

GCE

Classics: Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 H442**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H042**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

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	4
F392 Roman History from original sources	8
F393 Greek History: conflict and culture	14
F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power	18

F391 Greek History from original sources

General Comments:

Once again this year there have been a range of very good responses which showed detailed knowledge of both the prescribed and other sources. The best answers were able to demonstrate a very good understanding of the prescribed sources, using them intelligently to address the demands of the questions. Weaker candidates were able to show good recall of detail, even if at times the material was used uncritically or was not made relevant to the question.

Evaluation of sources remains a critical aspect of this paper. All too often this is presented in a rather general form, with little sense of the context of the specific material in mind, but examiners were pleased to see that stronger candidates were well able to use a wide range of material very effectively in context to support their argument. Weaker responses still too often rely on general evaluation paragraphs, often placed at the end of an answer, often repeated in different parts of the paper. This approach is unlikely to attract high marks.

Most candidates were able to deal very effectively with the (a) question, though for some reason there were a number of candidates who over develop the discussion in response to this question and either evaluated the source or included material from elsewhere. The (b) question remains rather challenging for some, and there were a few this year who made explicit use of the passage in this question, in spite of the explicit instruction to use 'other sources'.

On longer questions, there are still too many candidates who write without conveying an understanding of change over time, something critical for success at A2. However a large number of candidates were able to draw on a wide range of examples across the period studied and use information and sources in an effective way.

Option 3 (Sparta) remains by far the most popular topic on the paper, though there was a sizeable number of candidates for the other two. Two of the essay questions (Question 8 and Question 12) proved significantly less popular than the alternatives; candidates may have found these questions more demanding, or may have felt that the alternatives were much more approachable.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

This proved quite a popular question. The Old Oligarch is quite a challenging text, but the strongest candidates were able to deal with the detail effectively. Weaker responses stumbled over the significance of 'good' and 'bad' in this passage, and there was some confusion over the reference to slaves and metics in the second paragraph. In the (b) question, not all answers were sufficiently focused on the issue of participation (some confused 'participation' with 'power'), and while some included evaluation (which was not required), this was often rather perfunctory and unhelpful. In the final (c) question, examiners were looking for a discussion of 'benefit', but only the best answers actually responded well to this. Answers were often rather general and unfocused.

Question No. 2

Fewer candidates selected this question. The best answers were able to draw a range of detail out of the passage for (a). While candidates were able to draw on a range of examples for (b), not all of these could easily be used to show politicians controlling the assembly, and this

resulted in some rather convoluted argument. There were some good answers to the (c) question; many candidates used Pericles and Cleon to illustrate different points, with some good supporting use of Thucydides. However, in a few cases, it was clear that candidates were not entirely sure what rhetoric was, though the best answers were able to use the passage ('rhetoric as a sweetener') to good effect.

Question No. 3

This was less popular than Question 4. Weaker answers just described the democratic system rather than showing what the Athenians thought about it. The very best answers were able to make effective use of Pericles' *Funeral Speech* as recorded by Thucydides, though candidates as a whole were split on Thucydides' attitude towards the democratic system. Relatively few candidates commented on the less than positive attitude towards the democratic system found in the majority of our sources. Stronger answers often made very good use of the plays of Aristophanes and the *Old Oligarch*.

Question No. 4

This proved a very popular question. Weaker responses tended to rely on summaries of those plays by Aristophanes candidates had studied, sometimes with very little analysis and limited attention to other evidence that might enable an answer to the question. Some answers discussed Aristophanes first, then dealt with other sources, producing an essay of two halves; this perhaps made it more difficult to produce an overall answer. However the best responses demonstrated a pleasing grasp of detail which was then linked to a range of other sources so that a convincing response to the issue of reliability could be developed.

Question No. 5

This was less popular than Question 6, probably because of the challenging nature of the text. There was a good range of answers to this question overall. In (a) some candidates overlooked or omitted the final paragraph; where there are a number of paragraphs, it is a good idea to select detail from each. Most candidates were able to select some good examples for (b) and link these effectively to the sources. Some candidates use the Melian dialogue, and due credit was given for this, especially where candidates were able to place events on Melos in context and relate them to Athens' other allies. Weaker responses to (c) tended to repeat the material used for (b), but stronger responses dealt effectively with 'how important'.

Question No. 6

This proved the more popular question in this section. However, not all candidates were clear about the context of this passage in the Mytilene debate, or that this was a speech by Cleon, rather than an expression of Thucydides' own views. Most candidates were able to pick out examples from this passage in the (a) sub-question. Some candidates focused entirely on Athenian military action in (b), but there were some very good answers that dealt with a range of other methods of control: e.g. *proxenoi*, officials, garrisons, cleruchies, and even control through finance and religion. There were relatively few otherwise good answers that did not mention military control at all. There were some very good responses to the (c) question, often drawing on a wide range of evidence to present a balanced account on both sides of the question. Quite a few discussed Melos as if she were an ally in revolt. There was also some misunderstanding about what exactly a cleruchy was.

Question No. 7

This question proved overwhelmingly popular with candidates for this option. Most candidates were able to discuss the original purposes of the Delian League as described by the various sources. However, because this was for most candidates a very familiar topic, in a few cases candidates failed to set out what the original purpose or purposes were, assuming that this was obvious, and this sometimes resulted in a lack of clarity. The better answers discussed instances where Athens arguably departed from these original purposes, and also considered

the extent to which she continued to fulfil her obligations during the lifetime of the Delian League. Weaker answers were generally less balanced, and often showed an insecure grasp of chronology.

Question No. 8

There were very few attempts to answer this question. Examiners are therefore unable to comment on responses.

Question No. 9

Most candidates dealt very effectively with (a), though there were some misunderstandings of the passage ('all over Lacedaemon'). A number failed to make use of the first paragraph, which was a pity as it dealt with a different aspect of the kings in Sparta. Almost all candidates were able to cover a range of roles of ordinary Spartans, often including both men and women, but some went on to consider the *perioikoi* and the helots (and a very few focused solely on these). The (c) question produced some very good discussion of equality in Sparta, using the passage effectively and a range of other sources. Many candidates were able to use the term *homoioi* to good advantage, and were able to relate this to aspects of Spartiate life such as the *syssitia*. There were some interesting discussions of Spartan women, and many answers also dealt effectively with the treatment of *perioikoi* and helots.

