

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

ANCIENT HISTORY

H407

For first teaching in 2017

H407/23 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 23 series overview	4
Section A overview	6
Question 1*	6
Question 2*	8
Question 3	10
Section B overview	14
Question 4	14
Question 5*	15
Question 6*	19

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 is 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.

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 23 series overview

After some years of disruption, the general impression is that teachers and candidates have developed the skills and techniques required by the specification to a high degree. This component demands a wide range of differing evidence and varying skills. Candidates need to develop an understanding of the different scopes of the Period Study and the Depth Study. However, examiners have experienced excellent work across the component from a good range of candidates, with only a small number lacking the skills and knowledge to perform well.

It is important for a successful response to provide coherent analysis which answers the question by integrating the knowledge and evidence into an explanation. This requires information supported by a reference to a source which appears to confirm the information; this may be followed by a sentence which repeats in some form the terms of the question. A good response sustains a series of judgments focused on the terms of the question. Statements or assertions unsupported by evidence and vaguely linked to the information do not offer a developed answer.

Very few appeared to fail to understand the scope of the questions or their issues. Candidates had knowledge of the prescribed sources. Most provided detailed knowledge and understanding. There was a consistent engagement with the sources at all levels.

As always, there was generalised knowledge and assertions about authors or texts. Candidates do less well where assertion replaces argument. The phrase 'this tells us that' or 'this shows that' after some knowledge or evidence is not sufficient. There should be an explanation of how and why the evidence is linked to the view and/or the issue in the question.

Good responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding of, at least, part of the period and the depth study. Clearly in the context of an examination of limited time, errors were made and misconceptions arose, more numerous only in the less successful responses. By and large, these errors were minor. Candidates did well when they tried to be consistent throughout most of their responses for the highest levels. The vast majority of responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the response but not consistently.

There are still responses which provide very few (1 or 2) sources or none at all. The majority of marks for the essays are for the use of sources and evidence. Supporting the judgment with evidence is the primary aim of any response; even in the modern interpretation support is needed to develop a substantiated argument regarding how convincing it is.

There are candidates who present a paragraph on the author or genre (sometimes), or the background and supposed bias. There is little or no effort to relate the evaluation to the evidence being used. Some of these paragraphs can take up a page of writing (and time). They often end with a statement about the unreliability of the evidence which the candidate has just used to support their view or explanation, negating their argument. Good responses try to compare sources when evaluating where possible; alternatively, they make the evaluation focused on the specific evidence being used. In addition, they employ other evidence in support to assess the reliability of the evidence they are using.

Very few appeared to have problems in finishing the paper; this was sometimes due to answering the two essays first before Questions 3 and 4. As a result, they tended to spend too much time on the essays to the detriment of the shorter questions.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> displayed a secure knowledge of the periods studied, specifically the chronology of the reigns of emperors had a precise and clear grasp of the events/actions, and an approach which places information/sources in the correct context specified sources relevant to the terms of the question and gave precise attribution of sources especially in questions focused on sources (Question 5) gave evaluation related to the specific evidence prioritised the analysis over a narrative of the events. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> misidentified an event in terms of the time frame or the person/group involved; inaccurate chronology in both Period and Depth study confused the reign of one emperor with another, and the source which is relevant to the emperor employed generalised factual knowledge provided unsupported judgments or assertions especially on reliability of the sources provided limited sources or generalised phrases e.g. 'according to Suetonius' did not focus on the terms of the question.

Section A overview

Question 1 was more popular than Question 2. Question 1 asked candidates to express a view about how the reigns of emperors developed. It was suggested that candidates should provide comments on at least two emperors with no need to do more; most did all five, some quite briefly; this did not allow for a thorough analysis in some cases. However, most had good detail on at least two. Question 3 was more thematic in asking about the means by which emperors gained and kept good relations with the ordinary people. The question also required analysis of the reasons. The responses were often good to very good; some though less successful on the reasons than the ways; some hardly mentioned the reasons, focusing on a list of actions instead.

Over the years, candidates have become more assured in dealing with the modern interpretation. They are now much more willing to examine its argument and meaning in some detail. They are less inclined to discuss the debate on which it is based without relating it to the text. The questions appeared to be accessible to all levels.

