

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

ANCIENT HISTORY

H407

For first teaching in 2017

H407/21 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 21 series overview	4
Section A overview	6
Question 1*	6
Question 2*	9
Question 3	11
Section B overview	14
Question 4	14
Question 5*	15
Question 6*	16

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers are also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 21 series overview

Having had two years in which candidates did not sit examinations on this specification, there was some concern about how candidates would manage the structure, timings and techniques required to perform well. The specification requires a number of skills in using analysing, and evaluating their knowledge and information of the historical periods, and the complex array of evidence prescribed for their study. In addition, the candidates have to master both a period and a depth study with differing demands. In general candidates performed excellently in many respects, with few clearly having difficulties.

A key element for assessment and responses in this specification is the application of ancient sources, literary or material. The integration of the evidence into the explanation or analysis or argument is the core element of good response to any question in this specification. This applies especially to the essay questions (Questions 1, 2, 5, and 6). Here candidates do well when they support their views with specific and detailed evidence in order meet the criteria of a convincing and substantiated response. In addition, in reaching judgements, candidates should try to avoid assertions in favour of developing their conclusions thoroughly. Besides, candidates will do well when they present an array of accurate and detailed knowledge, displaying understanding of the topic and historical context. Candidates are having to exhibit these complex skills in a timed environment in the face of questions which are new to them. It was, therefore, pleasing to see so many candidates rising to the challenges in a difficult year. All credit is due to them and their teachers for their hard work and commitment, displayed at all levels in the series.

The candidates found the questions accessible. Some either misunderstood the focus of the question or misread what the question was about.

The great majority had clearly studied the prescribed sources. Candidates used their knowledge to display a consistent engagement with them. Candidates did less well where they recorded no ancient sources within the response; this is clearly a difficulty in assessment where the majority of marks for a question are for the use of sources. Even in Question 3 (Modern interpretation), the analysis needs to be substantiated with knowledge, and sources are often the means of doing this.

Good responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding of at least part of the period and the depth study; errors were made and misconceptions arose given the strictures of the examination. There were few less successful responses which displayed quite limited knowledge, and only partial understanding of some aspect of the study.

A selection of evidence, which is accurate and precisely used, is more effective than a narrative preceded by 'Tacitus tells us'. The evidence forms the basis of what will be a well-developed, convincing judgement. The majority of answers had this in parts of responses, where a really thoughtful point was developed, supported and led to a sound conclusion. Candidates will do well if they try to be consistent throughout most of a response for the highest levels.

Candidates do less well where assertion replaces argument. A good piece of evidence was followed by 'this shows that...' without an attempt to explain how we get from the evidence to the conclusion.

Candidates performed well when the explanation was the focus of the response. Where candidates were clear in their analysis of the issue and marshalled their argument, supported by the evidence and knowledge, then a good or better response resulted. The vast majority of responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the text. This suggested they had engaged with the material and had understood the issues in both the period and depth study.

The majority of good responses formed most of their judgements on the evidence producing convincing, and at times thorough, explanations.

Less successful responses had generalised factual knowledge, inaccurate chronology, general source references ('Suetonius tells us', 'According to Plutarch'), confusion between emperors and simple inaccuracies. More serious were those which did not offer any sources or very few sources. There were the mis-attributions between Tacitus and Suetonius, or Plutarch and Suetonius; the Res Gestae text has grown considerably in content during this examination with a number of new additions notably his views on the Imperial Cult.

Many responses made excellent evaluations of sources especially material ones, e.g. coins, inscriptions in the period.

Candidates did well when the prescribed sources were evaluated in their contexts showing how the context, genre and preconceptions of the author impacted on the reliability of the evidence. Sometimes this resulted in a disconnected paragraph on the author. This was occasionally placed at the beginning or the end of the response. For example, 'Dio was writing in the 2nd/3rd century AD, was not contemporary to events but was a senator so had access to...'. This information was not then related to the point it was meant to support. There is the paragraph which concludes that we cannot not trust the author. Yet the candidate did not seem to see that this negated the argument just presented.

