

Classics: Ancient History

Advanced GCE A2 H442

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H042

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

HX-CLAS/R/11

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Classics: Ancient History (H442)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classics: Ancient History (H042)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
F391 Greek History from original sources	3
F392 Roman History from original sources	9
F393 Greek History: conflict and culture	13
F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power	16

Chief Examiner's Report

The specification continues to attract more centres and candidates. There is clear evidence in the answers to the various units that those undertaking a study of the subject are enjoying their experience and engaging with the material. Furthermore, the examiners have been generally pleased with the personal responses to the material studied at both AS and A Level and by the way candidates have approached the issues in a thoughtful and well-informed manner. The vast majority clearly knew the prescribed material in each option at AS and had a wide range of knowledge at A2. The examiners are extremely grateful to teachers for their continued efforts in enthusing their students and providing them with both the knowledge and the skills required by the specification.

It is clear that in the second full year of the specification students are more aware of the skills required. This year there was more evidence of candidates using source material in a constructive and thoughtful way to answer the questions. There was a greater use of plans by candidates for longer answers at both AS and A2. There was also evidence of more careful approach in terms of dealing with the specific issues within a question rather than offering material vaguely connected to it. The candidates displayed an impressive amount of knowledge overall, and many showed a comprehensive understanding of their chosen options. At times, however, this knowledge was not used to develop an argument in answer to the question, or even accompanied by an explanation of its relevance to the issues.

A very large number of answers to the document study elements and the pure essay question displayed a good understanding of the issues surrounding the use of original ancient sources. Evaluation of the material was much in evidence. While some candidates felt secure with a general explanation of the context and approach of a particular author, many more attempted to evaluate specific references which they were using. It was pleasing to see less reliance on the final paragraph general evaluation of an author, and much more on placing the evidence in a context. There were very few answers at either AS or A2 which offered very few or no source material – in itself a pleasing development from the past. However, it is also noticeable how candidates make use of source material which is not adding to the answer. Arbitrary quotations or references which in no way answer the question are included – alternatively the reference is not made relevant with any developed argument.

One of the most common features of the less successful answer was the tendency to answer only part of the question which was set. This is true at all levels and in all options. Many questions are phrased to ask about the source material – this may be asking 'How far the sources support the view' or 'To what extent do the sources allow us to assess...' or 'How reliable are the sources for...'. Many candidates, while using source material to support their answer, often fail to address the aspect of the questions which asks about the sources themselves. So there might be much information on an aspect of Spartan kings or women, supported by sources, but no attempt to assess how far they support a particular view about kings or women, nor whether they are sufficient to allow an assessment. Occasionally this might also be the result of a pre-prepared answer which the candidate was trying to fit into a different question.

The candidates must read the question carefully and give themselves sufficient time to think through what the issues are and what they should provide in the way of factual knowledge, sources and argument to answer it. This may be easier to do at A2 where candidates have one hour for each question, than at AS where there is less time. However, time management of each part of the AS paper is an aspect which may be worth some attention.

Chronological understanding continues to be an issue. While many are quite capable of recognising the order of events, the lack of precise dating can lead the candidate to conflate or confuse events, make connections between them which do not exist and even provide them with significance they do not have. The same is true for authors: when they lived and wrote is very often not known with any certainty, and conclusions based upon such uncertain knowledge naturally lack substance.

It has to be said that the quality of the communication and legibility is much the same as last year. There are still candidates whose scripts are quite difficult to decipher and whose structure and command of technical terms is weak. Lengthy sentences which become so involved as to lack clarity and a lack of paragraphs weaken the quality of the answer and leave the argument under-developed. Assertions which are neither supported by evidence nor explained are not a substitute for developed analysis. The spelling of names of people and places, some of which appear on the examination paper, is variable and, at times, incomprehensible.

It is pleasing to see the continued support for the subject in a wide variety of centres. There continues to be a growth in the numbers. There is considerable enthusiasm for the subject among the students and this is largely due to the hard work of many teachers who clearly inspire their students when exploring the original ancient sources. This comes through at all levels of the examination.

F391 Greek History from original sources

General Comments

From the performance of candidates this year it is clear that the new specification is bedding down well. Across the three options, candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of the material they covered during the year, which they could deploy effectively under exam conditions. The majority of candidates were able to draw on a range of sources in producing their answers, and there was plenty of evidence of skilful interpretation and clear understanding of context. The evaluation of sources remains a sterner test for many, however, and there are still too many vague discussions and imprecise references. Some candidates have been taught to produce general evaluative paragraphs, which are often added at the end of the essay without any reference to the particular question asked; such paragraphs contribute very little to the essay as a whole, and in some cases seem to divert the candidate from more promising approaches.

As last year, there were a very few candidates who attempted the wrong section; it may be worth warning candidates taking Options 1 and 2 about sources common to the two topics, such as the Old Oligarch.

Most candidates appeared to be able to complete the paper in the time allowed, though again this year there were too many over-long answers to the (a) and (b) questions, which account for 30 marks; the (c) question and the essay together carry 70 marks, and so candidates must be encouraged to organise their time effectively under exam conditions. There were a very few rubric infringements where candidates answered two questions from a single section or answered questions from more than one option. It is clear that schools have done an excellent job in ensuring that candidates are familiar with the layout of the paper.

As last year, Option 3 on Sparta was the most popular option. Athenian Democracy was next in popularity, while Option 2 (the Athenian Empire) was taken by the smallest contingent. Only a small number of candidates attempted to answer the essay question first, followed by the commentary question. The paper has been designed so that the (a) question allows candidates a straightforward introduction to the exam, based on the selection of details from the passage on the paper. For the majority of candidates this worked very well, and they were able to draw out of the passage a wide range of relevant points; the best answers also communicated the context effectively. The (b) and (c) questions build on aspects of the passage set. There was a very small number of candidates who used the (a) question as the starting point for a broader (and in some cases, lengthy) discussion; examiners were able to reward such discussion where it clearly derived from the passage set, but where candidates introduced material from other sources, examiners were unable to reward its use, even if the answer demonstrated a very good grasp of the topic. As in previous years, a very few candidates wrote at excessive length in (a), which in some cases put them under time pressure towards the end of the paper. The very best answers made impressive use of the passage and concisely conveyed an excellent understanding of context.

The focus of the (b) question had been refined for this year's examination, as was discussed at Inset. The wording of the question is now much closer to the (a) question, but candidates are explicitly required to draw on material other than the passage on the paper, and, as a consequence of this, references to the passage are not credited in (b). In addition, we are no longer looking for evaluation in responding to this question, though if candidates choose to evaluate the sources they select, that can be credited using the marking grids. The emphasis is much more on recall of detail and interpretation of the evidence. The idea behind the change was to make a more natural transition from the (a) question, and also to enable a more concise answer; this then allows the candidate more scope to develop an extended answer (without the

problem of repeating, or not repeating, something they have already said) to (c) and a more substantial essay. Although many candidates continue to offer evaluation of the sources they discuss, the change in wording largely achieved its purpose.