Question 1*

1* 'The Julio-Claudian emperors' reigns always started well, became worse and then finished badly.'

How far do you agree with this view?

You must consider the reigns of at least **two** emperors in your answer.

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

This question was more popular than Question 2.

Many responses covered all five emperors and their reigns, although it was suggested that two might be acceptable for a good answer. The attempts to cover the five meant that many responses were superficial in their narratives of events. Alternatively, responses covered one (usually Augustus or Nero) with some detail but left the others to a short paragraph. These paragraphs tended to be general in knowledge rather than dealing with the issue of progression in a reign. It is important to approach these thematic questions by selecting material rather than trying to narrate everything possible.

A large number of responses tended to deal with the start and end in detail. The issue of 'becoming worse' was barely discussed especially with Gaius and Nero.

Responses which dealt with these emperors were often very good. They were detailed on the accession of both, using Suetonius and/or Tacitus (with Nero at least); they used precise examples of 'good elements' for example Suetonius *Nero* 10; they itemised the main events of the early and middle periods – again referencing Suetonius on actions preceding his 'illness'; the key moments of change were identified (Nero's murder of Britannicus, Agrippina, Octavia, his growing obsession with chariots racing and musical performance (Tacitus *Annals* 14.4–15); better responses recognised this was popular with the ordinary Romans, so that he remained 'doing well'; naturally the Fire of AD 64 (a date not always correct) featured; the differences in the sources highlighted by the better responses; again most recognised that Nero did behave well (in Tacitus at least); good responses highlighted Piso and the trip to Greece as the points at which Nero declined most clearly. Better responses on Gaius were detailed on his behaviour (even down to the sea-shell incident) and offered more nuanced explanation, than simply madness; they distinguished between the upper-class and lower-class views of Gaius. Good responses developed the evaluation of the sources throughout the answer.

Less strong responses went from 'quinquennium Neronis' to the Fire with little in between; Gaius' reign went from his popular support at first and the auction tax to making his horse a consul (or senator incorrectly). They often lacked evaluation of the evidence, especially in the case of Gaius. Tacitus was frequently cited incorrectly for this emperor. Less successful responses confused the chronology of Nero's reign, placing the Fire almost immediately after Agrippina's murder. They sometimes conflated events, perhaps confused because of Suetonius' own lack of chronology.

There was a tendency with the sources to preface a narrative with 'According to Suetonius and Tacitus'. Given that large parts of Tacitus Annals are missing, there are periods when only Suetonius would apply. The phrase means very little in terms of use of sources; equally making a statement or describing an event, ending with an author's name in brackets, does not identify what the source is contributing.

Augustus was commonly cited as one who did not become worse or ended badly. Some, however, did note the issues with succession, and the German frontier (possibly Livia's murder of him, but not in Tacitus as claimed); Claudius was well-used as another example of one who did not fit the rule. The common view was that he started badly and finished either badly or well, but got better in the middle. There were some very knowledgeable and sound responses using both these examples. Some thought that Tiberius fitted the statement well.

In general, most responses provided good or very good answers, showing knowledge of the period and sources.

Misconception



The '*Quinquennium Neronis*' is not mentioned as such in Suetonius or Tacitus but a phrase used by Trajan.

Res Gestae (often spelled incorrectly) does not use the sentence 'I found Rome built of bricks and left it clothed in marble'. It is found in Suetonius, and a version in Cassius Dio.

Question 2*

- 2* In what ways and for what reasons did the Julio-Claudians try to maintain good relations with the ordinary people of Rome?

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 dealt with both aspects of the question. They provided a range of 'ways' and a number of 'reasons'. There was a tendency to focus on the 'ways' in many responses to the exclusion of the reasons for attempting to gain good relations.

Good to very good responses focused on the 'ordinary people' as the question asked. Less successful ones widened the discussion to the senators and equestrians, which was not the focus of the question. Lengthy accounts of Tiberius' treason trials were barely related to the ordinary people but described how the relations with the senators declined. This was the same with Gaius with examples of mistreatment of the senators; they often ignored his relations with the ordinary people.