There appeared to be little difference in knowledge between the period and depth studies. It was very rare to see a candidate gain high marks on one and low on the other. Timing did not seem to be an issue with again very few appearing to run out of time. When it did occur, it was with those who chose to do the two essays first leaving not enough time for the shorter Question 4. The majority of questions was answered.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a secure knowledge of the period studied • a precise and clear grasp of the chronology • selected sources focused on the specific terms of the question • prioritised the explanation in response to the terms of the question, using evidence and knowledge in support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attributed an event incorrectly to a person/group • confused the reign of one emperor with another • did not focus on the main issue of the question but offered a generalised account of the period • provided a narrative of events, not an analysis • used few or no sources.

Section A overview

Question 1 was more popular than Question 2 which required a detailed knowledge of events in the provinces. Most responses for Question 1 displayed a knowledge of the aims of the person/group discussed, and an understanding of the actions for AO1; there was a variety of sources including material evidence for AO3; the dates and agendas of authors were not always developed for the value of the evidence; most explanations and judgements were clearly expressed and led to logically reasoned judgements (AO2). The questions appeared to be accessible, with the majority of candidates seeming to understand what was required. Some responses in the essay questions were focused on events in Rome – and showed no use of evidence from the wider Empire – particularly in Question 2.

Question 3 revealed how well the candidates had engaged with the material. The responses generally analysed the interpretation thoroughly. Almost line by line they displayed relevant and well-developed evidence in assessing the opinion of the author, both in agreeing with and challenging it.

Question 1*

SECTION A: The Julio-Claudian Emperors, 31 BC–AD 68

- 1* How far does the evidence help us to understand the aims of those who tried to control the succession throughout this period?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**

The key issue in this question is the value of the evidence which details actions of those involved with the succession and their aims. Assessments of the evidence varied. Some argued that 'aims' was less well documented than actions. Many took what was in the literary and material evidence as fact of aims. Evaluation of the sources was most important, as with any question which focuses on the sources. Candidates who were secure in their knowledge of the prescribed sources were able to develop and support their analysis. Those who narrated the events of one or other individual or group were less successful in dealing with the issue of sources.

The majority of responses covered the most obvious content in answering this question. Occasionally the range across the period is limited to Augustus and Tiberius – or Augustus plus one other.

The large majority dealt with the Augustan succession, to varying degrees. Marcellus, Agrippa, Gaius and Lucius and Tiberius were mentioned but not always all of them; some jumped from Marcellus to Tiberius. Good responses noted Tacitus on the tribunicia potestas and his view of its importance in the identifying a successor. Most mentioned Augustus' means- adoption, marriage to Julia, appointed to various posts.

Not all developed the analysis to identify possible aims such as creating a dynasty or focusing on the bloodline, despite Tacitus' making this clear in *Annals* 1.3. They were aware of what he and Suetonius (and others) had to say about Livia. It was generally accepted that Augustus did not want Tiberius, although the sources on this were not detailed, or even present in some cases. The coverage of Augustus was generally very good; the explanations were less focused in a number of cases, replaced by narrative.

Some responses tried to bring in building policies in Rome and tie this into the issue of succession.

Most responses dealt with the remaining emperors but in much less detail, apart from Nero and Agrippina. The detail on Sejanus (or Sir Janos) was variable based on Tacitus with little reference to Cassius Dio. Suetonius was the main source for the succession to Gaius and Claudius. Good responses made excellent use of Josephus in both these cases, especially dealing with the motives of the Senate, the people and the Praetorian Guard. There was much analysis of Agrippina's aims, whether for her son or herself (using the coin of AD 54 as evidence).