Question No. 10

Most candidates were able to make very effective use of the passage for (a). The (b) question was quite well answered, but not all answers really focused on 'relationships', in some cases as if the question were about women alone. There was much discussion of the incident involving Aristagoras between Cleomenes and Gorgo recorded by Herodotus to show that women's opinions were respected, though this incident was usually taken at face value. There were some excellent discussions of Spartan marriage customs which clearly had caught the imagination of some candidates. It was good to see Herodotus' story about Anaxandrides' refusal to divorce his wife used to illustrate the importance of the relationship between men and women. Examiners did not expect candidates to go into great detail about other Greek states in the (c) question, and the majority of candidates were able to pick out a range of examples where Sparta was different. Some weaker responses lost sight of the question in the attempt to cover all the details of, for example, the education system, sometimes without referring to any sources at all. However the majority of candidates were able to select a range of examples and make effective use of the sources studied. The best answers highlighted issues with the reliability of the sources and the Spartan mirage in some depth. A very few otherwise excellent answers were allowed to become overlong, with a consequent impact on the essay. It is also worth commenting on Aristophanes *Lysistrata*: a small number of candidates appeared to take the source at face value as a reflection of life in Sparta and in Greece.

Question No. 11

This proved extremely popular question. However, although the majority of candidates were well able to talk about the *helots*, some answers betrayed uncertainty over what 'Messenia' or 'the Messenia' was. There was some excellent discussion in answer to this question with many good examples drawn from a range of sources. The majority of answers did mention the helot revolt of 464 BC, though not all were able to date this, and quite a few did not explain the background relating to the revolt of Thasos and were not clear about the consequences of the worsening of the relationship between Athens and Sparta after this. Stronger answers were able to give examples of helots helping the Spartans, mainly in the military sphere; discussion of events on Sphacteria (where helots were involved in attempts to get food to the stranded Spartans) was less common. Weaker responses tended to focus solely on the negative effects of the helots. Many candidates were aware of the fact that one king remained in Sparta in the fifth century during a campaign, without an understanding of the actual context of that decision as given by Herodotus, and often presented an assumption that this was because of the helot

threat as if this were commented on in the sources. A similar issue arose in discussion of Cleomenes' meeting with Aristagoras and Sparta's reluctance to commit forces to the defence of Greece against the Persians both in 490 and in 480–79 BC. There were some interesting discussions of Brasidas's northern expedition during the Archidamian War and Plutarch's account of the *kryptaea*.

Question No. 12

This proved a much less popular question. There were a number of very good answers, though in some cases at least the failure to define what 'the challenges facing the Greek world' were meant that there was a lack of clarity about the argument. Those who did identify challenges tended to pick things that affected the Spartans in particular, such as the decreasing numbers of Spartiates, problems with the helots, and resentment at the growing power of Athens. Very few highlighted Persia as a challenge, even though the Persian Wars were mentioned in the question.

F392 Roman History from original sources

General Comments:

This year the majority of candidates responded appropriately to the questions set and showed clear knowledge and understanding of aspects of their option within the time allowed. Misattributions were more common than previous years (especially in Roman Britain) but thankfully the stock paragraph of evaluation featured less than last year. To reiterate: centres must be aware that very little credit whatsoever will be given to statements such as 'Suetonius is a gossip' or 'Tacitus hates emperors'. Equally there is little point in condemning an author just because he was 'non-contemporary'. Evidence should be evaluated when there is a clear issue of reliability. Evaluating authors' opinions rather than established fact is more likely to lend itself to a coherent argument.

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

The context questions, on the whole, were well done by the majority of candidates. The passages seemed familiar to the candidates and were mined for relevant support in Qa and Qc. Candidates must show understanding of the question in Qa and not just simply rewrite the passage in the candidate's own words. Qa responses seemed appropriate in length although literary material was mined with much more success than the numismatic evidence in Q10.

Qb requires a detailed use of sources to answer the questions supported by relevant discussion. Low scoring answers made assertions or unsubstantiated claims. It is useful to be quite specific when using sources and candidates should be encouraged to learn specific references when possible or use direct quotations.

Qc should be seen as a 'mini-essay' and for marks in the highest bands, it should be evaluative and analytical. Too many candidates treated it as an extended Qb answer with a clear, developed argument often missing. To receive a mark in level 4 or 5 in AO2, answers must offer a clear response to the specific question set. It was disappointing to see candidates struggle to find material in Qc but then fail to make any use of the passage printed on the question paper.

The bullet points in the essay questions are there to give guidance to candidates on how they should approach an essay; in a sense, they simply remind candidates to structure their answers in terms of the assessment objectives and to include evaluation. They are not essay plans. Again, generic evaluation adds little and there is still a tendency for candidates to reproduce a learnt essay rather than deal with the precise terms of the question. For example a Qc which specifically asks about the success of politicians in the Late Republic in using rhetoric cannot be abandoned to focus on bribery or violence with little attempt to cite examples from the sources where rhetoric is used effectively or ineffectively.

The number of illegible scripts has increased considerably during the life of this specification. Examiners will always strive to interpret handwriting but centres should ensure that all candidates take the time to present their answers in a way which can be read by the marker.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

Question No. 1

Q1a was overall well answered with the better responses understanding the context of the passage and that it referred to the *equites*. Many of the weaker answers thought that Cicero was in favour of equality, when he was arguing in favour of segregated seating. Most of the answer could be found in the first few lines but students must use the whole passage for maximum marks.

In Q1b the better responses focused on methods which were designed to win support of the lower classes and specifically named them. The weaker answers discussed methods in general, with many generic paragraphs on *amicitia* and oratory (which could be made relevant with specific reference to the lower classes e.g. Cicero's use of oratory in *Pro Sestio*). Sallust 20 was used as an example of a speech to the lower classes which is strictly untrue. In short, most answers were quite general about how politicians gained support with a significant number failing to really focus on the precise group mentioned in the question.

On the whole Q1c was answered well. The better responses examined the occasions where politicians were and were not successful using rhetoric with examples drawn from a full range of politicians not just Cicero! Weaker answers quickly deserted rhetoric (if indeed they dealt with it at all) and discussed other methods which were used to achieve political aims. The more detailed answers showed a good knowledge and understanding of the sources of which the most popular were Pompey's 'frost' after his first speech post-Mithridates (Cicero's Letters) and Cicero's *In Catilinam* speeches. Reference to *In Verrem* and *Pro Roscio* were often irrelevant where they could not be explicitly linked to how they helped Cicero achieve his political aims.