There were many well-judged answers to the (c) questions, though some candidates did not structure what they wrote as a response to the question. In the best answers, the interpretation and evaluation of sources were clearly and effectively integrated into the wider argument; examiners found it easy to reward these appropriately under the assessment objectives.

It is well worth spending some time encouraging students to engage with source evaluation in a meaningful way. It is a requirement for the (c) question and for the essay, and can prove one of the significant discriminators between answers. The best answers incorporated evaluation into their discussion of the evidence, and clearly related to what they were saying to the question. Weaker responses often separated the interpretation of evidence from any attempt at evaluation, and in many cases the evaluation offered was in a very general form which contributed very little to the answer. A significant number of candidates trotted out the line about Herodotus being the 'father of lies' (sometimes in the same sentence as describing him as 'father of history'), without relating this in any way to the value of the specific detail they had extracted (in many cases, correctly) from the *Histories* or using it to address the question set.

There were many excellent essays across all the options where candidates were able to make judicious use of material they had covered during the year to answer the question to very good effect. The most effective answers were very well organised, incorporating the issues raised in the bullet points as part of a coherent argument; in many cases it was clear from what was written that there had been over the course of the year lively and intriguing debates in the classroom about some of the more challenging aspects of the different options. This could also be seen in many weaker responses as well, though these were in some cases limited by an uncertain grasp of detail and a less coherent structure. Some candidates continue to rely on the bullet points as an essay plan, in some cases losing sight of the question almost completely. It is worth reinforcing to candidates that they must remember to state the obvious; in Option 2, Question 7, for example, a number of candidates referred frequently to the "original purposes" of the Delian League and clearly knew exactly what was meant by the phrase, but never unpacked its meaning explicitly so examiners could credit them for what they knew.

Producing handwritten work under examination conditions is clearly a challenge for some candidates, just as reading what is produced and rewarding it appropriately is increasingly a challenge for examiners. Each year there are more candidates presenting their work by alternative means and this is certainly worth considering if the candidate is likely to be disadvantaged by presenting in the traditional manner. Examiners work very hard to assign the correct mark to a script, but this can be very difficult in some cases. Where candidates are using a computer, they should remember that poor typing can also impact the clarity of their argument, and that a larger font, preferably with double spacing, can enable their work to be marked more straightforwardly. In some cases candidates would be well advised to spend more time planning and organising their thoughts before committing them to paper, rather than relying on the sheer quantity of answer produced. The same comment also applies to some candidates handwriting their answers. All candidates should bear in mind the value of proper paragraphing; where candidates add material at a later stage on the handwritten paper, they should make as clear as possible the links to the extra material. In some cases, candidates with larger handwriting doubled spaced their work which made it easier to reward them appropriately.

The precise understanding of the chronology of the period studied remains an excellent indicator of candidate's grasp of the subject; any uncertainty here communicates itself very quickly to the examiner, though, of course, the examiner is looking for more than just this. The majority of candidates were able to use appropriate technical terms accurately and clearly, though some might be better advised to use English terms rather than transliterations of the Greek. While papers are likely to choose English terms in the questions where appropriate (*assembly* rather

than *ekklesia*, for example, or perhaps both), there are some terms for which there is no commonly agreed substitute; a good example of this in this year's paper was *gerousia*. As in previous years, the examiners were struck by the quality of work produced by individual candidates and centres, which reflect considerable credit on all involved. It is refreshing to see the continuing interest in the classical world reflected in the range of responses to this paper.

Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5th century BC

In this option, Question 2 proved the more popular.

Q. 1(a) Most candidates were able to find appropriate points from this passage, such as the competition between members of the aristocratic families and the wholesale changes introduced by Cleisthenes. A very few failed to note that Cleisthenes 'took the people into his party'.

Q. 1(b) The majority of answers covered a good range of examples where we can see competition between political leaders in Athens. Popular choices included: Cimon and Pericles/Ephialtes, Cleon and Nicias, Nicias and Alcibiades. Relatively few candidates discussed the dispute between Pericles and Thucydides, son of Melesias. The best answers made clear references to the sources for the examples they chose, and interpreted them well: there were some good discussions of the Hyperbolus ostracism.

Q. 1(c) The best answers demonstrated a good understanding of the relationship between political leaders and the assembly, examining in some detail contrasting examples such as Pericles and Cleon, as presented by Thucydides. Weaker answers were not clear about the meaning of 'rely on'. A number of candidates used the Mytilene debate as an example, but the context of this was not always understood well; in some cases candidates seem to think that this debate, as presented by Thucydides, demonstrated Cleon's control of the people in the assembly.

Q. 2(a) The majority of candidates were able to draw a good range of points from the two passages, though it was clear that some candidates did not understand the references to 'business' in the Thucydides passage. Quite a number also failed to note the reference to the aristocratic perspective in the Xenophon passage.

Q. 2(b) There were some excellent responses to this question, drawing on a range of different types of evidence, from the opening of Aristophanes *Acharnians*, the archaeological evidence at the Pnyx and a range of material drawn from Thucydides (such as the Mytilene debate, the Pylos debate and his discussion of the oligarchic coup in 411 BC) and Xenophon (the Trial of the Generals).

Q. 2(c) This question offered considerable scope for different approaches. Many candidates were able to secure decent marks by selecting particular sources and discussing their attitude towards the Athenian democracy. There were some interesting discussions of Thucydides: some, relying heavily on his attitude towards Pericles, saw him as very much in favour of democracy, while others focused more on the negative aspects of his presentation of the democracy in action.

Of the essays, Question 3 proved more popular than Question 4.

Q. 3 The majority of candidates were able to put what the Old Oligarch said in context and draw on a wide range of other sources to support their discussion. There were some interesting assessments of the significance of individual political leaders (such as Cimon, Pericles and Alcibiades), and other changes over the course of the period studied. The best answers presented an interesting analysis of the increasingly radicalised democracy.

Q. 4 The best responses demonstrated an excellent grasp of Cleon's career, and were able to discuss the limitations of our available sources in considerable detail. Weaker responses tended to be rather vague about the details of what Cleon achieved, and there was considerable uncertainty about the chronology of the period. Some candidates appeared not to know that Cleon died during the Archidamian War, and traced his direct influence in later events.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

This was the least popular option. Answers were evenly distributed between the two questions in Section A, .Question 7 was considerably more popular than Question 8. Examiners were pleased to see better responses making reference to sources beyond the prescription (ie Aelian, Thoudippos Decree etc); some weaker responses continued to confuse Herodotus and Thucydides (and Thucydides and Xenophon). It is also worth reminding candidates of the difference between Thucydides, son of Olorus, and Thucydides, son of Melesias; there was also some confusion over Thucydides' career, though his hostility towards Cleon shone through many accounts of the 420s.

Q. 5(a) Most candidates were able to draw relevant material from the passage which brought out the importance of the tribute through the close attention to the details of the procedure for collection. Many discussed the role of the prytaneis and noted the significance of the 'identification token'.

