively responses could approach this by looking at the preventive measures rather than reactions. The focus needed to be on 'effective' rather than on simply the actions emperors took, and could look at how their actions even created opposition, as well as stopping it.

Responses generally had a range of emperors and instances of opposition, whether actual plots or simply resistance to an emperor's policy (such as August' marriage laws, or Nero's acting). Suetonius *Divine Augustus* 19 was usually in evidence, although sometimes it was claimed he gave more information than he does. Seneca's story of Cinna was used as the last example of opposition to Augustus in 16 BC. The various plots were detailed in better responses – Lepidus, Caepio and Murena, Piso's plot against Nero, Chaerea and Gaius were popular. There were some who claimed that Senators killed Domitian and/or Nero or that Vespasian had no opposition. The opposition within the imperial household was introduced with some detailed material, although it was difficult to relate it the question. Good use of material was seen in responses which looked at how emperors sought to prevent opposition through generous measures or developing good relations with the two groups, dealing with discontent before it got out of hand. Augustus' treatment of Cinna was used well, as was Vespasian approach to Priscus. A few were mislead by Tacitus' claim that Augustus had no opposition and that Tiberius was opposed by all. Some failed to realise Sejanus was an equestrian, despite his role as Praetorian Prefect. In general little reference was made to equestrians by even better responses with the Senate treated as a unified body by some. Effectiveness often came down to whether they survived assassination or not.

Question No. 8 considered the extent to which sources provide reliable portrayals of emperors. Responses need to offer detailed and specific examples of the source material, whether literary or material on which to base their assessment. Not all emperors were needed, nor a complete range of sources for a full response. The focus needed to be on the 'reliability' of the portrayals using specific examples, with accurate details. They might consider the agendas and backgrounds of the authors chosen as long as it related to the issue.
A wide range of evidence was provided by the responses in various forms from the statues of Augustus and his coins to the portrayals of the Flavians in both literature and art. Generally, Tacitus and Suetonius were the most popular with Cassius Dio and the *Res Gestae* close behind. Some used Velleius Paterculus, Josephus, Philo and Pliny the Elder. Good use was made of the Augustan poets and Juvenal, with appropriate evaluation of their worth. It was often stated that the *Res Gestae* was propaganda, without explaining what that meant in 14 AD.   There were some responses which offered generalised summaries of the authors on emperors with generic evaluation along the lines of Suetonius used gossip and so cannot be trusted, or Tacitus was not present at a speech in the Senate so how could he know. Better responses distinguished between a recording of an event that clearly happened such as Gaius' death or Augustus' return from Actium which is clearly reliable, and the interpretation placed on the event by the author. It is difficult to argue that Augustus is unreliable on the amount and number of handouts he gave, while one can suggest he is not being totally honest about his raising of an army.

Option 3

Question No. 9 required candidates to examine the extent to which Roman rule greatly impacted on the provincial economies. Responses need to detail the areas of economic activity with the Empire. This could cover a range including development of specific industries such as pottery, the grain supply, urbanisation (and the consequent constructions and employment), the growth of opportunities for trade, increase in the circulation of coinage through the army, specific imperial policies and financial aid (e.g.Tiberius' aid to Asia) and the demands made on the provinces by Rome such as taxes. Responses needed supporting evidence for these aspects. Analysis should develop the 'impact' both positive and negative as well as some appreciation of the scope of the evidence.

Most responses had a range of aspects, generally focusing upon the effect of taxes, the presence of the army, the opportunities for trade (with the expansion of roads) and examples of imperial involvement in the provinces. Much use was made of the *Letters* of Pliny and his frequent mention of building projects. However, this was not always linked to 'economic impact' in a specific manner, in terms of Roman involvement. Tacitus' Agricola 21 was also used to suggest that Romanisation affected the economic activity of Britain. This was also extended to other areas of the Empire such as Gaul and Spain. At the same time some responses developed the issue of governor corruption which impacted negatively on the provinces with examples from Bithynia, Britain and Judaea, although the extent of its impact on the economy was not always made clear. Very good use was made of archaeological evidence in inscriptions which detailed individual and group activity in the economy- a common example was that of Barates. The evaluation of this was usually competent, stressing the limited information provided and that usually it did not provide information of the general population. Responses used the evidence of shipwrecks and amphorae, although not always critically. Good points were made regarding the distinction between elites and the less wealthy provincials.

Examples of urbanisation/cannabae (including the setting up of colonies) were fairly common ranging from Britain (Colchester) to Cologne and Dacia. How these affected the local economies was sometimes generalised into the demand for goods and the spread of coinage. Most made some assessment of the ways in which the Eastern provinces differed from the Western provinces usually in terms of 'civilised' and 'uncivilised'.

Question No. 10 asked candidates to examine the extent to which emperors relied upon groups and individuals other than senators for the administration of the Empire. Responses needed specific examples and sources which detailed the roles of procurators, equestrians, governors, freedmen, soldiers, client kings and local provincials in administration. Responses could develop in detail the use of local magistrates using Pliny's Letters and other sources such as inscriptions. Responses could assess senators' roles in terms of answering 'extent' but the focus should have been on the roles of others primarily. Responses could develop views on the differences between East and West.