Question No. 2

The majority of answers in Q2a identified the reference 'the republic is finished' and the phrases about violence. A good number could explain something of the context of the passage regarding the triumvirate. Better answers were able to give context to the comments made by Cicero, where weaker answers relied on quotations with no explanation.

In Q2b the majority of candidates were able to cite a wide range of examples of violence in the Republic - the better answers also pointed out violence as used by the state, such as the execution of the conspirators. Popular sources used were Cicero's letters on Clodius and his threatening gangs in the Senate and Pompey's reference to sword and shield (Plutarch). Some students gave detailed explanations of the violence with Milo and Clodius but were not able to achieve high marks due to a lack of sources as is invited by 'what can we learn from other sources....'. A significant number of answers included the arrest of Cato as an example of violence.

In Q2c many answers to this question tended to be quite general about the actions of the triumvirate. The better answers really analysed the power struggle between the Senate and triumvirate. Weaker answers gave lengthy explanations on the formation of the triumvirate without referring to sources. Reference was typically made to Caesar's achievement of winning the consulship; the Senate's winning of the consulship with Bibulus; how the triumvirate intimidated Bibulus into no longer attending the Senate; Clodius' gangs.

Question No. 3

The better answers covered what the Letters tell us and then gave examples from other sources of problems not covered in Cicero's Letters. Better answers were also able to identify which letter they were referring to and showed understanding of the context of the letter. Weaker answers could not differentiate between the letters, or in some cases, discussed the problems in a generic manner and referred to them being in the Letters, which in some cases, notably the Catilinarian Conspiracy, they were not (unless referring to Letter 7). The majority of answers showed a detailed knowledge of their content, but not all really focused on what they say about the problems of the late Republic.

Question No. 4

This question was more popular than Q3, with most responses quite detailed about what the sources say about Cicero's life. The better answers gave an overview of Cicero's political achievements from across his career and consistently were able to show that they were political. Common downfalls were reference to court cases without showing how they were political achievements; focusing solely on the Catilinarian Conspiracy; discussing events rather than achievements, e.g. Cicero's exile. The best answers focused on discussing the presentation of these achievements in the sources, which many answers sadly did not do, despite being invited to by the second bullet point. A strong way to answer this question was to outline the achievement and reference in the source; explain how the achievement was presented in the sources; evaluate how reliable the source is. A common issue was too much description of the achievement without referring to its presentation in the source.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

Question No. 5

Answers to Q5a were generally very good. Most candidates selected the majority of relevant parts of the passage, with hardly any irrelevance. Many candidates successfully contrasted traditions Augustus renewed or upheld with things he changed, such as the naming of the month Sextilis. The majority of answers were able to point out Augustus's mixed attitude towards Roman traditions.

Answers to Q5b usually contained a good amount of detail about things Augustus did. However, few really focused on the idea of reorganisation. In the best cases candidates gave examples of changes to the Senate, army, religious life of Rome and the administration of the city of Rome. The Res Gestae and Suetonius were the most used sources.

Q5c was generally answered well. Most detail was given to the lives of the lower classes through grain, money and games. Most had a range and included changes in the Senate, with some mentioning the promotion of some equestrian families. A significant number talked about those outside Rome without credit. Many answers focused on how Augustus improved life for all, i.e. his methods, but the better answers assessed how successful he was. There was discussion to the marriage laws in many answers. However, analysis as to why this improved life for inhabitants wasn't always very convincing. Evaluation was often stock with obvious opportunities for pertinent evaluative comments missed such as how we could ever know much about the lower classes when the sources all come from the upper echelons of society. Surprisingly, there was little use made of the passage which represented a missed opportunity to give further examples of how Augustus improved life for the inhabitants of Rome.

Question No. 6

Although many candidates in Q6a did not show a fully secure understanding of the language and context of the poem, many were able to select some of the key phrases. Most answers discussed the prosperity brought by Augustus and many identified the reference to military success. There was a good understanding of the support that Augustus had from the Gods.

Q6b offered very detailed answers in the main. A significant number of responses mentioned conflicts, such as Philippi and against Sextus, in the context of foreign wars, which were not permitted under the precise terms of the question. Most answers were focused on the appropriate sources with much use of the *Res Gestae* and the Crocodile Coin (celebrating the conquest of Egypt). Many answers recalled many of Augustus's foreign campaigns but these were not always supported by the sources and sometimes just appeared as a list. Many answers were often very 'Actium heavy' and often neglected to mention other campaigns. There was some good discussion about campaigns in the Alps and how Augustus received credit for Tiberius and Drusus' victory as supreme commander. The Varian Disaster can hardly be considered an achievement!

It was pleasing to see the way in which centres have clearly spent a greater amount of time focusing on both the poets and the context in which they worked. In many responses for Q6c there was a clear understanding of Maecenas and his role in commissioning the work of men like Horace and Virgil. Unfortunately, some candidates failed to link their examples back to the central issue of Augustus having the support of the Gods. Ovid, Propertius, Horace and Virgil were all regularly mentioned but again bizarrely some candidates chose not to make use of the poem on the page!

Question No. 7

Most candidates in Q7 were able to provide some specific evidence of how successful Augustus was in dealing with opposition during his reign. However, whilst they provided good examples of opposition (e.g. Seneca's account of Cinna) they often failed to consider the central question of how successful Augustus actually was at dealing with this opposition. Often, they were distracted by stock evaluation citing the limitation of the sources (e.g. Tacitus didn't like emperors!) without offering an overall judgement on Augustus's successes. This approach limited the overall coherence of these responses. Better candidates integrated evaluation alongside their evidence but maintained a genuine focus on the question throughout their responses. Many answers took 'opposition' to mean military opposition i.e. against foreign enemies and the many campaigns Augustus had been engaged in which received limited credit. Many knew details of Lepidus, Rufus, Caepio and Murena and Cinna. Others tried vainly to argue that the proscriptions of the 30s BC by the 2nd Triumvirate and the Battle of Actium were instances of Augustus effectively crushing opposition. Candidates were expected to know that Augustus' reign begins, at earliest, in 31BC, after Actium.