Q. 5(b) Many candidates did not focus on the attitude of the allies to Athenian control, merely giving lots of examples of Athenian control, though these were normally well supported from the sources. Most candidates mentioned the Mytilene Debate from Thucydides, but without focusing on the complaints of the Mytilenians, whether explicit or implied, so failing to address the key question of why they revolted. Most chose instead to focus on the details of the debate between Cleon and Diodotus and its outcome. Many candidates made good use of the Khalkis, Methone and Standards decrees, and the ATL, and could give individual instances of revolts, though not always the reasons for them. A few candidates discussed very effectively the limitations of what we can tell from the sources about those states that chose not to revolt.

Q. 5(c) Some candidates discussed the Melian Dialogue, although Melos was not an ally at the time; however credit was given where details about Athenian imperial control were given from the dialogue. For both parts b) and c) only the very best answers were able to conclude that the allies' attitudes, Athenian control, and Athenian interference changed over time.

Q. 6(a) This proved quite a demanding question, but those candidates who extracted relevant material from the passage achieved very high marks. Some candidates were drawn away from the passage to discuss economic advantages more generally.

Q. 6(b) Weaker answers did not focus on 'economic impact', though it was good to see many citing the Methone Decree (and other examples) as evidence of positive impact for the allies, and some discussion from better candidates of the advantages (and disadvantages) for states outside the Delian League, and also for metics and other non-Athenians.

Q. 6(c) Most candidates mentioned Plutarch on the Periclean Building Programme, but only the better answers ranged more widely, considering the development of the Athenian fleet, the opportunities offered for pay on campaign and for official duties, together with cleruchies (eg Naxos) and colonisation (eg Amphipolis). The best responses considered 'to what extent' and so gave balanced answers.

Q. 7 A significant minority of candidates picked up the term 'original purposes' from the question, but did not explain what they understood it to mean; it is worth reminding candidates to explain the obvious so that it can be credited. Examiners were pleased to see many candidates referring to Thucydides 1.96 and his use of the word 'pretext' (in the translation), though fewer could

discuss in detail 1.99. The majority of candidates referred to both the Mytilene Debate and the Melian Dialogue, though not always without confusing the two. There was also some good discussion of the Peace of Callias before moving on to talk about increasing Athenian imperialism, though only a very few candidates discussed Athens' use of League forces for operations other than against the Persians.

Q. 8 Some candidates who attempted this lost sight of the question, and focused too much on the development of Athenian imperialism, and did not relate this to Thucydides; nor did they address 'to what extent'. Some also were tempted to spend longer on evaluation of Thucydides than they might have in other questions, but where this was accurate and relevant due credit was given. Better answers gave full consideration to what decrees might add to our understanding. Several candidates when evaluating Thucydides dismissed his account of the Pentacontaetia on the grounds that it was not his main theme, some going further stating that the purpose of the Pentacontaetia was not to show increasing Athenian power and imperialism; it is worth considering Thuc. 1.23 & 1.89.

Option 3: Politics and society of Ancient Sparta

There was a pretty even split on questions 9 and 10, with the latter being marginally more popular and generally answered slightly better. Question 12 proved much less popular than Question 11, though there were many excellent answers from candidates who showed an excellent understanding of Sparta's very different relationships with Corinth and Argos. There were also many references to the 'Spartan mirage' (variously spelt), with no explanation of what this means.

Q. 9(a) This question was generally well handled by candidates; most were able to draw a good range of material from the passage, though there were some who thought that the passage suggested that Anaxandrides replaced his first wife. It is also worth noting that the passage can be used as evidence in Section B: relatively few candidates who attempted Question 11 noted the reference to the Elders here (ie members of the *gerousia*), and there were quite a few who used the incident to illustrate the importance of the Ephors ahead of the *gerousia*.

Q. 9(b) Some candidates interpreted 'family' in a way that surprised examiners (eg 'the royal family'); where possible, credit was given for this. There were some very good answers arguing that the family was of limited importance, because of the value Spartans placed on 'community'; and some equally good ones arguing that family was extremely important. Some chose to emphasise the communal aspects of Spartan life (eg the *syssitia*, the *agoge*), while others focused on the importance of producing the next generation and the honour paid to women who died in childbirth. As is often the case, any mention of the *agoge* can become overblown; candidates must be encouraged to focus on the demands of the question.

Q. 9(c) There were some interesting discussions of the position of women in Sparta. There were plenty of candidates who were able to give the stranger details of the Spartan wedding ceremony and make comparisons with Athenian women, but only the best candidates could go further to think about the social implications of the Spartan system for women. Most candidates were able to draw on the evidence of Plutarch and Xenophon, but significantly fewer were able to discuss Aristotle's attitude towards Spartan women in detail, and his views were often dismissed as 'misogynistic' without clear explanation.

Q. 10(a) This passage was used successfully by most candidates, who were able to make a good range of points.

Q. 10 (b) Most candidates were clear about the domestic roles of the helots, and some were able to recall in detail the contribution required by Spartiates from the land allotted to them (and the importance of this to their membership of the *syssitia*). Rather fewer were clear about the military uses of the helot population (eg at Thermopylae and Plataea, or rather differently by Brasidas in his northern campaign). A significant number of candidates included discussion of the passage, which cannot be credited for a (b) question.

Q. 10(c) Some stronger candidates were aware of the Corinthian jibe directed at the Spartans in Thuc. 1.69 & 70, but fewer seemed aware of Thucydides' own comment at 1.118. Most mentioned the helot revolt of 465/4 BC, but far fewer made mention of Pylos in 425 BC (both because of the confusion this incident caused in Sparta and because of the use by the Spartans of helots to supply the men trapped on Sphacteria). Many candidates produced examples where the sources (they claimed) refer to the Spartan fear of a helot rebellion; for example, Cleomenes' refusal of help to Aristagoras (Herodotus Book 5) or Archidamus' speech to the Spartan assembly (Thucydides Book 1) – however, in neither of these cases is there a direct reference to the helots.

Q. 11 This proved a very popular question. Weaker answers revealed some confusion about the role of the *gerousia*, and even what it was, with many confusing it with the *ephors*; not all answers gave details of the membership. There was not secure familiarity with Plutarch *Lycurgus* 5 & 6, and surprisingly large numbers seemed unaware that the *gerousia*, 'elders' and 'founding fathers' were one and the same. Only a very few of the very best responses appreciated that the importance of the *gerousia* might have changed over time, fluctuating as the kings lost power and the *ephors* rose in importance, notwithstanding the fact that the *ephors* were in office for only a year as opposed to the *gerousia* members' life tenure once elected. Very few candidates really discussed the *gerousia*'s probouleutic function, and too often candidates made assumptions about what the sources include. Relatively few made explicit use of the Herodotus passage in Question 9.

Q. 12 There were surprisingly few answers to this question, given that the topic is clearly in the specification and the question made straightforward demands of candidates, as was shown by the generally good answers from those who did attempt it. The best answers showed a sure grasp of the chronology of the period studied and were very clear about the very different relationship Sparta enjoyed with the two states. Most, but not all, candidates who attempted this question were very clear about the limited nature of our sources for Spartan relations with other states.

F392 Roman History from original sources

General Comments

Once again, credit is due this both to teachers and candidates from all those centres involved in the Roman History AS paper. The quality of work noted, including detailed, supported arguments and succinct, specific answers to commentary questions, was admirable, and from this perspective it is heartening to see the fruits of much hard work from all parties involved.