Weaker responses seemed to have difficulty distinguishing senators from others, and so developed discussions based on Pliny and Agricola as 'individuals' without recognising their status as senators. It was occasionally stated that Agricola was an equestrian. Better responses made comparison between these and others, for example the equestrian governors of Egypt or procurators involved in Britain and Bithynia. Good use was made of Pliny's Letters to identify local administrations (good and bad), the use of freedmen and soldiers, the relations with client kings and the extent to which they were used. Evaluation of these was often in terms of a concern that since they were to be published Pliny was careful what he said which is not the case with Book 10. Better responses made the point that Pliny did not want to appear incompetent to Trajan. Some reference was made to soldiers in various roles from construction to tax collectors (the Frisii centurion) with the use of Apuleius border guard and evidence from Vindolanda. Reference was made to the army's use against revolts and or conquest. Procurators and equestrians were well supported with evidence from Tacitus (Catus, Classicianus), Josephus (Pilate, Felix) and Pliny and some inscriptions (Xenophon). Inscriptions were also well used when looking at the local elites and their roles. Reponses mentioned Client Kings in Britain (Cogidubnus, Cartimandua, Prasutagus) and Judaea (Herod) and others under Claudius and Gaius. Very little mention was made of the governor's staff.

Question No. 11 asked how far peace and stability were affected by the ways emperors promoted themselves and their rule. Responses needed detailed examples of promotion using evidence. This could cover coinage, cultural developments, economic involvement (in terms of constructions, aid, taxes), reactions to events and imposition of policies, and the imperial cult among other aspects. Evidence needed to be developed on how these affected peace and stability. This could take the form of reactions by provincials, the effect of actions by emperors (such as military activity) and the efforts by some to display loyalty to the Empire.

Responses provided good detail of the imperial cult (at times to the exclusion of other aspects). There was discussion of the differences in the effects on provinces. Gaius' efforts in Judaea and Claudius' temple in Britain were commonly discussed, usually well, although the specific evidence from Tacitus and Josephus was often generalised and sometimes misrepresented. The AD 66 revolt of Jews was not easily connected to the attempt by Gaius to place a statue in the temple. Good reference was made to the various military activities

and the ways emperors' efforts to promote themselves as successful generals impacted on the Empire in Britain, Dacia and occasionally in Parthia. Nero's promotion of his Hellenism was detailed in some cases, although the effect this had on the Gauls (according to Dio's speech by Vindex) was rarely used. Coins were again prominent – Tiberius coin on his aid to Asia, Trajan's coins showing his victory in Dacia, or Claudius' in Britain, as well as Nero's depiction as Apollo. There was much use of revolts to indicate how the peace and stability was affected, although these were not always easily linked to the way emperors promoted themselves – Tacitus' account of the mistreatment of Boudicca did not seem related to Nero directly although use could have been made of the Claudian temple. However better responses made a good argument in that peace and stability were often not affected by the promotion of emperors but by other factors. Responses used Aphrodisias but not all made it clear who erected the Sebasteion and why.

Question No. 12 requested candidates to assess how useful are the sources for our understanding of the views of provincials towards the Empire. Responses needed to detail specific examples of views from the sources. This could take the form of reported views by Roman writers such as their views on corruption (for example in Judaea- Florus in Josephus or Tacitus, the Frisii), taxation (Tacitus' on Florus and Sacrovir or Boudicca or Josephus on the Jewish Revolt), mistreatment (Boudicca in Dio and Tacitus) and the behaviour of emperors (Dio's speech by Vindex). Inscriptions could be used to show provincial elites support for the Empire and involvement in administration, for example Cogidubnus, or Classicianus. Focus needed to be on the value of the evidence rather than what the views were whether positive or negative. Accounts of revolts would be relevant provided the value of the evidence was the focus. Some assessment of the differences of East and West and the limitations of the evidence could be developed.

Better responses balanced positive and negative views, using the various reports of authors with an understanding of the limitations of these accounts. Accounts of revolts predominated in some responses with the Jewish revolt (Josephus) and Boudicca (Tacitus and Dio) mostly used. Some went further and discussed Florus and Sacrovir and Tacfarinas; few used the Jewish revolt under Trajan. There was some confusion over the cause of the Jewish revolt in AD 66, as attempts were made to link it Gaius' behaviour. Better responses used Philo here as well as Josephus and were more accurate. Speeches in Roman authors were generally used carefully with some thorough assessment of the views expressed. They were either reliable or unreliable depending on whether they were Tacitus' attempt to see the other person's perspective or simply made up. Examples were Boudicca, Calgacus and Caratacus in Tacitus and Vindex in Dio. Some used Vindex's coins but again not developing how they proved his view of Rome and Nero. Good distinction was made between Boudicca's issues and the wider issues for the tribe of the Iceni. Better answers used the Trinovantes' problem with the Claudian temple. Better responses also had specific examples of local responses to the Empire as at Aphrodisias, or Thugga, and in Pliny's *Letters*. These indicated either a welcoming attitude or at least a desire by elites to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the Empire. The inscription by Cogidubnus was often used well as was Tacitus *Agricola* 21 although evaluation of this often went no further than it was exaggerated due to Tacitus being Agricola's son-in-law with no reference to the archaeological evidence in Britain.

A frequent reference was made to an intention to publish Pliny *Letters* X which supposedly affected Pliny and Trajan's work. These were not published with Books I-IX.

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