Question No. 8

The best responses to Q8 followed a chronological approach which allowed these candidates to demonstrate not just a thorough knowledge of the ancient sources but the nuances of individual events e.g. The First Settlement. Less successful responses were dominated by a central event - generally Actium. Disappointingly, many answers lacked specific detail about events, especially those after 27 BC, and few fully addressed the issue of how reliable, beyond general evaluative statements about the writers. Nevertheless, there were many good responses to this question. It is worth noting that candidates that took the time to plan their essay before writing were often more successful than those that did not.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

Question No. 9

Q9a was generally well done with the majority of answers selecting Agricola's qualities from a very familiar passage.

Few students answered Q9b with material in the obvious chronological order i.e. Wales, the lowlands, Mons Graupius. In the main, candidates did not show enough detail of Agricola's victories. Some knew of the Ordovices (who were often called 'the Silures'), fewer of Mona, most of Mons Graupius (but with surprisingly limited detail) and hardly any of the other victories in the North or in Scotland. The better answers selected three or four specific military victories as recorded by Tacitus with development and detail of what we can learn.

Q9c was a very straightforward question with the majority of answers focused on the reliability of Tacitus. Occasionally, answers focused almost solely on this aspect, largely neglecting detail from Tacitus of Agricola's specific achievements. The best answers pointed very effectively to Romanisation and buildings as well as administration and military victories. Some excellent answers were seen.

Question No. 10

Q10a was well done, with the majority of candidates selecting appropriately the disadvantages of occupying Britain from the passage.

There are many views of Britain and the Britons in the set sources and some candidates were able to recall these in detail in Q10b. The most popular sources were Caesar and other parts of Strabo, while some candidates used Suetonius and Horace in addition. Very few students went beyond the *terminus ante quem* of AD43. Views included ethnography, topography and mineral wealth.

The better responses in Q10c discussed political glory, wealth and resources and were able to cite and evaluate individual examples from the sources. Often candidates pointed to lack of benefits, despite this being not what the question was asking. Most answers were descriptive in giving a list of those who wanted to invade (Caesar, Augustus, Caligula and Claudius) and discussing why. Some chose to give a list of materials and wealth which Britain offered; either approaches were fine so long as they were underpinned with information from the sources and focused on the idea of benefits for invading.

Question No. 11

Q11 was a very popular choice with some excellent answers which were able to discuss the many possible factors which may have caused the Boudiccan Rebellion. Often, factual knowledge was rather disappointing, however, with few answers able to go beyond the flogging of Boudicca and the rape of her daughters. Few answers discussed the detail of Boudicca's speeches in Dio and Tacitus – but those that did evaluated this material impressively. Some but not the majority mentioned underlying animosity caused by the uprising in AD 47 and showed clear understanding of issues which may have incited the Trinovantes to rebel (the *colonia* at Colchester and the erection of the Temple of Claudius as a 'citadel of eternal domination'). There was often serious misattribution between Dio's account and Tacitus which affected the subsequent attempts to evaluate. As seems commonplace with essays on the events of AD 60, some candidates chose to give a blow by blow narrative of the entire rebellion which was clearly outside the scope of this question.

Question No. 12

Q12 was far less popular than Q11 but was often well done. Many theories were put forward as to the effectiveness of Hadrian's frontier. SHA and hypotheses based on the physical features of the Wall were used to discuss theories as to its possible purpose. Those who tried to shoe-horn the Vindolanda tablets into this question did not seem too aware that these date from over 20 years before the wall was even begun; as stated so often, chronology is so important in Roman History.

F393 Greek History: conflict and culture

General

Over-all there was very little difference in performance from candidates' this year compared with previous years. There were, as ever, candidates who failed to make adequate use of sources, and those who resolutely refused to relate their evaluation of the sources to the question at hand. Equally, there were outstanding answers, which made full use of a wide range of appropriate sources, and argued cogently in response to the question set. As a general comment, candidates would be well advised to ensure that they know what the basic terms in the specification mean – for example, political ideologies in Option 2. This would help them to consider and develop the significance of the key concepts in this specification.

Question Specific

Question 1

For some reason very few candidates answered the question directly and discussed how useful Herodotus actually is, but rather just gave an outline of the Ionian revolt and then dealt with why Darius invaded. A moderate number of candidates ignored the 490BC date and discussed Xerxes' invasion. The best answers appreciated that Herodotus actually does give us a lot on information but not in an ordered or coherent way, and that clearly without him we would know almost nothing: they referred in detail to the bedroom scene with Atossa, Athens giving earth and water in c.507, Athens and Sparta killing the envoys in 491, the agitation of Hippias, the failure of Mardonius' expedition in 492 and of course the Ionian revolt and the initial failure of the Persians to incorporate Naxos into its empire. The better answers then used Persian sources such as the Behistun inscription to reinforce the image of Persian kings which Herodotus portrays. However very few candidates could actually recall the detail of the Behistun inscription and evaluate it properly – equally only a few candidates appreciated that by 490 Darius really had no need to secure his rule or prove himself with further conquest.

Question 2

This question was a golden opportunity for candidates to show off their knowledge of what Herodotus writes but very few did this - too many erred on the side of a general discussion about Herodotus as a historian and the nature of history and did not make enough references to what he actually wrote. The best answers gave a balanced appreciation giving examples of historical facts and research e.g. the battle tactics used at Marathon, thinning the centre of the phalanx and then the fanciful stories e.g. the appearance of a phantom and the man going blind at Marathon. Reference to Herodotus own self-evaluation in his prologue was very useful and his comment that he records everything but is not bound to believe it. Better candidates discussed why references to divine intervention etc were perfectly acceptable in the ancient world and therefore did not make Herodotus a story teller by the standards of his own day. They also appreciated how little we would know if Herodotus' work had not survived. In general, the references to Herodotus were rather too narrow. It is also important for a question like this that candidates think carefully about what it is asking – a sensible approach to this would be to define their terms, and then use the evidence which they have to follow through on these terms.

Question 3

Candidates often struggled to get to grips with this question, especially in terms of appreciating who the Greeks were and how the sources actually portray strength and weakness. The best answers discussed the fact that more Greeks fought for the Persians than against them which suggested that medising Greeks saw the Persians as stronger; they also appreciated that views

changed over time e.g. the Athenians were the first Greeks to face the Persians without flinching at Marathon but post Eurymedon you have the image on the Eurymedon vase. The best answers therefore did cover the whole period down to 449. They also appreciated the inconsistency of Herodotus who at times portrays the Persians as being strong and powerful but at others as falling apart under a Greek onslaught - comparison of the strengths and weaknesses of individual leaders was effective e.g. Xerxes compared to Themistocles especially in terms of choices made at Salamis.