No particular problems were noted with any parts of the paper. There was a good range of responses to each part of the paper; it seemed as though there was a greater number of centres now studying Roman Britain, and slightly fewer studying the Republic.

One point to bear in mind by ALL centres is that in every Option of the paper, the (b) question has been re-worded so that there is no need for candidates to evaluate sources – simply to cite them, to interpret them, and to refer to their content. However, where specific evaluation of sources was found, it was credited: but teachers need to bear in mind, throughout the paper, that specific, rather than generic or general information, about the reliability of a Plutarch or a Suetonius will help to raise marks in AO2. It is also disheartening to read the same paragraphs, trotted out *sui causa*, in (b), (c), and in an essay.

Another peculiar practice noted this year was the habit of students from a few centres to answer the questions in reverse order. For the sake of giving a candidate enough time to answer an essay – and time pressures are tight – it may be sensible for a candidate to do the essay question before the commentary questions; but it appears to be completely counter-productive to do (c), then (b), and finish with (a), since the questions have been devised specifically to enable even a candidate of modest ability to identify points on the question papers and say **something** in (a), then refer to **other** sources in (b) and then to compose a short essay of wider scope in (c). To do them in any other order leaves the weaker candidate without recourse to the help we had intended to provide by setting the questions as we did.

(a) questions were done pretty well on the whole, though several candidates made only passing reference to points, or (in some cases) cited everything whether it was asked for or not. There was still an occasional discovery of a general essay in (a), with little or not reference to the passage. Highlighting relevant parts of the passage on the question paper, on which to focus should be encouraged, and *citation+comment* – ‘this shows that . . . because . . .’. Four or five points usually secure a mark of 8/10 – though marks depend on the quality or relevance of the point made and the amount of material in the extract.

(b) questions were generally done quite well, with three or four detailed references to sources being enough to enable good marks to be scored in (a) and (b). In weaker responses, sources are referred to, and then an general evaluative paragraph frequently follows, rather than a discussion raised by the evidence focused on the question. Again, practice is needed. As noted above, there is no longer any need for a candidate to write any evaluation of the source in (b), though it is credited where found.

(c) questions were also done well on the whole – often better than (b) – though weaker responses had often covered the same subject-matter there and needed to say it again. Essays were often impressive in both length and detail, and took the wording of the question into account. Responses which tended to include quite a good amount of factual knowledge, but then made no use of it in addressing the issue raised in the question, and/or added a vague, general evaluation of reliability of the sources, would have been greatly improved if there had been consideration and specific comment relating the point or source back to the question.

Time was generally well-managed and appropriately balanced between the questions. Where candidates seemed to have managed their time poorly, this appeared to be more to do with the imbalances in their knowledge base. Very few rubric errors were noted.

The standard of written English remains very variable. 'Emporer' and 'invation' were by no means the only examples of words common within the sources, which candidates really should be able to spell accurately. 'Ceasar' and 'Britain/Briton' remain ongoing issues. Due allowance is made for errors resulting from writing at speed, but centres need to stress that accurate spelling of subject-specific terms is a desideratum. Slang was less common this year.

Other issues

Centres need to remind candidates to start each question or sub-question on a new page. The examiner needs some space to write summative comments and enter marks.

Comments on Individual questions

Option 1

1 By far the most popular choice.

(a) was mostly well done, with good use of the passage; there were some subtle interpretations of those who both 'build like millionaires . . .' and yet 'are never likely to become solvent again.' Weaker responses tended to see both groups described in the passage as one lump – close reading needs to be encouraged (and practised) here. There was some good context supplied to explain why the groups had found themselves in this state.

(b) was more demanding, with *seriousness of the threat* (or at least *seriousness*) often being overlooked, which led to fewer marks being awarded in AO2. There were also some fairly creative anti-Ciceronians who argued that there was really not that much threat at all from Catiline. Provided they considered such factor as a consul leading an army against Roman citizens, and the gravity of an SCU, they gained good marks for this approach.

(c) this question differentiated well. Weaker responses tended to stick to the printed extract and say 'yes, they were all poor.' There were some very good answers which were able to distinguish between 'poor' and 'desperate' – often those who had also been careful readers of the passage, to judge from their answers to (a).

2 About 1 in 5 candidates in Option 1 answered this question.

(a) was generally done well, as there was a lot to draw on, though more evidence of awareness of context to explain the differences in status and importance in the voting process would have been welcome.

(b) Problems arose with the precise use of the term '*amicitia*'. Candidates often interpreted it as any kind of political alliance. Centres need to make sure that this kind of technical terminology, which is often not readily transferable to the modern world, is clearly explained.

(c) was generally done better than b), with plenty of examples of individuals who succeeded without lots of support from all parts of society – Julius Caesar and Clodius being the most popular examples. Several responses tried to include Catiline, who hardly classes as a runaway success.

3 was less popular a choice than 4 – about 25% of candidates offered it. It was sometimes done very well, but too often there were elements from the sources – particularly his role as aedile – which were omitted, and some weaker responses tried to incorporate material which they appear not to have studied in any depth, as far as his death. There is no set limit of the relevance of material – the specification merely speaks of ‘the late Republic’ – but the criteria about accurate detail in the grids apply to all material seen.

4 was the most common choice, and was sometimes done well, but some ended up trying to make it into a different question, along the lines of ‘how much was Catiline’s defeat due to Cicero alone’ or ‘does Cicero exaggerate his own role’ – the latter being closer to the question set, and more rewardable.

Option 2

There was – roughly – a 50-50 split between answers to Questions 5 and 6.

5 (a) Generally well done, though weaker responses included much irrelevant material instead of finding material which ‘tell us about the importance of military success to Augustus.’

(b) not that well done. Candidates often found themselves at a loss to go beyond Actium and its propaganda-portrayal by Horace and Vergil.

(c) was generally better. It was not necessary for candidates to discuss other factors than the army to gain marks at the highest level, though they were credited as appropriate.

6 (a) was usually done well, with candidates finding plenty to comment on, and talk about ‘seriousness.’

(b) ‘popular support’ caused some problems. Examiners allowed ‘popular support’ of all kinds where it was clearly defined – but not, for example, courting the Senate for its support.

(c) was sometimes done well, but there were too many vague and imprecise answers which made no mention of any ‘actions taken by Augustus’ – lots of answers missed the settlements out completely.

7 about 1/3 candidates tackled this, and 2/3 did Question 8.

7 was sometimes done well, with a good detailed exposition of which individuals did what to help Augustus – notably Agrippa and Maecenas – with quite wide knowledge of Tiberius and the rest of the family. Some answers tried to make out ways in which Julia & Julia were necessary or helpful in Augustus’ rule of Rome, where this was attempted it was not done convincingly. At the lower end of answers, there was no accurate knowledge on show beyond Agrippa and Actium, and little consideration of ‘extent.’

8 Done in much the same way as 7; some answers well supported and wide-ranging, and at the lower end just assertions with no examples. Candidates need to be taught techniques so that they include some supporting material: some kind of habitual adding of ‘this is shown by’ to every general point they make.