The ways in which relations were maintained varied: the most frequent ones were the corn supply, water supply, largesse, infrastructure projects, festivals, and games; others referenced were security (vigils), fire control (Nero), and religion (Imperial Cult). Most responses provided specific examples supported by sources. Augustus dominated the accounts as the one who maintained good relations; Tiberius was the example who did not. Almost every answer quoted 'To the Tiber with Tiberius' as proof that he failed. Some thought he was actually thrown into the Tiber. Tacitus does not use the phrase (which many thought he did). If candidates had read the entire section of Suetonius (75), they would discover he was cremated with due ceremony.

As in Question 1, the knowledge of the chronology of the reigns was varied but less damaging in this question; the events in Claudius' reign were conflated so that it was unclear when he had a shortage of grain, or which aqueducts he built; the point at which Augustus refused the dictatorship was often unclear; its relationship to the grain problem not developed. Not all were clear about the death of Germanicus, who was confused with Drusus by some.

The better responses dealt with the reasons specifically and identified how each emperor had different problems to solve. Claudius needed to establish himself with his poor relations with the senators; Augustus needed to overcome the past reputation of the civil wars; Gaius, with no experience in politics and military, needed to establish a base of support; all needed to avoid the mob rioting when hungry (although few could give an example of when they did – such as Claudius pelted with stale bread). Less successful answers dealt with this in one or two sentences at the end of a list of actions taken by emperors. There was limited development of the judgment or supporting evidence in these responses. The responses were unbalanced; they consisted of a narrative of actions with much evidence but little analysis.

Responses were mostly knowledgeable and focused; there was ample detail of the 'ways'; better responses had a wide range of these; weaker ones tended to focus on two; grain and largesse.

Exemplar 1

		Claudius, the fourth fourth emperor of the Julio-
		Claudian Dynasty, tried to maintain the support
		of the ordinary people of Rome vastly different
		reasons to Augustus, in 41 AD, Claudius became
		Emperor unexpectedly after the assassination of
		Caligula ('Gaius the monster' (Suetonius)). Claudius
		tried to create good relations for two reasons,
		to protect himself and to restore/secure the
		republic. Claudius did this through a number of
		social and political reforms. According to
		Tacitus, Claudius rebuilt the harbour at Ostia,
		something promised by Julius Caesar, he built
		aqueducts started by Tiberius and drained a
		lake promised by Augustus, the building works
		were also followed by his invasion of Britain,
		which secured glory for the army and therefore
		the ordinary citizens of Rome. While Suetonius
		describes the invasion as 'of no great
		importance', the invasion expanded the empire,
		and the glory of the army significantly
		increased his support from the people (Tacitus).
		Tacitus, while non contemporary, was a significant
		historian for understanding the time of the
		Julio claudian emperors, making him reliable for his
		works (although Caligula books 7-12 were lost).

This candidate's response displays some of the issues with responses to this question.

The focus on reasons at the start is good; the comparison with Augustus (already discussed) is valid; the context of his accession explains his need for protection and to stabilise the state. The response lists some of his actions to gain and maintain good relations – Ostia, aqueducts, draining of a lake, invasion of Britain. These are stated to have increased his support among the people (supported by Tacitus).

The one specific reference to Suetonius is not immediately related to the issue of support, although it might have been developed to indicate an attitude towards Claudius which prevails in the sources.

Apart from a suggestion his aqueducts were begun by Tiberius, the response establishes both methods and reasons. It tries to use sources but this is less successful. The naming of the source in brackets or saying 'According to Tacitus' does not add to the analysis or the knowledge – in what way does it help the discussion if Tacitus does remark on Ostia or the aqueducts? Is Tacitus the source for Augustus' promise which Claudius now fulfils? Tacitus is claimed to be the support for the view that the invasion increased support. This section of Tacitus is missing in the *Annals*; Britain enters only when Scapula is governor; the *Agricola* is brief on the invasion. This naming of a source as if somewhere the author will make the comment is undermining the response. Finally, a brief effort at evaluation – reliability is confirmed because he is a 'significant historian'. This might help to confirm the existence of Ostia or support if there were specific examples. However, as it stands it has no value.

Question 3

3 Read the interpretation below.

Item removed due to third party copyright restrictions

How convincing do you find Alston's view that there was a 'take-over of the Roman state in which the old Roman Republic was absorbed and managed by the emperor'?

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

Candidates responded very well to the issue raised in the interpretation. The vast majority had knowledge of his actions. Candidates now show a good set of skills in dealing with complex discussion of an issue.