Question 4

The best answers covered the whole period down to 449 seeing the Persian invasions as a catalyst for Athenian sea power, the Delian League and eventually the Athenian Empire. They also appreciated that there were short term and long term impacts e.g. Athens being burnt to the ground but recovering to create her own empire. The better answers also appreciated that the Greek world was split between medisers and those who fought back; that there was a temporarily greater unity between some Greek states but it did not last for long. Comparison between the destruction of Miletus after the Ionian revolt and the introduction of democracies and new tax levels for other Ionian cities was effective; also an appreciation that some things really did not change in the long run.

Question 5

This question was by far the most popular in option 2. Many candidates effectively brought in related factors (such as Sparta's allies - Corinth and Megara especially) and made this relevant to the question. Stronger answers broadened out conflict from Sparta/Athens to explore Athens relationship with her own allies and stasis across Greece. Candidates may find it helpful to break down the word "conflict" in class time - perhaps define battle, war, campaign and maybe consider what non-military forms of conflict we cover. Conflict certainly shouldn't just cover the Peloponnesian War (or "The War" as many candidates refer to it). Given the above there was the usual tendency to focus evidence on the period 435-431 for this question which made "range" quite an issue for AO1. There seemed to be a lot of confusion between Themistocles' rebuilding of the city walls and Pericles' building of the long walls. This caused a few issues of clarity. It also meant that a lot of candidates (more than usual) spent quite a large proportion of their answers exploring an event that occurred much earlier than the 460 start to the specification. As usual there were a few candidates who created the logical issue of arguing that fighting causes conflict and therefore focused on key conflicts rather than their causes.

Question 6

This question was the least popular within this option, and tended to be divided between the very able/confident and those with little knowledge. There were a few really high quality answers with considered, relevant and precise discussion of reliability. As usual the candidates' main issue seemed to be being unsure about what precise knowledge they could/should include - resulting in the inclusion of little knowledge. It would also be good in a question like this for candidates to think more broadly than Thucydides, and to use their knowledge of a range of sources. Some candidates did this, but all too often fell into a narrative rather than evaluated account of the sources chosen.

Question 7

Candidates tended to either narrate the changes of leadership/personality in Athens (often very well referenced) or the changes in conflict in Greece, but rarely link the two firmly together. However candidates who managed to link the two elements of the question produced some thought provoking answers. Favourite individuals were Pericles and Alcibiades, with some Cleon. Often individuals were well chosen but not used to answer the question. Many candidates missed the opportunities offered by the authors on this topic to really engage with the reliability

of our sources on individuals. A range of abilities attempted this with a matching range of results. Seemed to allow candidates to really get their teeth into a topic with which they felt confident. Some candidates seemed to confuse "effects" with impact of conflict and answered a very different question, but these were rare; there was a tendency to claim that Lysander was central to the Treaty of Miletus.

Question 8

There were few (accurate) descriptions of oligarchy and democracy. Surprisingly few candidates seem to know what "political ideology" meant. There was a strong tendency to ignore the question and talk about their favourite cause of conflict. A few candidates made excellent points about the links between democracy, empire and hawkish behaviour in Athens.

Question 9

This question was well handled by the more able candidates, but there were considerably numbers who seemed to want to turn it into a question about Socrates, and then rehearse all their (often limited) knowledge on this interesting character. The phrase 'adequate explanation' in the question was that that well addressed in many answers. Candidates should also be careful in dealing with a question like this to ensure that their accurately evaluate and use effectively the sources which are available.

Question 10

The challenge with this question was to create more than a list of roles and duties for both slaves and metics. Some candidates managed this with excellent explanations of the contributions which metics, for example, made to the religious life of Athens. Some took contribution very literally, and focused on the work which these individuals did, using this as a contribution in an economic sense. For many, the challenge with this question was to make use to the sources effectively: for some the *Old Oligarch* appeared to be almost the only source, whilst others managed to broaden out and use both tragedy and Thucydides, not to mention art work. Many of the best answers offered a comparison with the opportunities available for citizens.

Question 11

This question was well answered by some candidates, who brought together substantial knowledge of a range of different plays, both tragedy and comedy. As always, there were those who felt that simply narrating the events of two chosen plays would be adequate. Nevertheless, there were some excellent attempts to look at the idea of Greek society in drama, and to draw appropriate conclusions. All too often, however, candidates failed to notice that the idea was to use drama as a means of looking at society – this was not, really, a question about the theatre – it was about using the theatre as a source to study society. The most successful responses grasped this idea, and used it effectively, whilst also questioning what was meant by 'Greek society'.

Question 12

As in question 11, there is a tendency for candidates to recall in a somewhat sketchy manner a range of information about the architecture of this period, with some added comments on the sculpture. The focus, however, of the question was on the contribution of that architecture of the religious lives of people in Athens. The strongest answers had displayed a good understanding of the limitations of our understanding of this topic, and of the different roles of the various buildings and sanctuaries. Some candidates chose to broaden their answers, and discuss religion more widely, using this as a context for their critical appreciation of the architecture.

Such an approach had much to commend it, but was by no means the only route to a successful response.

F394 Roman History: the use and abuse of power

General Comments:

The Examiners again recognise the quality of the teaching in Centres. This is displayed in the general standard of the responses by candidates.

The seriousness of illegibility is apparent and the problem has worsened. Candidates need to realise that assessors can only mark what they can read. Writing down the margin is not the best way to add a new thought, especially now that marking is on line and not on a paper script. It is impossible to read and the candidates suffer.

The responses often fail to address the terms of the question especially where the terms included 'evidence' or 'sources'; some responses simply supplied all the knowledge the candidate had and 'dumped' it onto the response. This affects both AOs. Some of the stronger essays tackled the terms of the question from the outset in the introduction, and even gave some sense of what the main body of the answer would discuss. It is really good to see some candidates presenting their overall judgement in the introduction (perhaps with a few brief examples), balancing this judgement in the conclusion.