Option 3

Answers to all parts of the commentary questions were done much more securely than last year. There were very few responses to Question 10 (under 10%), which is disappointing, since – despite its unusual W. H. Auden-esque appearance on the page – it ought to be a familiar text.

9 (a) This question was sometimes done well, with fine reference to the passage and good coverage. Weaknesses were displayed where candidates only used two sections of the passage, or left out obvious sections and as a result made use of only three or four citations.

(b) most candidates were able to manage at least some discussion of varying reactions to the Roman invasion, but too many seemed to resort to Boudica too hastily. The examiners allowed 'Roman invasion' to include any expansion into new territory, so Calgacus and the Caledonii were accepted; Boudica was not, unless there was good context explaining how the material was relevant.

(c) was generally done better than (b) though many candidates confused Dio with the non-surviving Tacitus, and quite a few seemed to have no detailed knowledge about the invasion at all. A lot of candidates wrote about Caesar and stopped in 54 BC – relevant, but rather limited.

10 (a), where seen, was done well very occasionally, but more often there was a limited use made of the passage.

(b) Answers varied, not in range, but in detail. One or two were very finely done, with excellent support from inscriptions and archaeology – funerary sculpture – as well as literary evidence.

(c) Again a few excellent answers here, and the standard overall better than in (b), with supported examples of the activities of 'various units.'

11 This was often done well, with good use of archaeology and literary sources – not just the expected Caesar and Strabo, but one answer in particular stands out for its use of Horace, Tibullus, and Suetonius. There were some fine answers which made some detailed use of the coins from LACTOR, which was pleasant to see. Weaker responses focused not so much on contact 'between British tribes and the Roman Empire' as 'Roman contact with Britain' – more limited standpoint – and the weakest talked about Caesar and then stopped (much as was seen in weak answers to 9 (c)).

12 There were some very good, very thorough essays here, though again, accounts could be limited; some just gave narrative, covering the whole period with little attention to 'how varied' (a major differentiator in this question, as it turned out.) Others misplaced the Antonine Wall, confusing it with the Stanegate and putting it chronologically before Hadrian's Wall; one or two only talked about Agricola.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

The standard of work presented this year in the examination was generally similar to that last year. There was a slightly greater tendency for candidates not to answer the question set, but to prefer to write lengthy accounts of 'what they knew about'. For example, the first question on the paper elicited a number of lengthy accounts of the Ionian revolt, which candidates clearly knew well, but they failed to connect fully with the question of whether Darius attacked Greece in response to this or whether there were other issues at play. In general, candidates should be reminded of the importance of considering what the question asks, so that their argument and the information and source material which they select can be directed towards an appropriate response. When an answer is not properly directed towards the issues in the question, it is all too easy for marks to be lost both under AO1 – because the material is not fully relevant – and AO2 because the issues in the question are not being appropriately analysed and the validity of the sources in this area evaluated. Candidates should be encouraged to think carefully about the sources and about key episodes in those sources, so that they can analyse, evaluate and interpret them effectively in the light of the demands of the question.

Option 1 Greece and Persia

Q.1 This was a popular choice of question which was, on the whole, tackled well. Candidates discussed Darius' possible motives in detail and drew on Herodotus and Diodorus as well as some good use of Cornelius Nepos and some Persian inscriptions. Some candidates drifted away from the focus and discussed Xerxes' motives for the 2nd invasion. Least successful were the candidates who narrated the events of the Ionian revolt. Candidates should also be careful when speaking about the hubris/nemesis theme in Herodotus that it is appropriately applied to the question. In relation to the use of sources, there was a tendency in some candidates to narrate sections of Herodotus, and perhaps evaluate them briefly, but then not draw any wider historical conclusions from these passages. The best answers recalled the detail from Herodotus that indicated that it was revenge, and then went on to say why quotes such as 'Grant O god that I might punish the Athenians' might have been made up. They then evaluated the accounts with reference to Herodotus' fascination with hubris/nemesis, the role of individuals or his exaggeration of the importance of Athens. Some then went on to talk about trade, economic reasons, political reasons, especially pressure from individuals such as Mardonius, Hippias, Atossa, the different routes taken in 492 and 490, the size of the invasion force and then reached a conclusion balancing up all the different factors at work. There were some good references to various Persian inscriptions, but many candidates did not appreciate that by the time of the Ionian revolt Darius had been on the throne for 23 years. Indeed, a number of candidates seemed to think he had just come to power. The best candidates recalled the detail of how Darius dealt with the Ionians who had revolted, and used that to illustrate how the Persian empire and Darius as ruler worked. Some candidates used the idea of the expansion of the Persian empire effectively in their answers, but then conflated Herodotus' and Diodorus' accounts, with the result that their evaluation of the former was rather confused.

Q.2 was a popular choice, but less successfully tackled than Q.1. Details of the Battle of Salamis were generally well known, although a surprising number of candidates failed to give accurate detail from Herodotus' account. On the other hand, knowledge of events after the battle proved to be somewhat weaker. Some candidates referred to, and used, Aeschylus' *Persae* successfully, whilst others were able successfully to compare other possible turning points, such as Thermopylae, Plataea and Mycale. Candidates often failed to take into account the idea of a turning point, and instead merely gave a list of events, or just stated that each of the other battles was also a turning point. There were lots of details about the build up to Salamis and Themistocles' role in the battle, and what happened in the battle but very little on why these events marked Salamis as the turning point. Recalling the details of the other battles seemed to

be beyond many and a number in their desperation brought in Darius/Marathon and events after Xerxes death. Although many mentioned Plutarch and Aeschylus as well as Herodotus, they generally were not evaluated effectively – in fact evaluation was rather simplistic and generic rather than specific to the quotes they were referring to.

Q.3 Fewer candidates attempted this. The best answers were able to deal in detail with Xerxes, Darius and individuals in their courts. Some answers avoided discussing the role of the kings, others concentrated on their character, rather than what they did. Many were able to successfully deal with the exaggeration issue, but some ignored this element of the question completely. There were some perceptive arguments about how the Persian empire operated and how critical the court and the king were. Comparisons with other sources such as the bible or inscriptions or Aeschylus' Persians to Herodotus would have really been helpful. There was too much general argumentation about the role of kings and their courts and not enough specific detail from the sources eg Artnnesia's contribution, the debate before Xerxes finally decides to invade etc. Candidates struggled to reach convincing conclusions about whether Herodotus did exaggerate.

Q.4 Whilst some answers to this question were excellent, many candidates who attempted it lacked knowledge of barbarians in battle. Candidates tended to talk about the Persians in general rather than in battle and even when focused on the question they struggled to recall the specific detail of how the Persians behaved at Lade, Marathon, Thermopylae, Artemesium, Salamis, Plataea, Mycale and Eurymedon. A number of candidates chose to discuss whether Persians were *barbaric* or not. Many candidates did not seem to understand what the term *barbarian* meant to a Greek. Candidates are reminded of the need to read questions carefully and focus on the wording. It was also rare for candidates in this question to refer to Persian inscriptions/reliefs and more importantly to how Persians were represented on Greek vases and in Aeschylus' *Persians*. The best answers referred to things like fused jaws bones found at Plataea and the sculptures on the Parthenon of the lapiths and centaurs to broaden their arguments.