Good responses covered the issue of aims linked to sources, tending to focus on the idea of a smooth transition as the main aim. They displayed a range of knowledge of the sources, often detailed, with accurate quotes. This was used to support the judgements and explanations in those which performed well. Good evaluation of specific examples produced well-developed judgements.

Some responses treated sources as fact rather than as support for an explanation. For example, using Tacitus/Suetonius on Livia and/or Agrippina to narrate events. There was much less of the context and how that impacts on the conclusion from them. Three or four lines of general 'evaluation' often followed with no explanation as to how the background of the author impacted on the information from the source.

Some responses showed how important it is to integrate the evaluation into the analysis as support. Naming a source before a stretch of narrative, without any detail of what they say or what the relevance is, does not add to the quality of the response.

Some responses seemed at times confused. Where this confusion was continued with a discussion which could have applied to the individual, it lessened the effectiveness of the response. For example, Agrippina and Messalina were interchangeable at times; Gaius seemed to be Claudius in places, and Nero, Gaius. A perfectly relevant reference to evidence might be affected by a mis-attribution leading to a wrong conclusion; it may be a misunderstanding of the context, again leading to an unconvincing analysis. This was true of Tacitus and Suetonius throughout.

Misconception



Suetonius was often termed a 'senator'. He was said to have a bias against emperors in support of the Senate. He was, in fact, an equestrian.

It was stated that Tiberius made no effort over succession to Gaius; in reality he did make a will (Tacitus) naming Gaius and Gemellus as heirs; the will was overturned by the Senate (Suetonius).

In a few responses, 'succession' was understood to be 'accession' or even 'success'.

Exemplar 1

	<p>The sources tell us of Claudius' wives plan to control the succession throughout this period. Tacitus tells us that his third wife Messalina tried to replace Claudius with her lover Silius. Suetonius talks of her schemes too. This evidence clearly helps us understand and see the aims of Messalina here, which are to replace someone else on the throne and have more control over succession.</p> <p>Josephus tells us that Claudius' next wife Agrippina was afraid of the the empire going to Claudius' son Britannicus instead of her own son Nero. Josephus and Suetonius blame her for having a hand in Claudius' death to control the succession and have Nero on the throne.</p> <p>The evidence the sources provide are, in my opinion, very clear in informing us of both Messalina and Agrippina's aims in controlling and influencing succession - Tacitus was a senator with experience under harsh domination so may be bias but isn't in this case. Suetonius talks a lot about Messalina's character due to her his fascination with characters as he's a biographer.</p>
--	--

		His work is backed by Tacitus here, so probably reliable. Josephus is from a Jewish background, so most clear from the other sources Roman world out of the sources. However he could be more biased than obvious as he was a freedman and friends with one of the emperors, Vespasian, son Titus.
--	--	---

The response is describing the efforts of the two wives of Claudius to control the succession. Messalina is considered first supported by Tacitus; extra support is provided by Suetonius. Neither of the sources are detailed, and do little more than establish the facts. A conclusion is drawn from these facts about her aims. The actions of Agrippina are underpinned by reference to Josephus and Suetonius. Again, they establish the facts of the situation and suggest her intentions. The candidate concludes that the sources do clearly indicate the aims of both these women. In general terms this is sound and to some extent developed from the evidence used. The discussion then continues with a general attempt to establish the reliability of the authors: Tacitus could be biased (bias) but apparently is not here – although no argument is offered – in any case Tacitus only told us what happened. With Suetonius we are not told what he says of Messalina's character, but that he is fascinated with characters. It is claimed that Suetonius is supported by Tacitus, and, therefore, he is reliable (provided that Tacitus is reliable presumably). Josephus could be biased as a friend of Titus. It is clear that the extra evaluation segments are not integrated into the analysis and are not helping the overall argument. This is that the sources help us understand the aims. The sources do not precisely tell us what the aims were- they tell us what the women did. They are not put into the context of the authors' views on women, Claudius and the politics of the times but used as fact.