Evaluation of the evidence continues to improve. But there are still some, often weak, evaluations either tacked on to the end of an essay, or positioned at the end of a paragraph without any connection made to the specifics of the argument / quotation that preceded it. Quotations from texts need to be relevant to the issue and the question. It is important to be precise about material evidence: coins or inscriptions should be given their contexts and description. Out of context evidence is often unhelpful. Where the candidate has no idea of the context, and knows only the quote, never having read the author to any extent, the interpretation suffers. General statements about sources do not help the judgments or the interpretations which are the foundation of clear arguments. Saying a source is either 'subjective' or 'objective' without further explanation about why and how that is significant does not count as good evaluation.

Sometimes one more sentence is needed to improve the quality of candidates' analyses for AO2 - we need more than a statement using the terms of the question, but instead a more detailed explanation of why the candidate's argument is compelling.

Good analysis provides a series of events where the chronology is clearly understood. Accurate chronology can help the candidate attempting to explain change within a period. Candidates must also be reminded to stay within the period unless they can indicate events outside have a bearing on their analysis of the set period. Some responses tend towards lengthy narrative, often where the extended detail is really not the issue.

Option 1

Question 4 was more popular than Questions 2 and 3 with Q.1 being the least popular. Better candidates focus on the concepts e.g. Q2 'inevitable', or Q 3 'role' influence' and 'decline'. There was adequate coverage of the latter part of the period but the detailed knowledge of the latter part of the period is less secure. A number still stop at 49 BC, and some even at 59 BC. Better responses provided precise references to the sources rather than 'Plutarch tells us' with no explanation of which 'Life' was meant. There was a full range of sources. Responses remained within the period for the most part but a number did lack a sufficient range.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

Responses should provide details of issues and events and the accounts of these in Cicero's letters and speeches and other sources. Responses should show coverage of the period but answers will use well-selected examples appropriate to the question. Responses should show detail of various events and issue with reference to these sources. Responses should consider how far the candidate agrees with the statement. The analysis should offer an argument concerning the reliability of Cicero's accounts of specific events and issues and make comparisons with other sources of evidence. The responses should deal with the issue of 'only' in the question and form an argument in answer to this issue in the conclusion.

The better responses to this question went beyond simply considering Cicero's works as a whole, and explored the reliability of the different sorts of materials we have from Cicero (speeches to the Senate, law courts and people; letters; philosophical works). Weaker responses failed to focus enough on Cicero, and were not able to provide enough specific information from other sources for comparison. There were some very general responses which outlined Cicero's corpus without a single specific reference. Some weak responses gave biographical outlines of authors not sources. A number were aware only of a few examples of his work and not always in the correct context. Comparison with other sources was often limited to one other source (usually Plutarch). This question also prompted a lot of very generic evaluation of sources - 'he was alive at the time, so he was reliable', 'he wrote centuries later, so was unreliable' and so on.

Question 2

Responses should offer detailed information on a range conflicts between politicians. Responses should consider some of the contexts for conflicts when discussing '*inevitable*'. Responses should analyse the conflicts, their causes and course, in terms of the question. There should be some discussion on 'inevitable', and some understanding of how this applies to historical events. There should be a focus on 'to what extent' in the argument and a conclusion dealing with this aspect. The support from the sources should be treated critically in relation to the question.

Responses generally produced a good range, often reaching Octavian and Antony but including a number of different ones, both military and political, for example Clodius and Milo, and Crassus and Pompey. This is one of the questions where the terms of the question seemed to get a little lost in responses. Conflicts were often described in quite limited detail, and then the 'inevitable' side of the question wasn't really addressed. The most common responses were that politicians had different viewpoints and were therefore highly likely to clash for example Cicero and Catiline (or commonly *Cataline*). Some very strong responses considered the general condition of the Republic following Sulla's reforms, and the effect which greater competition for political offices had on conflicts. Others used the source material to develop the aims and ambitions of individuals and how this led to conflict. Some questioned the concept of 'inevitability' in history and a few considered the ways politicians worked together rather than in conflict.

Question 3

Responses should use a range of sources relating to the Senate's role and influence covering a reasonable selection from the period. Responses should include various roles in legislation, finance, military commands and the armies, control over executive officers, courts and constitutional issues. Responses need deal with some aspects of the possible changes in influence and role. Responses should focus on the usefulness of the evidence on the Senate and its role during the period; there should be some discussion of its influence and how far the

sources provide evidence for a decline. There should be some assessment of the extent of decline where it occurs and the argument should develop the issue to some extent.

This was a popular question. There were some responses that simply gave some sort of narrative of the period (with occasional nods in the direction of 'decline') as a way of dealing with the question. Also, some responses discussed a series of individuals (Sulla, Pompey, Caesar and sometimes Octavian) who impacted upon the Senate. The better responses worked hard to show evidence of the Senate trying to exert its authority over powerful individuals, either with success or failure. Good responses realised that it was not a case of steady decline. Responses did not always display in detail what the senate was actually there for, and how you became a senator in the Republican period. The better responses showed a really clear balance in their argument but some failed to come to an overall judgement which affected the development of their discussion. As always, the failure to note that the question was asking about the sources as much as about the Senate affected the quality of the response. There was some lack of detail about how the Senate worked in the constitution. There also needed to be some understanding of the Senate's 'role' and this was not always clearly expressed in the responses. Better responses provided a clear statement of the role in order to assess how it declined.

Question 4

Responses should consider the actions of Sulla and their effects upon the republic; they should also consider the actions of other politicians and their effects e.g. Pompey, Caesar, Crassus, Cicero, Octavian, Antony and others. Focus should be on the role played by individuals in the fall of the Republic and not a general discussion of factor that may have brought it about. Candidates may select from a range of material but reasonable coverage of the period is expected. Responses should analyse the effects of Sulla's action and reforms on the Republic and assess how far he strengthened or weakened it in terms of meeting the challenges of the period; responses should deal with other individuals and assess the effects of their actions and compare them with those of Sulla. They should provide an argument for or against the view in the statement.

This question was the most popular, providing candidates with a chance to display their knowledge of Sulla. Unfortunately, a number had only a vague idea of the reforms, and the sources who deal with them. The tribunate was mentioned most often and the increase in the numbers in the Senate but not a great deal besides. Equally how these reforms impacted on the Republic was not always clearly developed. Responses generally gave a good account of Sulla's attempts to bolster the Senate (though not how effective they were); how his other actions set a precedent/example for other ambitious individuals to bypass the traditional Republican routes to power was a feature of most discussions but not all. Responses went through a catalogue of potential culprits – Pompey, Crassus, Clodius, Catiline, Octavian and Antony. Caesar was very popular as the villain of the piece rather than Sulla. The better responses, though, gave a clear judgement placing the blame with a particular individual, providing a good focus on the terms of the question. Better responses also made a case for the underlying issues which affected the Republic, not quite absolving the individuals of blame, and including the role of some senators (e.g. Cato) in adding to the problems of the Republic.