Option 2

Question 5 was a very popular choice, and in the main the issues were well discussed. Few candidates spotted that the reference to Thucydides in the question, but this was not necessary and most discussed it well and were able to use a good variety of sources, pointing to the role of allies on both sides successfully. There was a tendency to focus on 431 and short term causes, rather than broaden the argument. There was very little knowledge of the period 460-431 and the issues surrounding the rising power of Athens in evidence, which rather weakened the arguments of those candidates who wanted to focus on causes of the Peloponnesian War in 431.

Q.6 There was a tendency to turn this into a Delian League question, or else to deal with only part of the quote. Most were able to point to examples of tyranny by Athens, only some candidates were able to give examples from the sources of Athenians speaking of freedom at home. There was a tendency to focus on knowledge before 460 – Thasos/Naxos etc, sometimes to the detriment of more detailed knowledge of the later relations between Athens and her allies. In particular, candidates' knowledge of the years 412 and after proved to be rather weak. Few candidates dealt with the wealth of inscriptions available, those that did were often the most successful answers. It is always helpful for candidates to evaluate Thucydides' (or Xenophon's) account with reference to the 'facts' of Athenian behaviour towards their allies as indicated by the inscriptional evidence.

Q.7 The most successful candidates produced detailed answers and discussion of the events at the end of the 5th century BC. In general answers were a bit narrow in focus and candidates should be encouraged to think more widely about the issues, in particular what was meant by the idea of destroying democracy.

Q.8 This question was noticeably better answered than the others – across the board, from the less able to the more able it seemed to allow them to answer effectively. These answers showed better knowledge often than other question by the same candidate. Weaker responses tended just to list individuals rather than answer the question – however they often still did well due to some good knowledge. There was some really thoughtful source evaluation and everyone at least seemed able to access comments on Thucydides and Aristophanes' issues with Cleon. Few candidates went beyond the idea of war tactics, but several showed excellent knowledge and discussion of the roles of generals from both Sparta and Athens in the Peloponnesian War. Some knowledge of individuals from the whole of the period would have provided some balance.

Option 3

Questions 9 and 10 proved to be the most popular.

Question 9 led to some excellent and detailed discussions of the trial of Socrates. Most candidates, but not all, successfully outlined the charges against him and then discussed the evidence for these charges in the sources. Weaker answers focused on whether Socrates was a sophist or not, whilst a number seemed to think that he had been charged with being a sophist. The wider political aspects of Socrates' trial were well treated by some candidates, but many failed to draw out the connections with Critias and Alcibiades effectively. Most candidates showed knowledge of Plato, Xenophon and Aristophanes, although many did not then effectively evaluate Aristophanes in this context, and the significance of his play in relation to Socrates' trial. All too often there is a generic evaluation of comedy, rather than specific comment on this issues surrounding Socrates. Very few candidates drew a clear distinction between the charges levelled against Socrates and his behaviour in court.

Q.10 produced some excellent responses showing detailed knowledge of drama, and often strong deductions about the role of women in Athens. The best used other sources to compare to dramas, and were able successfully to evaluate drama as a historical source. Many candidates used the Medea and Antigone, whilst some also used the Lysistrata and Thesmophoriazusae. Weaker answers often accepted what drama said at face value. Some candidates seemed to take the question as an opportunity to write all that they knew about the plays they had studied or to discuss the plays as literary works rather than historical documents. Candidates should be reminded to look carefully at the plays as sources, considering what can be learned from them about the society within which they were performed, rather than just seeing them as works of literature.

Q.11 was not very popular, but many were able to point to Aristotle and the Old Oligarch for their evidence, usually without going much wider than this. A number of candidates did not address the issue of 'rights and responsibilities' of citizens, and chose instead to write more generally about they knew of the sections of Athenian society. The weaker of these answers tended just to write about slaves, metics and women, with some reference to the sources, and fail to address the issue in the question.

Q.12 was attempted by a good number, some of whom turned the question into a discussion of the Building Programme rather than an analysis of the sculpture. In general candidates did not know enough detail about the sculpture on the acropolis, but a few of the better answers were impressive and were able to compare the material remains to literary sources. Some candidates failed to identify correctly the layout of the Parthenon and what the sculptures meant in terms of the Athenians' position in the Greek world. Some candidates made excellent links between the buildings and the rhetoric of Pericles' Funeral Oration. The discussion of the issues of using sculpture as a source for interpreting Athenian views was limited, and often there were only limited references to other sources to help elucidate the meaning of the sculptures in their political and cultural context. Some candidates, however, were able to discuss Pausanias and Plutarch effectively.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

Many of the answers to questions in all the options indicated candidates had a clear understanding of the factual information and evidence. They made informed responses to specific issues and generally offered relevant literary and material evidence to support their views. As always candidates developed a variety of ways of treating a particular question which produced very good and well-organised discussions based upon interpretation of well-chosen and relevant evidence.

Questions which ask about the extent to which sources support a view or about the evidence and its usefulness or accuracy still cause some candidates to suffer when they do not take this aspect into account in their answers. It is important to remind candidates that the information and argument in their answers has to be relevant to the specific question. This is especially true of quotations from sources or reference to sources – quotations from Suetonius about Augustus leaving Rome in marble are of little worth when the question is about the role of the Senate.

Questions which do not specifically ask about the sources/evidence still need to be answered through references to them; this is explicit both on the paper and in the marking grids and mark schemes.

On the subject of interpretation and evaluation, there are still the generalised paragraphs, often the first or last paragraph of the essay, unrelated to the specific source material being used. The evaluation needs to be tied to the specific source material being used – whether it is valuable evidence or not. Interpretation succeeds where candidates draw conclusions and not just another (unexplained) fact.

Candidates do not always make clear the context of the source material they are using, and the result is very often a misuse of the source. Clearly candidates have learnt a phrase or a sentence but have no idea at which point in the text it comes, or what was the original context or to what it referred. The result is that it is inappropriately used by the candidate. An isolated word or phrase is of little worth. The lack of any supporting source material or evidence affects the candidate's performance in a number of ways.

More candidates are taking the opportunity to plan their answers – although sometimes the plan can be longer than the answer! Well-structured answers are well-rewarded in the marking grids. The candidate should display an understanding of the evidence and issue(s) across the period as a whole. Coverage of part of a period is partially relevant where relevant issues or information has not been used from other parts of the period. There may be good reasons why part of a period is omitted but the candidates should ensure that their answers show an understanding of the development of the period as a whole.

Many responses displayed a limited understanding of the chronology of the period – which seriously affected the quality of their responses when events were placed in the wrong order and conclusions drawn from this. Equally the way the constitution worked, whether in the Republic or the Empire, was clearly a difficult issue for a number of candidates when answering questions about institutions, power, control, decision-making, administration, and political activity. There were some basic errors in understanding and knowledge – it was claimed the Senate elected consuls, Cicero executed Catiline, the Senate organised the building of the temple of Mars, and, most often, details about authors were simply wrong.