Question 2*

- 2* To what extent were the emperors of this period successful in their military and political aims in the provinces?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**

Very good responses recognised that this was a question concerned with the actions and aims of emperors in the provinces not in Rome. Some of the political aims could relate to the effect actions had in Rome on the reputation of the emperors. The focus of the response needed to be on the achievements of emperors in the Empire and their success or failure.

Very good responses deployed examples from across the Empire and the time period – i.e. Tacfarinas, Britain, Armenia and the Rhine and Danube frontiers. The Nero period tended to be overlooked – but some good responses talked about Vindex.

Responses mostly discussed Augustus' victory at Actium and the acquisition of Egypt; some continued with the various activities in Gaul and Spain; they referenced the triple triumph; not all could say what it was for. Better responses added the Varus disaster; some included the events in Pannonia and Germany (with Tiberius as general). Some used the coin of Tiberius and Drusus and their successes. Sources were mainly on Actium; better responses referenced the *Res Gestae* (which has a range of information). Some mentioned the return of the Parthian Standards.

Apart from Claudius and the invasion of Britain, there was some information and evidence on the other emperors in the responses. Most knew of the mutinies in AD 14 and Germanicus' adventures in Germany (although not in any detail). Some were able to extend this with other activities, for example the Sacrovir revolt, The Frisii; Tacfarinas had more coverage. Tiberius had been a successful general himself (according to Velleius). Some stated that he took no interest in the provinces accepting Suetonius *Tib.* 41 as truth.

Gaius' expedition to Gaul and Germania, with the failed attempt at Britain received some coverage; this was sometimes marred by reference to the sources as Tacitus. Nero also was said not to be interested; some did in fact deal with the events under Corbulo in Armenia and his promotion of Tiridates. Better responses mentioned Boudicca and, of course, Vindex. Nero's interest in Greece was also sometimes developed. Claudius was covered in detail, although again Tacitus, rather than Cassius Dio, was used as the source. Good use was made of the efforts to promote his success, by reference to coins, and the Arch and achieve some political ends.

The responses varied on 'aims' and success. The better responses identified a range of aims from expansion, securing the frontiers, control of provincials and the army, rationalisation of defence, promoting the emperor, resources and the spread of the Imperial Cult and Romanisation in general. Many focused on the latter. Some unfortunately concentrated all their effort on what happened in Rome rather than the provinces. Good use was made of the Gytheion inscription, Claudius' letter to Alexandrians, the altar at Narbonne and so on. Augustus' restraint was contrasted with Gaius' aggressive promotion by using the evidence in Cassius Dio and Suetonius.

Most were able to use the closing (not opening) of the doors of Janus, suggesting peace was an aim, along with his claims in the *Res Gestae*. The settlements of 27 and 23 were well-used to suggest Augustus's aim was control. Candidates used the Cyrene edicts to good effect. They also referred to the banning of senators from Egypt as a good indication of his aims. Some candidates assessed Tiberius' aims. Most discussed Claudius' aim of promoting his military credentials and some developed his efforts to include Gauls in the Senate, as well as his view of worship in Alexandria.

Good responses very carefully selected a range of examples and organised the analysis well around these rather than trying to cover all period in a narrative. Those focused on the aims and arguing for success or failure produced the better responses. These had a clear explanation, well-supported and reasoned well.

Misconception



Tacitus as source for Gaius; this section of the *Annals* is lost.

Tiberius was uninterested in the provinces or government in general. There are a number of examples of his involvement in Rome and in the Empire; for example, we are told by Dio that he did not want excessive taxes in the provinces.

Plutarch's *Life of Augustus* no longer exists. Extant still are his *lives of Galba and Otho*.