Option 2

The most popular question was No.7, although as in previous years the focus on 'sources' after the statement was ignored by some and barely argued by others. This was also true of Q5 but less so. Most responses displayed a knowledge of the whole period, although responses did not necessarily mention every reign while still providing a good or better response to the questions. These responses selected precise and specific instances from across the reigns to deal with the issues. There was some stereotyping of the emperors on the lines of Suetonius (who was

perhaps the most quoted source), which displayed simplistic judgements on some events and actions.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 5

Responses should offer a range of detailed examples of the Senate's role and actions under a range of emperors. This could include its powers, roles, actions, their relations with the emperors, opposition to emperors, and control by the emperors. Responses might consider the Senate under different emperors and develop the effectiveness of it at different points in the period. Responses might include opinions from sources on the Senate. Responses should assess the extent of the subservience of the Senate as portrayed in the sources. They should argue how far this affected the Senate's effectiveness in government and administration under the principate. In order to answer the question, the sources should be a focus for the argument.

The majority of responses took this as a relations or power response, and showed little evidence of direct subservience (or the opposite). The better responses moved away from very general discussions towards providing specific examples of the Senate asserting itself, or of an emperor attempting to get the Senate to make a decision (for example Tiberius' frustration with the Senate or Claudius' speech on the Gauls). Equally there were specific details of the areas where the Senate or senators were effective in a variety of roles on commissions, as decision-makers or acting out the decisions made by the emperors. As in Q3, responses often displayed an insecure understanding and knowledge of the role and functions of the Senate and individual senators during this period. Many responses did not deal with the contribution of individual senators. There was a tendency to do the 'good'/'bad' emperor narrative in the weaker responses, mostly about treatment, with a great temptation to record the worst excesses of Gaius and/or Nero (with an occasional nod towards Domitian).

Question 6

Responses should offer a range of detailed examples of the part played role by family members and friends for a range of emperors. The responses should cover the arrangements and actions for succession, and the efforts made to keep power. Responses should select a range of emperors and friends to discuss. They could include a range of examples showing how family and friends undermined the position of the emperor in discussing the 'importance' issue. Responses should assess the aspect of 'importance' in relation to the gaining and maintaining position and power by emperors. There should be analysis of the evidence regarding how far family members and friends were involved in this and the extent to which they affected the position and power of emperors.

Friends of emperors are not well known! Freedmen loomed large (as they do in Tacitus and Suetonius; Sejanus was often cited as a good and bad friend, although not always with the right emperor being occasionally confused with Seneca. However, we had few mentions of Agrippa, Burrus, Macro, Maecenas etc. In family, wives (Livia, Messalina, Agrippina) were popular, at least for gaining position and power, or coming close to losing it. There was mention also of Germanicus and Drusus. Otherwise, quite a few responses turned this into either an answer on the imperial cult, or succession. Both of these *could* be relevant, but the analysis needed to be really clear on how these are relevant discussions. There needed to be more detailed explanations of why the imperial cult helped an emperor to gain or maintain power, whether it was Augustus deifying Julius Caesar or Gaius his sister. Weaker responses simply stated Claudius did not rely on family but the Guard for his accession, without considering why the Guard chose him in the first place. Better responses reflected on relative value of the factors which gained and maintained power in order to assess the value of friends and family.

Question 7

Responses should detail a range of issues or problems in the administration and the emperors' reactions to or policies towards them. They might consider the differences between the approaches of emperors; there should be a reasonable coverage of the period; responses may also include some other factors which led to problems for Rome. Responses should deal with 'the failure of emperors to deal with Rome's problems' by analysing the effects of their actions and administration; they should assess how far they contributed to the lives of the inhabitants, and whether these made Rome 'unsafe and unrewarding'. There should be a focus on the evidence and an argument as to how far the sources support the view in the statement.

This was one of the better handled responses from this option, although there were several responses that saw this as an 'administration' question, and again didn't really concentrate on the terms of the question. The weaker responses focused entirely on the issue of 'neglect' which some stereotyping of emperors into those who did and those who did not. Better ones distinguished between the idea of 'neglect' and the question of 'unsafe' or 'unrewarding' arguing that these terms did not signify neglect. The range of examples covered buildings, entertainment, water supplies, fires, food, donatives and more. There were a number of responses which made the assertion that 'this made it safe/rewarding' with little detailed explanation about why this is a sensible judgement - again, another step was needed in most analyses. Responses which displayed a great deal of information often mentioned everything they knew about the administration of Rome, but really did not go far enough in the analysis to make sure every example was explained properly, which made the overall argument 'good' or in some cases 'partial', rather than 'thorough'. References to treason trials and persecutions making Rome unsafe for some were less effective in the argument.

Question 8

Responses should offer a range of detailed examples of the challenges and actions of emperors e.g. plots and threats, riots, disasters, opposition to policies, senatorial opposition etc. There should be reference to the use of patronage, bribery and force in dealing with challenges. Examples might be included which showed other means to exercise control and respond to challenges. Responses should assess the aspect of 'effectively' in discussing the use of patronage, bribery and force by emperors. There should be analysis of the evidence regarding how challenges were dealt with and how effectively this was done; the extent to which they used patronage, force and bribery should be assessed for some balance in the argument.

Most responses could give a good account of various 'challenges' during this period, but did not concentrate enough on the use of bribery, patronage and force. Others focussed almost exclusively on force. Weaker responses did not address the issue of the sources in the question, preferring to narrate events through the period. Some of the weaker responses failed to explain why their discussions of the use of bribery or force were related to challenges, be they real or potential challenges. Even good responses did not assess how effective the measures were consistently, making assumptions for much of the time. The most sophisticated responses dealt with a range of challenges (other than assassination attempts) and considered how the most successful emperors used a variety of solutions depending on the circumstances of the issue they were either responding to or pre-empting. Patronage was often omitted altogether either through a lack of knowledge or a lack of understanding as to what it meant. Responses usually had a range of examples and sources regarding bribery or force.