It must be emphasised that candidates are asked to assess the content of the extract. Candidates spend time explaining what is not said. They argue that it is not convincing because of what it omits. The question is asking the candidate to assess the view in the extract; the candidate can then bring in material which they feel counters the points in the passage. They should cover the evidence which they believe shows that it is or is not convincing. However, arguing it is not convincing because Alston here does not itemise the settlements is not dealing with what is being claimed; suggesting Augustus does not bring peace because there are generals actually doing the fighting does not deal with the full context of the point in the extract.

These extracts will be a summary of some aspect of one of the three debates; they will provide an opinion or view on an issue. That should be the focus of the response: whether it is supported by the evidence we have.

There were a number of issues which the extract raised; the candidates were asked to assess the idea of a 'take-over' and how far Augustus managed/absorbed the Republic; good responses identified areas where Augustus could be said to have done this; precise information on his powers and settlements supported their analysis. Some could not distinguish the two settlements or confused them. Some added powers/positions which were not included. The majority were accurate and detailed.

Most responses picked up the idea of 'traditions', 'social order' and 'values'. They focused on the Julian Laws. However, many did not include the full sentence – Augustus 'represented his pre-eminence as the means...' and so did not quite analyse the point Alston is making; that he did focus on tradition as a way to support the position he held. Better responses dealt with 'his exceptional position' or 'atypical position' and how represented it. Some discussed the 'paradox' of his position within the Republic.

Many expanded on the idea of a dependency very well; equally, many discussed the issue of wealth and legions with specific support regarding his control of both. Most took issue with the assertion that only Augustus could bring peace. However, few related it to the events of 22–19 BC which was Alston's context.

A few responses discussed the 'take-over' by reference to the other emperors rather than Augustus, despite the passage being clearly about Augustus. The debate again concerns Augustus. The idea of 'peace' was argued as unconvincing using the revolt of Vindex and the victory of Vespasian.

Exemplar 2

		<p>This is convincing as it shows that Augustus transformed Rome from a Republic into a state where he had all the power.</p> <p>- Alston says "as the means by which Rome could rediscover her traditions and discipline" showing that Augustus set himself up as a necessary part of the new Rome and that this could only be achieved by giving him power. Alston says "his position was abnormal" showing that that amount of power wasn't normal for a man and that he was warping the Republic into something different, but keeping up the façade of a Republic. Cassius Dio backs that up when he describes Augustus as a king which shows that he was taking all the power, but showing that the ^{Republic} state still had power and it hadn't changed.</p> <p>The laws of 27 BC also show this when although he gives up his ^{Republic} state ^{power} he gains ^{proconsul} proconsul and consul at the same time which hadn't happened before and in 23 BC he gained ^{maius imperium} maius imperium and ^{tribunicia potestas} tribunicia potestas showing he gained lots of power, but still kept up the façade of a Republic but secretly had power over a lot of different areas of the Senate.</p>
--	--	---

		Alston also says "traditionally incompatible with the elevation of an individual to such a position"
		showing he presented himself as the only way to restore the republic, but him being that power went against the republic's values showing how he integrated himself into the system and made it seem normal. Alston says "Behind the emperor were his legions (ay his wealth and legions)"
		Showing that he secretly held all the power but pretended he was letting the Senate rule.

This candidate's response takes a very organised approach, dealing with selected sentences from the interpretation. It begins with the first sentence of the passage, although it omits part of it which is somewhat important (his pre-eminence as the means). The response does establish that Alston is saying that Augustus is securing his position by suggesting he is necessary despite his exceptional status. It picks up the idea of 'abnormal' as a support for the view of Augustus 'warping' the Republic while pretending to preserve the values. The response makes good use of supporting information in Cassius Dio. This continues with reasonably accurate accounts of the settlements to show the exceptional nature of Augustus' position, thus agreeing with Alston. The response continues with reference to the extent to which his position was incompatible with the Republic, while maintaining a normality on the surface. It adds the issue of 'wealth and legions' although does not develop this with support or explanation.

The response focuses on the issue of Augustus' position and Alston's analysis of its atypical nature and how Augustus justified it by reference to aspects of the Republic. The response lacks some supporting information in some respects although it displays accurate knowledge where necessary. It is very focused on the passage; it selects specific issues/ideas and assesses them in the light of knowledge; it could develop both the assessment and knowledge in places with more detail.