Exemplar 2

	Success, Plutarch writes about how Claudius succeeded
	where Julius Caesar failed in conquering Britannia, winning
	him considerable favour amongst the Roman citizens.
	However Plutarch writes mostly biographies and sometimes
	romanticises / glorifies certain aspects of his writing
	for his readers, making him not completely reliable.
	Now that Claudius had a great military victory
	to his name, it gave him the freedom to pass
	more laws through the senate, such as granting
	former slaves Roman citizenship and then awarding
	them with positions in the Roman treasury and other
	higher offices. This is something he likely couldn't
	of done without his triumph in Britain.

The paragraph begins with a reference to Plutarch commenting on Claudius' invasion of Britain; while Plutarch describes Caesar's invasion, he makes no reference to Claudius. It could be Suetonius which is meant. There follows a general evaluation of Plutarch. In itself, it has little value since it does not relate to the specific information- the candidate seems to be claiming that Plutarch is romanticising Claudius' invasion and is unreliable. It is unclear if the invasion is unreliable or his success. The lack of value is compounded by the fact the evidence is mis-attributed. The passage continues to argue that the victory gave Claudius powers he did not have before, presumably as a political gain or aim. This is unclear. Apart from the damage done by not being accurate on the source and not making the evaluation relevant, the claim is questionable. It is a good example of the problems arising from this error.

Question 3

3 Read the interpretation below.

How convincing do you find Goodman's interpretation that, for the inhabitants of Imperial Rome, 'it had become a civilised place in which to live'?

You must use your knowledge of the historical period and the ancient sources you have studied to analyse and evaluate Goodman's interpretation. [20]

The interpretation gave candidates a selection of issues and points to examine. It was important that candidates dealt with what Goodman said rather than what he did not say. Responses which dealt with what he actually wrote and assessed the points with close attention to the text were clearly going to score well. Good responses supported their views with precise knowledge of the context and details of this debate.

Candidates who recognised that Goodman described a 'peaceful society' and a 'pleasanter place to live' as well as 'civilised' as in the question developed their discussion on what he meant. Good responses were able to assess the extent to which he had made a case for Rome being a civilised place by placing it in a wider context.

Most responses were very thorough in their treatment of the extract with very few discussing it as a whole without reference to any specific part. Some responses treated this as an essay on the benefits of the emperors to the Romans or improving the lives of the people of Rome.

Good responses supported their views with reference to specific knowledge of the areas covered by Goodman. These supported their view of how far they found it convincing.

It was important to set out the positives as well as the negatives. Some focused mainly on the negatives which suggested he was incorrect in his statement. As a result, the discussion pointed out that his view took no account of such events as Nero's Fire in AD 64 or Gaius' cruelty or Tiberius' trials. These responses did not mention that many positive events were happening in period 31 BC to AD 68; also, that these were far more common than the negative ones which the responses focused on. These responses, therefore, tended to be unbalanced analyses; while making valid points, the argument was one-sided

Successful responses looked at his points and examined the case with supporting material. Most referenced Augustus' buildings and his 'brick/marble' quote; better ones named the buildings and how they applied specifically to religion, water or entertainment. Claudius' projects were also well-used to support the idea of fresh water and entertainment. Better ones could name a bath built by Agrippa or Nero; good ones identified the provision of food by use of Augustus' arrangements or Claudius' port at Ostia. There was excellent detail on Claudius' arrangements by some candidates. Peace was supported by the closing of the doors of Janus or the work of the vigils.

In reference to religious reforms, this was taken to mean the Imperial Cult, although not exclusively given Augustus' promotional of 'traditional religion'. However, the reference to the Cult led some to develop a discussion of it in the Empire which was not relevant. Much time was also spent on Gaius in this respect who was credited with upsetting the peaceful society as a result. Good responses used the evidence of the worship of Augustus' genius (with Ovid in support) and the deification of some emperors, as well as the rejection of it by Tiberius and Claudius. Good responses noted that Augustus wished to downplay this aspect for political reasons and support traditional religion instead (coin of four priesthoods). Many responses, again, focused on the point that whatever the reforms, the acceptance of them led to a more peaceful society than under the Republic.