Option 3

Q.9 and Q12 were the most frequently attempted, and they allowed some reference to Boudicca (if made relevant). Material evidence is used but this was not always specific and clearly integrated into the discussion and/or analysis. Candidates often did not deal with the full range of

concepts and issues in a question: for example, in Q.9, 'the main reason' in the context of control; in Q.12, 'transformed' in both an economic and social sense; in Q.11 'consistent and coherent' in terms of policy, not just actions. Better responses were displayed an understanding of the issues with the evidence. However, there are still generic evaluation paragraphs or statements which add little to the argument.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 9

Responses should include specific examples of the army's support and the impact upon the emperor's control. Areas might include dealing with revolts, defence, campaigns, roles in administration, distribution across the empire etc. Responses might select a range of emperors and their control of the Empire, but there should be reasonable coverage of the period for a balanced discussion. Other factors may be considered in the argument on the role of the army support. Responses should address whether the army was 'the main reason' in discussing the control of the Empire. There should be analysis of the various ways in which the army supported the emperors and the impact this support had; they should assess the level of support for different emperors. Responses should analyse how far the army's support contributed towards maintenance of control.

Most responses had some knowledge and understanding of the range of activities which the army engaged in during the period. Better responses had specific instances and could support their discussion with relevant examples of crushing revolts or controlling the frontiers. Responses generally were less secure in their knowledge and examples of the role of the army in routine administration or the range of tasks undertaken. Weaker responses were limited to a couple of paragraphs on the strictly military role before developing every other means of control, of which they had more knowledge. The result was a weaker argument and analysis of the role of the army and therefore whether it was the main reason as the question asked. Better responses had a balance of material and developed the use of the evidence accordingly. There were examples from both East and West using sources which ranges from Tacitus (*Agricola* and *Annals*), Josephus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio and Pliny. There was some reference to archaeology and epigraphy in the better responses where the material was specific both in content and context.

Question 10

Responses should show factual knowledge of a range of detailed examples of the government of the Empire covering the period. Responses should detail specific examples of government, governors, procurators, other officials and administrators both central and local. In addition, there should be specific examples of improvement or lack of it. There should be reasonable coverage of the period and coverage of a range of aspects of the government for a balanced discussion. Responses should address whether the quality of government improved and how far the sources support the view. There should be analysis of the various ways in which the Empire was governed and the impact these had on the provincials; they should assess the extent to which the sources allow us to assess any improvement.

This was a less popular question. Responses generally focused on the latter part of the period using Pliny and Tacitus as their evidence. If limited to this, the argument on 'improved' tended to make assumptions that administration was better towards the end. There was also an approach which identified 'bad' emperors as providing 'bad' government and the reverse with 'good' emperors. Therefore, under Nero government was bad, witness the Boudicca revolt; whereas later there were no revolts, meaning government was improved. Better responses, while arguing that revolts suggested some inadequate administration, at the same time provided evidence of good government throughout the period, even in areas where revolts occurred. Better responses

also gave specific instances of governors, procurators, soldiers etc who contributed to government well or badly. Very good responses had a good grasp of what government entailed and the personnel involved. The evaluation of Pliny and Tacitus could be very successful when tied to specific examples but often was limited to paragraph on the author rather than the text.

Question 11

Responses should include a range of policies from emperors; examples of the activities of emperors and the governors should be used to identify policies. Responses may compare and contrast the approaches and policies of different emperors. Responses need not cover all the emperors of the period but must provide examples from across the period. Not all events/activity on each frontier need be addressed for higher levels; the focus should be on policies rather than actions. Responses should employ the factual material and sources to identify policies. They should consider how consistent and coherent they are between different emperors and different parts of the period. Responses should have some assessment of both frontiers for higher levels. Responses should address 'to what extent'. Responses may consider the consistency of policies between emperors but also the consistency within the reigns of individual emperors.

Fewer candidates chose this question and the responses varied. Better responses had knowledge of both frontiers, and the areas they covered. They were able to use the evidence from literary and material sources to characterise the actions and events on the frontiers in terms of policy. Better responses also were aware that individual emperors may change their approach and policy towards a particular frontier in the light of events. Equally responses dealt with different policies towards the two frontiers such as under Nero or Domitian the differing policies towards the North and the East and even with the Northern frontier in relation to Britain and the Danube. Good responses differentiated between pro-active and re-active emperors in their approach to the issues. Weaker responses were unsure as to the concept of 'frontier' and discussed Spain or Egypt or seemed to think the whole of Gaul was the frontier. Revolts were routinely placed on the frontiers (Tacfarinas in Africa being used in a number of responses). There was occasional mention of fortification on the frontiers under Agricola in Britain and later, or in Germany.

Question 12

Responses should provide detailed examples of the source material on the economic and social aspects of provincials' lives; ways in which the lives may or may not have been transformed should be included e.g. economic, prosperity, employment, agriculture. Transport, trade, finance, citizenship, education, religion, buildings, amenities for all sections of societies. Responses may compare and contrast the different parts of the Empire in the sources. Responses need not cover all the provinces or provincials of the period but must provide examples from across the period. Responses should consider the extent to which the sources are supporting the view in the statement. There should be some discussion concerning the extent of 'transformation'.

Both economic and social aspects should be covered. There should be a balanced argument regarding the nature of the sources and their reliability leading to some conclusions in answer to the question.

This was a popular question. There was a tendency to treat this as an opportunity to offer the 'Romanisation' essay, ignoring the precise terms of the question, especially 'transformed'. Equally the issue of sources and the limitations of them was only explored to any degree in the better responses. Weaker ones supplied a range of examples where Roman occupation affected the province in areas such as religion, trade, language, infrastructure, entertainment and so on. However, they did not go on to argue the extent of transformation or how far the sources could or did support the view. Better responses took each piece of evidence and discussed its value in terms of the question, whether it showed widespread or limited effects, or dealt with elites but

not the vast body of provincials. Better responses also dealt with the differences in East and West, arguing that transformation was unlikely in the East but possible in the West. Weaker responses also failed to deal with both 'economic and social'. Tacitus' *Agricola* was commonly used but only better responses dealt with the claims by using other evidence. Pliny *Letters* were used to show transformation in the building of aqueducts or theatres without realising that The Greek East had had these before the Romans came. There was generally better use of the imperial cult as a feature of transformation. Good responses were also aware of the evidence of the maintenance of local traditions.

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

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

© OCR 2017