Section B overview

Both essay questions were equally popular. Question 5 focused on the source evidence for two governors; it required evaluation of the evidence as the primary focus; a narrative of their period in Britain did not meet the requirement of the question. Question 6 asked candidates to assess the economic benefits of Roman rule. This question required some detailed knowledge of the material evidence for economic activity; good responses had a variety of material from which to draw valid and reasoned conclusions. In general, the responses indicated that the questions were accessible, one with a narrow focus, the other with a more wide-ranging and thematic one.

Question 4 asked candidates to assess the evidence from coins; many were able to draw some conclusions; they often placed them in context, as far as possible given the lack of evidence for the end of the period. There was a lack in a number of responses of a clear understanding of the chronology of the period; events were placed inappropriately in the sequence, causing judgments to be either weakened or incorrect.

Question 4

- 4 Read the sources below.

Items removed due to third party copyright restrictions

How useful are these sources for our understanding of the importance of the frontier of Britain in the reign of Hadrian? [12]

Some candidates either misread or did not read the information correctly; a number referred to the As as an *Aureus*. This led to a misunderstanding of the value of the coin. The *aureus* would tend to be used by wealthier people, while the As is a much lower denomination. This mattered because candidates claimed that the As were directed at the rich (as an *aureus* would be). Some candidates thought the As was a higher value than the *sestertius*. In addition, many claimed that Hadrian's Wall had been built by AD 119, so interpreted aspects of the coin as stressing its presence; they seemed unaware of Hadrian's visit to Britain, or of what might be happening there.

Most responses examined the coins in some detail; they identified the meaning of the various titles and roles which Hadrian had; they noted the differences between the As and the *Sestertius*. Good responses identified the coins as before and after the building of the Wall. Many introduced SHA as evidence of activity on the frontier in AD 119; they deduced the coin was celebrating some contest in which the Romans won a victory. Some used the tombstone of Pontius Sabinus as evidence of the event. Good responses linked the coin to Hadrian's visit and the conclusion of a campaign against the British. Those who knew it was a low-value coin emphasised the use as propaganda for Hadrian among the ordinary people, either of Britain or the Empire. Some suggested it lacked usefulness because it was propaganda and showed only what Hadrian wanted. Equally, responses argued that it was useful only when linked to other evidence of the frontier.

The *sestertius* was largely treated in a similar manner; most noted the slight change in titles and additional spear. Good responses explained the later context; after the Wall was built; towards the end of his reign; they noted that Hadrian wanted to keep Britain in everyone's mind throughout his reign as something he was proud of. Success in Britain was seen as important to Hadrian, as was the title *Pater Patriae*. Some made a point of the fact that the Wall had been built and even amended which may be relevant to the coin.

Many responses made use of other sources. The Vindolanda tablets were mentioned as a sign of peace on the frontier; it was not clear how many knew they were dated to the turn of the century, some 20 years before the first coin. There seemed to be a view they related to Hadrian in some way. Some made a reference to elements of the Wall, for example Milecastle 38; this was evidence of dealing with the British problems which the coin suggests is solved.

Question 5*

5* 'Agricola was a more successful governor than Ostorius Scapula.'

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 focus of this question is the reliability and quality of the sources on the subject of these two governors. As most candidates recognised the main, if not the only source, for any detail of the governorships is Tacitus. Most responses recognised that this posed a problem since our information on Agricola comes from a eulogy. The information for Scapula is contained in Tacitus' *Annals* rather than the *Agricola*, books with very different aims and agendas. Good responses dealt with the issues raised by this very well. There were some excellent discussions of the sources and the successes of the governors; many had accurate and detailed information supported by the sources; most knew the main achievements of Scapula, if not the specific events as told by Tacitus. Good responses went beyond military events to look at the wider role of governors. They included Tacitus' claims of Romanisation and improvements in the administration. Some mentioned Scapula's attempts to settle the south with the founding of Camulodunum.