Good responses noted the less positive side of life in Rome with a balanced discussion. Few accepted without question the claim that Nero set fire to Rome and many noted his new regulations. Most recognised the disruption of Gaius' reign was solved by Claudius' prompt actions. Some took up the reference to a 'modicum of wealth' to note that the majority still had a hard life.

Some responses dealt with the issue of wealth inequality quite well and questioned if things had genuinely improved for various sections of society despite the building and entertainment.

In general, the responses displayed a good set of skills and careful analysis of the passage.

Misconception



The claim by Augustus that he found Rome built of bricks; I leave it clothed it in marble is found in Suetonius *Aug.* 28; it is not in the *Res Gestae*. It is also in Cassius Dio 56.30

Section B overview

Question 6 was answered by more candidates than Question 5. Question 5 dealt with a specific event in the period, whereas Question 6 was more thematic in its focus. However, Question 6 did have a specific focus on an individual rather than the whole period and in essence covered the last quarter of the period. Candidates did tend to discuss the whole period in some cases, as if the questions were asking for an overview of why the Republic broke down. Question 5 asked candidates to assess the value of the evidence as well as provide knowledge of the event. Question 4 also required candidates to assess the usefulness of extracts and draw some conclusions from them while again assessing their value as evidence. These are very important skills for this specification. Candidates mostly displayed a good level of ability in these areas. Most candidates had a secure knowledge of the content of the Depth Study and the prescribed sources, some to a very high level indeed.

Question 4

SECTION B: The Breakdown of the Late Republic, 88–31 BC

4 Read the passages below.

How useful are these passages for our understanding of the reasons for the hostility between Clodius and Cicero?

[12]

Very few candidates did not cover both passages as was needed for higher levels. Some responses, instead of dealing with what the source says and how useful it is/what it tells us, spent time on what it does not say. Some also spent much time on the background to the relationship without getting to the passages.

Candidates had no problems in identifying the main points made by Cicero about Clodius and his violent actions. They referenced 'massacres', 'wrecking', freeing slaves, and his 'slaughters' in Passage 1. This did not always lead to analysis of reasons for the hostility, or what they suggested as reasons. This was true also of Passage 2. Candidates tended to describe Clodius' behaviour from the passage, almost repeating it word for word.

The context of the second passage was generally known- a trial, in this case of Milo; some thought it was the trial of Clodius over the Bona Dea incident. The mention of Pompey allowed candidates to suggest that Cicero's dislike of Clodius was due to his opposition to Pompey whom Milo supported. More outlined Cicero's general stance as 'optimates' and Clodius as 'populares' as a source of hostility. Cicero's exile was universally mentioned, apart from in the weaker responses.

The evaluation of the extracts was at times very good and well-informed. Many rightly pointed out that it was one-sided with none of Clodius' view of the events. In addition, while they told us of the hostility, the passages do not overtly give reasons. There was usually discussion of the *Letters* as more reliable than Cicero's speeches because they were private letters to friends. Good responses developed this by more reference to what is in the extracts and if the claim was true, rather than a general assertion of it. A point was made by many that Cicero and friends clearly had their own gang, which he carefully avoids saying.

However, some responses had evaluation as a general passage on Cicero and his works; the key issue was to link the comments to the specific points in the passage where they illuminate (or not) the issue in the question. Some responses spent much space on what the passages do not tell us about Cicero and/or Clodius.

Question 5*

5* 'The Catilinarian Conspiracy was a significant challenge to the Constitution'. How far do the sources support this view?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[36]**

The question asked candidates to focus on the Catilinarian conspiracy and assess the evidence for it as a challenge to the Constitution. The candidates needed to gather the evidence and assess it primarily. Good responses focused almost entirely on the conspiracy and the sources. It is important to say that evaluation of the two main sources was a key element in good responses.