Option 1: The fall of the Roman Republic 81 – 31 BC

The candidates provided a range of responses and all questions were attempted. One of the features of this topic is that candidates tend to approach answers with a chronological narrative of the period rather than a thematic discussion. This is understandable to a degree but it can lead to superficial treatment of relevant information as candidates try to mention everything they can.

There was a variety of responses to Q.1 (How far do the sources support the view that the senate failed to deal with the challenges facing the Republic throughout this period?). There were some exceptional answers here in which candidates were able to identify challenges and analyse fully the role/position of the Senate in responding to these across the period. There was a natural tendency to start with Sulla and work through the period. For weaker answers this meant a narrative of events which did or did not challenge the Republic. A few saw occasions when the senate did meet a challenge, thus providing a more balanced response. Better answers offered a more thematic response, looking at the type of challenges or considering separately successes and failures by the senate. Some answers displayed a good range of knowledge without identifying explicitly specific examples of challenges such as illegal acts, bribery and so forth. Most answers had an array of source material, the best of which was tied closely to the question of 'failure'. Some very good answers identified a range of challenges beyond simply ambitious politicians (competition, optimates' exclusiveness, bribery and control of the system through clientela, violence, the army etc). Some candidates displayed a knowledge about the role of the Senate and its limitations as a body. A good number of responses were weakened by an insecure understanding of the material, a lack of secure dating and a tendency to quote, especially Plutarch, with no indication that they knew the original context of the reference. Examples of insecure chronology are: the Leges Gabinia and Manilia were often in the wrong order, Pompey went to Spain in the 60s after dealing with the pirates. A number of candidates were able to focus on some challenges facing the senate but were less convincing in keeping to the time period with excessive discussion of Marius and the early Sulla years. The best answers dealt with how far the sources supported the Senate's failure to deal with challenges rather than just highlighting where and when it failed.

Q.2 asked the candidates to consider how far Julius Caesar was typical of the politicians of this period. This was a popular question with candidates. There was no need for answers to cover every other politician they could think of, and clearly better answers selected a good range to compare with Caesar. Generally students answered this question confidently and successfully with some excellent responses dealing with the career of Caesar and arguing the issue of typicality/or not with precise reference to Caesar's own career and also other politicians of the time (ie comparisons and contrasts). Better answers also provided a balance in terms of typical and atypical comparisons. There was a noticeable lack of knowledge of Caesar's early career, most responses starting with the triumvirate in 60 BC. Some candidates clearly thought that Caesar chose a triumph rather than consulship in 60 BC. Weaker answers viewed Caesar as atypical, ignoring his generally similar behaviour for much of his career. Pompey was the popular choice for comparison, seeing him and Caesar as much the same. His dictatorship seemed to colour a number of candidates responses when judging his typicality. Weaker responses managed to answer without reference to any other politician. It was apparent in this question that candidates of all levels tend to have a very hazy understanding of the how the constitution worked, what was legal or illegal and how decisions were made. Weaker responses tended to provide a narrative of Caesar's career without specifically dealing with typicality.

Q.3 (Was Sallust correct in his view that moral decline was the cause of the collapse of the Republic?) was generally less popular. Some candidates did not refer to Sallust's view in their answers but developed a discussion of the various factors which did affect the Republic. Others defined various aspects which could be considered part of a 'moral decline (use of bribery, violence, corruption, greed etc). Some candidates gave the impression they were unaware of Sallust as a source. Better answers made connections between 'moral decline' and the failure of

the Republic politically with some thoughtful analysis of the effects of wealth and ambition. Better answers developed an argument from well-selected examples with support from Sallust's view of Catiline, Cicero and others such as Pompey, Crassus and Sulla; Cicero was also used to effect. Plutarch was used frequently although less successfully where evaluation was generic rather than specific. There were some candidates who spent time on the Gracchi and Marius, information for which is outside the period. There may be a case for indicating how the 'moral decline' began with them but too much space and time was spent on this by some. There were some answers that relied on prepared material that focused on a general response without really addressing the precise needs of the question.

Q.4 (To what extent were individual politicians able to control decision-making throughout this period?) suffered from a lack of understanding about how decisions were made and how the constitution worked, especially in terms of how individual activity was central to the politics of the period. Better answers provided examples of specific decisions, and the context in which they were made, as well as the extent to which an individual was responsible for them. The range of examples and source references used was impressive and informed. Weaker answers assumed politicians could always control the making of decisions rather than seeing how this happened in specific instances. Candidates also provided more successful responses where they looked at how individuals could affect decision, through *amicitia* (such as the triumvirates), bribery, violence, control of tribunes and so on. They used the evidence of (?) Quintus' *Commentariolum*, Cicero's Letters and Speeches, as well as later sources such as Plutarch on political activity. Good balanced arguments were made about Pompey's early successes and later problems. A number of candidates had interesting and well-structured approaches to the question, other than a simple narrative of politicians' efforts to achieved their aims. Appian, Dio and Velleius (variously rendered) appeared in a number of responses, but rarely was the reference given in a specific form and quite frequently in a paraphrase which was barely recognisable. Once again the Gracchi and Marius were discussed as part of the answer, despite being outside of the period. The best answers focused on the extent to which individual politicians were able specifically to control decision making rather than just highlighting occasions when they made decisions for their own benefit.

Option 2: The invention of Imperial Rome

This was a more popular option. However, a number of candidates displayed a weak understanding of the constitution, although stronger candidates were aware of the nature of the constitutional power of the emperor. Equally candidates sometimes took Rome to mean the Empire. Responses often did not provide consideration of the latter part of the period.

There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q.5 (How far do the sources support the view that the emperors extended their power and control over Rome and its people during this period?). This was a popular question most students recognised the role of maintaining popularity through food supply, games and entertainments and there were some good discussions of the key elements of political control established by Augustus. It was clearly important that answers dealt with the issue of the sources in this question; responses which gave a narrative of imperial power and control would inevitably be limited in both objectives. Weaker answers did not distinguish between power and control; many responses focused purely on control of the population of Rome (essentially the lower classes). Understanding of how power worked and how it was exercised was present in better answers. Development beyond Augustus at times was weak, and even where there was some attempt to show how power and control changed, many ran out of information when it came to the Flavians, despite the clear contrast between Augustus and Domitian. Better answers sometimes showed how the emperors' power could be limited. The issue of control was often dealt with by reference to donatives, corn dole, water supply, buildings and propaganda with the emphasis on popularity. Some reference was made to the Praetorian Guard and the *vigiles*, and under Tiberius, the treason trials. Sources were usually better for Augustus (*Res Gestae*), becoming less exact and

less relevant as the period progressed. Some answers displayed very little use of sources/evidence.