It was good to see a number make the point that a comparison of the two had to assess the context. Scapula was the second governor when the province was still unsettled and conquest was on going. Agricola, in contrast, took over a province largely settled as far as what would become Hadrian's Wall; previous governors had settled Wales and the Northern tribes; Romanisation and advance was far more feasible for Agricola than Scapula. Some very good responses argued that it was very difficult making a comparison due to the nature of the evidence since Tacitus cannot be entirely reliable for either governor.

Good responses used details from Tacitus for the career of Scapula; most recorded his successes; the Icenii revolt (twice), the defeat of the Deceangli and Brigantes; his aid to Cartimandua, and his defeat of Caratacus; some mentioned the setbacks with the Silures involving ambush and guerrilla war; many saw Tacitus as unfairly critical of Scapula in recording the view that he had to be forced to fight Caratacus by his men. Most recognised his tactical skill, again in Tacitus. The fact that he died from overwork or anxiety or stress, depending on the response was commonly mentioned, although some felt Tacitus was making it too critical.

It was often cited that Tacitus downgrades other governors to make Agricola look better. This may be true of some briefly mentioned in the *Agricola*. However, the *Annals* were written some 20 years after the eulogy and it seems unlikely that Tacitus is still trying to bolster Agricola's reputation in the later book. However, responses show a real effort to evaluate the text and deal with the issue in the question.

Most responses could provide more information on Agricola. All mentioned Mons Graupius (in various spellings); better responses assessed the account in various ways from a fabrication by Tacitus to a likely battle but not as Tacitus describes it. Most were sceptical of the numbers (most were correct in their versions); the speeches were treated as unreliable; the success was largely accepted. It was generally understood that this was a greater success than Scapula's on the grounds that it conquered more of Britain (all if Tacitus is believed). However, stronger responses criticised the idea of success by explaining the retrenchment which followed. Some claimed that even Tacitus could not hide Agricola's mistake of splitting the legion up into three parts and almost getting caught in an attack.

There was some good use of non-literary evidence; the forum at St Albans, the water pipe at Chester and the finds at Stonea camp; Inchtuthil and its nails were rarely omitted. It should be noted that the Chester pipe relates to a fortress rather than Romanisation and may be more due to a previous governor.

Exemplar 3

A good place of comparison between Agricola and Scapula can be found in the handling of their major threats of Caratacus for Scapula and Calgacus for Agricola; both being portrayed as noble British warriors fighting for freedom by Tacitus. Scapula's victory over Caratacus and the Silures is not credited by Tacitus to Scapula himself but to his army, saying that it was won not due to the brilliance of a general but the determination and honour of his army. Scapula is also not the one to capture Caratacus, with him fleeing to the Brigantes and being turned over by Carimonduca to be given to the emperor. This further diminishes Scapula's prestige as a ~~war~~ general as Caratacus was only captured due to the help of a Briton and not due to the skill of Scapula's governance. Agricola, on the other hand, is given full credit for his victory, successfully leading his men and instilling them with confidence and strength through his speech before the battle, being further enhanced through the noble nature of his foe. In this instance, Calgacus' depiction serves to increase the glory of his victory, as

it is displayed as the last stand of the honourable and free Britons who are desperate to prevent their enslavement, ~~Ceratacus~~ making Agricola's victory over them all the more great as he is fighting the best Britain could offer. Cosatacus' portrayal as the same sort of noble savage does not reflect on Scapula in the same way however, instead reflecting on Claudius and making his triumphs greater, as shown by Cosatacus' speech in Rome where he claims his resistance is what made Claudius' triumph and glory possible. Overall these battles and how they are depicted show a stark difference in quality with Agricola clearly being the greater general.

Another major factor to consider is Tacitus being the main source for all of these events since he was Agricola's son-in-law and wrote the Agricola as a eulogy to commemorate his achievements. This has positives and negatives as while it probably led to some exaggeration and embellishment of Agricola's greatness and as he claims that he almost ~~fully~~ conquered Scotland before being called back by Domitian's retrenchment, it also gave him an insight into how ^{the} governorship of Britain worked and what made a good governor. His embellishment of Agricola

The candidate's focus is analysis rather than a narrative of the two governorships. Rather than list the events, major or minor, of each governor and then conclude which was more successful, this candidate makes a direct comparison of their major event. The response also focuses on the sources as the question asked. The information is supported consistently by reference to the source. There is a consistent and focused interpretation of the source. The response assesses the way the source presents the information on the two governors. It analyses the source's view of the achievements of the governors, avoiding a narrative of events. The comparison is precise in its detail of both events; it makes clear that Scapula is treated worse by the source, which affects how we can judge the two governors.