Good responses used the Sallust and Cicero prescribed texts to outline a number of aspects which suggested the conspiracy was a challenge to the Constitution. These were varied in the response. Source analysis in this section was at times impressive contrasting Cicero and Sallust.

Most developed the aims of the conspirators, not only Catiline. Using Cicero *in Cat II*, most provided detail of the supporters. Very good responses had precise, even quoted, references to Cicero's list. Some were more general listing 'criminals' or 'debtors'. The majority referred to the 'Sullan veterans'. Good responses could give the history of these and suggest that they had done this once and thought it would work again. Very good use of analysis was developed by those who used Manlius' letter. Good responses compared Cicero with Sallust in this aspect.

Good responses had details of a good selection of actions by the conspirators; and some were very precise about the threats they made. Equally precise were the responses which detailed the actions by Cicero and the Senate, e.g., the SCU, the calling for armies, and the debate in the Senate. Some focused on the debate alone to suggest how serious it was.

Good responses developed the issue of a challenge by pointing to the ease or difficulties which Cicero and others had in dealing with the conspirators. Good responses noted the relatively easy victory in the battle; some suggested that Pompey would in any case deal with Catiline. Good discussion was developed in many concerning the role of Cicero, and the extent of the 'threat' given his position and aims.

Evaluation of Sallust and Cicero was generally good. Some were very detailed, mostly on Cicero rather than Sallust. There was some detail on Sallust's account of the so-called first conspiracy; some knew that Cicero had mentioned it in his speech as a candidate; they also knew that it did not fit well with his suggestion that he might defend Catiline in his trial. These responses dealt with this event convincingly.

Good responses placed the Sallust account in the context of his view of the state of Roman society in general (sections 10ff, 36-37). They argued that Catiline was not a threat but rather the overall corruption was. Some supported this with Plutarch's view on the inequality of wealth and that it only needed a spark to light the fire (Plutarch *Cicero* 10) which is not prescribed.

Cicero was evaluated with the same high degree of understanding in many responses. Responses identified that he had a good reason to exaggerate the events; some developed this with reference to the *Pro Sestio* and his view of the state of Roman politics. Good responses had a good account of his list of supporters as well as his characterisation of Catiline. They challenged his descriptions as rhetorical display rather than fact, aware that he revised the speech for publication.

Many responses were fully focused on the conspiracy. Some became unfocused by lengthy narratives on other challenges. Some were not clearly linked to what happened in the Catiline events. They appeared as unrelated to the analysis of the sources on Catiline. A page or more on Caesar or Sulla with the end sentence that Catiline was not as serious did not provide a convincing argument on the 'significance' of Catiline's challenge. It is acceptable to use other events to assess the Catiline Conspiracy where the sources allow it and the link is precisely made. Candidates should primarily focus on assessing the conspiracy as the question asked.

Misconception



Often quoted was Catiline's comment on the state as having two bodies; some were precise. Usually it was quoted from Sallust's record of Catiline's speech in the Senate. It is originally from Cicero's *Pro Murena* 51.2 quoted in Plutarch *Cicero* 14. It is not quoted in Sallust.

Question 6*

6* How far did the actions of Octavian contribute to the breakdown of the Republic?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[36]**

The question required an examination of the contribution of Octavian to the events leading to the end of the Republic. The issue concerned the actions of Octavian in the context of the political and military situation during the period 44-31 BC. Candidates should support their account of these actions (leading to a breakdown) by detail and evidence relating to Octavian. Generalised paragraphs on the economic problems, the extent of violence and the actions of others were less convincing as explanations of Octavian's contributions.

Excellent responses focused on Octavian and the evidence for his effect on the Republic. Some responses dealt with other issues involved in the breakdown of the Republic and linked them to Octavian consistently without losing focus on the main issue in the question. The analytical approach served them well.