Q.6 asked the candidates to consider the extent to which emperors gave the Senate and individual senators an effective role in the administration of the city of Rome. In responses to this question, better answers had some detail of what the Senate and senators did. Weaker answers discussed the relative power of emperor and senate. Responses tended to be either very strong or very weak. Candidates again chose not to use the terms in the question and focused on relationships or power. Some answers did not use sources, perhaps because the sources are not mentioned in the question; however, all the questions require use of source material. Some responses did make use of the *amici principis*, the increased role of the Equestrians and freedmen which offered a relatively straightforward structure to the answer. Some answers discussed the reason for the way emperors treated the Senate without developing what it actually did (or did not do). Answers which became diverted in to discussing the role of senators in the provinces were not focused on the question about the city of Rome. It was clear that some candidates had prepared an essay on the overall relationship of the Senate with the emperor and put this forward disregarding the precise terms of the question.

Q.7 invited the candidates to discuss the evidence for the efforts of the emperors in establishing the Imperial Cult in Rome. The important parts of this question were the scope of the evidence and 'in Rome' and better answers recognised that the answer required addressing both the development of the imperial cult within Rome and whether emperors tried hard to establish this. Better answers examined the quotation critically and in some detail. Not all candidates knew what the Imperial cult was or how it worked. Some responses seemed to see 'established' as 'started'. Many responses appeared to know few details about its ritual, and officers and relevance to the main state religion. Candidates were perfectly at liberty to argue that emperors did not make efforts and the evidence is slight – evaluating in the process the limitations of our evidence. Better answers made that point with some emperors but were also aware of the efforts made by others to extend the worship of the imperial family, and even emperors while alive. Some candidates took the opportunity to question much of the evidence in the literary sources, especially the poets of the Augustan Age, while offering some numismatic and epigraphic evidence. However, these examples were often not given a context – a coin of Nero with radiate crown (actually from Syria) does not help unless interpreted specifically and in detail. There was a tendency to narrate through the emperors, without suggesting a sense of the development of the idea of the cult. Why it was useful, politically and religiously, was again not explored by most. Evidence from outside Rome could be useful as a way of indicating an emperor's intentions if carefully interpreted. Some weaker answers were not certain about definitions of the imperial cult and there were very few answers that focused on religion in the city of Rome during this period, generally.

Q.8 (How consistent were the emperors in their policies towards the city and its amenities?) As in a previous question some candidates did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. They are not mentioned in the questions but the very clear instructions on the paper, as well as the marking grids and previous mark schemes have made it clear that all answers need to be supported by detailed use of the sources. This question was generally well answered with most (but not all) understanding amenities. They were able to give specific examples. Identifying the policy and analysing consistency was less well done. Better answers discussed the idea that emperors often reacted to a situation rather than had specific policies. One policy mentioned was the need to keep the plebs happy. While noticing some inconsistency, candidates did not always note why it occurred. There was good reference to Frontinus and Juvenal which was used to establish some policies or actions as well as their effectiveness. In some answers there was failure to address the issue of consistency or there was insufficient coverage across the period – many candidates were very good on the Julio-Claudian period but seemed less knowledgeable and confident about the Flavians. Some candidates limited amenities to buildings alone. Many candidates were very good on the Julio-Claudian period but seemed less knowledgeable and confident about the Flavians.

Option 3: Ruling the Roman Empire AD 14- 117

Candidates were largely knowledgeable, at least about some parts of the period and some events; they generally had knowledge and understanding of the evidence available. Concentration on the latter part of the period was noticeable in answers. However, there were some excellent answers with detailed use of evidence and a wide range of knowledge. The difficulties we have with source material for provincials was often mentioned but rarely explored in the body of the answer. There are limitations with the source material, and the danger is generalising from one piece of information.

There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q.9 (How typical of the provincial governors of this period was Pliny the Younger?). This was a reasonably popular question and well-done by most. Candidates knew a selection of Pliny Letters. They were less familiar with what other governors did, and oddly did not use the material on Suetonius Paulinus, and other governors of Britain which was used in other questions. There was some weak understanding of what constituted typical activity by a governor. Some answers had detail of governors mentioned in Tacitus and Dio Cassius, and better answers knew the range of tasks a governor had. The most often used governor was Agricola with varied use of Tacitus' biography.

Q.10 asked the candidates to consider how far the sources help us to assess the extent to which Roman rule was welcomed in the provinces. Weaker responses had little to offer beyond revolts with Boudicca the prime example. References to Cogidubnus or Cartimandua were used in better responses. Judaea was often mentioned as an example of a people who did not welcome the Romans (usually in a generalised manner with no idea that some did welcome the Romans). Bithynia and Africa were also employed occasionally. Sources varied, although occasionally and briefly the bible was used (and it could be used more in this option). Pontius Pilate made an appearance as a cause for disquiet (although the bible was not used as a source usually). Josephus (sometimes rather vaguely) was referenced, along with Tacitus (Agricola), Dio Cassius (Boudicca) and Suetonius. Inscriptions were used in responses to good effect. Better answers offered a balance by indicating evidence of cases where the provincials did welcome the Romans; this was further explored by those who distinguished between elites and ordinary provincials. The evidence for this varied from inscriptions of dedications by locals (although the author was sometimes referred to as Lactor 8/18) to the Letters of Pliny. Some showed a discrimination in their use of information recognising that not all revolts indicated a lack of welcome for the Romans but were specific to certain grievances. Examples of locals welcoming the Romans included Aphrodisias, Cogidubnus' inscription, and coinage. There were good arguments about the limitations of evidence concerning only the elites.

Q.11 invited the candidates to discuss the extent to which the evidence supports the view that the Empire was financially well-managed. Answers tended to focus on taxation without much evidence other than the revolts caused by excessive taxes eg Frisii, Sacrovir. This indicated it was not well-managed. There was some reference to good and bad emperors who filled or emptied the treasury respectively. Economic policy, trade and the extent to which the Empire was successful economically replaced the idea of financial management, not without some degree of sophistication and success where it was well-argued. Some candidates used material from Pliny to indicate corruption among local elites and governors. Weaker answers had an overall view but few specific examples upon which to base their arguments. Details of the way the Empire was managed and the officers involved (such as freedmen and procurators) were present in the better answers, as were examples of good and bad practice.

Q.12 ('The security of the Empire depended entirely upon the army during this period.' How far would you agree with this view?) Some candidates did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. The better answers recognised the significance of the word 'entirely' and were able to argue that the army was one of number of factors. Suppression of revolts seemed to be the prime duty of the army (although not always related well to the idea of security as in the question). This often resulted in a narrative of armies putting

down revolts; sources were employed about the revolts but they did not relate to the security of the empire or the role of the army as such; rather they explained the causes of the revolts. Better answers knew of the duties of the army – garrison duty, infrastructure development, settlement in colonies, and internal security. These responses would also indicate that good government by provincial administrators offered an alternative to the army and addressed the issue in 'entirely'. Much information was similar to the material used in Q.10. This in itself was not a problem but it had to be interpreted in terms of this question. Other factors included Client Kings (eg Armenia), Romanisation (Tacitus Agricola 21), diplomacy, and so on, but answers did not always provide specific examples.

The handwriting of a number of candidates caused a problem and an inordinate amount of time was spent trying to decipher what had been written. One suggestion might be to make candidates who invariably word-process their homework to hand-write their work from January onwards. If nothing else it might alert centres to potential problems. The spelling of some words is a perennial problem – Caesar, Emperor, Britannia, Mediterranean are typical examples.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553