The response continues with an assessment of the source itself and how and why it favours one over the other. It supports the account of events and adds a layer of evaluation onto the discussion. It does not develop the analysis to the level in the first paragraph; this part lacks some details of 'positives and negatives' to enhance the judgments. It does not return to the account of the main event to evaluate the views of the source in the light of this criticism. It would have been better to have dealt with the issues with the source in the course of the comparison in the first paragraph. This would have made it more specific and less of a general evaluation.

Question 6*

6* 'Only the elites gained any economic benefit from the effects of Roman rule.'

To what extent do you agree with this statement?

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

This question was less successfully answered than Question 5 was. The information in Question 5 was more secure and precise due to the focus of the question. Question 6 was more wide-ranging and required knowledge of the development of the economy of Britain.

The majority of responses gave useful examples of elites who either gained benefits or suffered losses under the Romans. Most mentioned Cogidubnus. Some confused him with Togodumnus. This then damaged the analysis since he died early in the invasion. Cartimandua was also prominent as a beneficiary; many knew of her help over Caratacus and the rewards which came from that. Although they mentioned she had military help, this was not linked to economic benefits as such. Prasutagus was frequently cited as one who benefited from being a client king but who also suffered later. Boudicca was generally sensibly used to show that the Romans were exploiting the native elites; Tacitus or Dio were cited, using her speech, to show the issue of taxes and their complaints. There was further use of Calgacus' speech on the same lines. These speeches were sensibly evaluated as fabrications. However, it was argued that they at least show that Romans knew of the discontent among the provincials and that these were likely complaints.

Some material evidence was used; Fishbourne Palace was commonly cited; some had quite detailed descriptions; the issue with ownership was sometimes discussed since it might not be owned by an elite tribal leader. Camulodunum (and other towns) were used as examples of the spread of economic activity. Good responses argued that it was another example of exploitation if Tacitus is to be believed.

The Vindolanda tablets provided some evidence of economic activity and trade. These were not always placed in context, properly dated, and located. The growth of settlements close to forts and fortresses was often discussed although not all could name an example other than around Hadrian's Wall. There were somewhat general references to imports of goods such as Samian Ware or wine. Evidence of pre-Roman trading and wealth (from coins) was used to suggest there was ample chance for economic benefit.

There was some vagueness about what constituted elites; some felt that Roman soldiers and veterans came under that heading since they did have some benefits and contributed with their pay to the spread of goods in the local economies. It was asserted that some wealthy Romans took benefits with reference to loans made to the British. Seneca's loan in Cassius Dio was cited as an example. There was some attempt to link the lead pig and mining to elites exploiting resources. Tacitus was cited where he describes Agricola's attempts to organise the supply of food and prevent corruption. Some references were made to new tools for farming and new methods to improve yields to allow farmers to grow more to sell.

A very small number took the question to refer to the whole of the Empire's economy or even that of the city of Rome; elites in this case meant senators and how they gained from the Empire economically; the non-elites (ordinary Romans) also gained from free food, games, and handouts. This Depth study is Roman Britain, and questions are focused on the topic and period in the specification whether Britain is mentioned in the question or not.

Misconception



The Chester lead water-pipe is part of the legionary fortress. It may well have been started by Frontinus rather than Agricola; more specifically it cannot be claimed to be evidence of Romanisation by Agricola.

The Vindolanda tablets are dated to around AD 100 not to the period of Hadrian's Wall or Agricola's governorship; it is an example of limited chronology affecting judgments.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

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](#).

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin 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 professional development 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 for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

[ExamBuilder](#) is a free test-building platform, providing unlimited users exclusively for staff at OCR centres with an [Interchange](#) account.

Choose from a large bank of questions to build personalised tests and custom mark schemes, with the option to add custom cover pages to simulate real examinations. You can also edit and download complete past papers.

[Find out more](#).

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 (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).

You will need an Interchange account to access our digital products. 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.

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**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/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 2024 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 in your centre, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the resource. Resources intended for teacher use should not be shared with students. Resources should not be published on social media platforms or other websites.

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.