Good responses specified events and actions which suggested Octavian's role in the breakdown of the Republic. Good responses worked through his career from 44 BC in detail assessing each action in terms of the question. Good responses also provided well-selected and relevant examples of the sources, not necessarily in every case.

Most responses covered the early period after Caesar's death and his acquisition of support from various politicians including Cicero. Most went on to record the Senate's use against Antony, his march on Rome and his eventual consulship. The triumvirate was almost universally discussed as an issue. Responses seemed less familiar with events in the late 40s BC apart from the proscriptions and the splitting of the Empire. Most responses moved onto the build up to, and battle of, Actium. Some did deal with the actions in the 30s. Most had a good range of knowledge and sources to provide a good assessment of his contribution to the end of the Republic.

Some continued into the 20s with information on his settlements and organisation of the army and provinces. The responses suggested by this that Octavian was finishing off the breakdown completely.

Good responses provided a wide range of sources- Cicero, Suetonius, Plutarch and Appian, with an occasional reference to *Res Gestae*. Some named a source, e.g., Appian, before a narrative of events. The narrative was followed by a short paragraph on Appian's reliability in general. It was unclear which part of the narrative was from Appian and so what was reliable or unreliable. Good responses had specific examples linked to specific actions, e.g., the centurion pointing to his sword in Suetonius or Appian when the centurions demand his election. Good responses detailed Cicero's changing relationship with Octavian. Good responses identified selected sources which showed the illegality of Octavian's actions to support their assessments.

Some responses focused on other people or groups or issues which contributed to the breakdown in answering 'how far'. The conclusions varied from 'to some extent' to 'hardly at all' on the grounds that Cicero had already said the 'Republic is finished' in 59 BC. Good responses taking this line linked each of Octavian's actions to some aspect in the period. Many good examples argued that Octavian could draw on the experiences of his predecessors like Sulla, Caesar and Pompey and so argued successfully that the breakdown was near, if not fully, complete before Octavian. In each case they showed that previous, similar actions had already damaged the Republic. In this approach, good responses displayed a detailed knowledge of Octavian's actions. Some provided a page or so on Octavian in general followed by more pages on others such as Sulla or Caesar with little reference back to Octavian. The response was a general discussion of what brought down the Republic rather than an assessment of Octavian.

Exemplar 3

Another action taken by Octavian that brought Rome closer to the breakdown of the Republic was the formation of the Second Triumvirate. By uniting with Antony and Lepidus, Octavian moved ^{influence} ~~power~~ further away from the Senate and more towards individuals in positions of ~~an~~ power. ~~However~~ However, this was once again a precedent being followed, one set by Julius Caesar and the ~~first~~ First Triumvirate of 60BC.

While the First Triumvirate did less to decentralise power from the Senate, it certainly worked to increase the power of an individual. ~~Suetonius~~ Plutarch suggests that by "using" Pompey and Crassus, Caesar "made himself more powerful than than anyone," which is significant in underlining the ~~of~~ ~~eff~~ effect of Octavian forming a similar triumvirate, almost two decades later. This highlights a continued pattern of following precedents that truly caused the breakdown of the Late Republic, and suggests that by following them, Octavian was contributing to the breakdown - although less so than those who set the precedents.

The paragraph details an action of Octavian- formation of the 2nd Triumvirate – and its effect on the Senate and his own power. It proceeds to link this to the 1st Triumvirate and its effects, comparing the two. Additionally, a source is used to exemplify the point and make further link to Octavian and his significance. The general analysis completes the paragraph on the effect of following precedents which attributes some blame to Octavian but less than those who set the practice. The candidate has integrated and developed the example into the analysis of Octavian's contribution very well. They have not lost focus on Octavian in the process. The source used is useful, although not specific to Octavian. It is not evaluated in any way. A judgement, however, is formed from it which is creditable. The candidate has avoided disjointed paragraphs on other reasons for the breakdown of the Republic by organising the analysis in a convincing manner.

Supporting you

Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/company/ocr**

 **/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.