

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

ANCIENT HISTORY

H407

For first teaching in 2017

H407/21 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 21 series overview	4
Section A overview	6
Question 1*	6
Question 2*	8
Question 3	10
Section B overview	14
Question 4	15
Question 5*	16
Question 6*	17

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 21 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 not demonstrating the skills and knowledge to perform well.

It is important for a successful response to provide a 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 not 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 gave evaluation related to the specific evidence prioritised the analysis over a narrative of the period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> misidentified an event in terms of the time frame or the person/group involved; inaccurate chronology 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 the reliability of the sources provided limited sources or generalised phrases e.g. 'according to Plutarch' 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 2 was more thematic in asking about the means by which emperors gained and kept good relations with the ordinary people. The question also required an 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 the 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 of 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 Cassis 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 responses tended to focus on two; grain and largesse.

Exemplar 1

		Claudius, the four 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 ('furious 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.

Augustus represented his pre-eminence as the means by which Rome could rediscover her traditions and disciplines and face the challenges that lay before her. Although clearly his position in the state was abnormal, his exceptional position was justified by the guarantee of social and political order that he brought.

... That bargain entailed a take-over of the Roman state... in which the old Roman Republic ... was absorbed and managed by the emperor. Augustus established a form of dependency in which the atypical position of the emperor was necessary to protect and preserve the political values of Rome, values which were traditionally incompatible with the elevation of an individual to such a position. This is the paradox of the imperial settlement. ... Behind the emperor lay his wealth and his legions. Power and political ideology were mutually supportive and those who did not accept the ideology were bound to reflect on the power of the regime. To a considerable extent, that power had been displayed in its absence from late 22–19 BC: only Augustus could bring peace to Rome.

R. Alston, *Aspects of Roman History 31 BC–AD 117* (adapted)

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 they 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 one 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 one 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's} 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 tribunician ^{tribunician} power he gains proconsul and consul at the same time which hadn't happened before and in 23 BC gained maius imperium ^{maius imperium} and tribunician 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 with and 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 (and his wealth and legions)"
		showing that he secretly had all the power but pretended he was letting the Senate rule.

This candidate's response takes a very organised approach to 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.

This 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

All the questions seemed accessible to a range of candidates. Question 6 seemed more popular than Question 5, although there was little difference in the quality of the performance on either question. There were some very good responses to both questions; they showed an understanding of the period as a whole; there was ample use of the main sources of evidence, dominated, as one would expect, by Plutarch and Cicero. The majority of citations were detailed and accurate, with some confusion of authors in places. The most common failing was an insecure knowledge of dates and the relationship of events. There were some very good analyses of the causes of the breakdown of the Republic, placing the role of individuals in a wider context. Some, however, took the opportunity to discuss a range of factors losing sight of the focus of the question on individuals. Responses to Question 5 were generally successful on the Senate but lacked detail on other aspects of the constitution. Better responses dealt with the courts, magistrates (tribunes) and assemblies.

Question 4 asked candidates to assess the passage in relation to the reforms of Sulla and the effort to change them in the 70s. Most had information on the eventual change in 70 BC; stronger responses detailed the efforts of tribunes to change the laws with some mention of the changes which were achieved. Not everyone could name the speaker; many assumed it was Sallust; stronger responses evaluated the speech and its language.

Question 4

4 Read the passage below.

'Citizens of Rome, you are perfectly well aware of the difference between the rights bequeathed to you by your ancestors and this state of slavery engineered by Sulla. ...

When Sulla died, who had imposed this criminal slavery upon you, you thought your troubles were at an end: but then came Catulus, far more savage. An uprising interrupted the consulship of Brutus and MamerCUS [77 BC]. Then C. Curio exercised despotism (*dominatio*) to the extent of ruining an innocent tribune. Last year you witnessed the ferocity with which Lucullus attacked L. Quintius. Finally, look at the turmoil now being stirred up against me! This action of theirs will certainly turn out to have been futile, if they bring about the end of their own despotism (*dominatio*) before you put an end to your own slavery; especially since in this struggle of citizen with citizen other reasons are alleged, but on both sides the fight is about despotism (*dominatio*) over you. Other matters have flared up from time to time, arising from indiscipline or hatred or greed. One thing only has remained constant, which was coveted by both sides and has been snatched away for the future: the tribunician power, the weapon that our ancestors fashioned in defence of freedom. ...'

Sallust, *Histories* [3.34]

How useful is this passage for our understanding of the undoing of Sulla's reforms through the 70s BC? [12]

Good responses identified this passage as part of a speech and named the speaker (Macer). Good responses also were able to place the speaker and speech in context; Macer a tribune, the date 73 BC and his affiliations with the '*populares*' and later Pompey. Good responses provided some context for the passage on which to base an assessment.

Better responses also provided some context to what was said; the idea of slavery engineered by Sulla was supported by details of his reforms which the speaker sought to undo. The examples in the speech of the attempt to prevent the undoing of reforms were sometimes explained. Most had some idea that Lepidus' effort to end the reforms was ended by Catulus; many were aware of the efforts to overturn the reforms in the 70s which are partially mentioned in the passage e.g. in 75 BC the partial reform of the tribunate; most mentioned Pompey and Crassus in 70 BC.

Good responses noted that the passage indicated that efforts were being made but being blocked by Sulla's supporters in the Senate – Curio, Lucullus; they suggested the source was useful in showing the disruption caused by the reforms and the efforts to undo them; good responses suggested it gave an idea of the atmosphere in the 70s of factional fighting.

The importance of the tribune as a defence against domination was commonly considered with varying detail of its usage in the period.

Very good responses discussed the nature of the speech and Sallust's record of it. They assessed the reliability, the likely accuracy, and Sallust's own position having been a tribune and opponent of the *optimates*. Some used knowledge of the fragmentary nature of Sallust's *Histories* to suggest the difficulty of assessing an isolated piece such as this.

Good responses also pointed out that this passage does not explain the undoing as such, nor the events by which the tribunate and other reforms were changed, limiting its usefulness.

Misconception



It is often stated that Plutarch lists Sulla's reforms; he does not; he does spend time on his proscriptions; Appian provides details. Quotes from Plutarch regarding the tribunate often come from Velleius or Appian in reality.

Question 5*

5* 'Throughout the period 88–31 BC, the institutions of the Roman Republic failed to function effectively.'

To what extent do you agree with this view?

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

This was much the less popular of the two questions.

Candidates had difficulty if they could not clearly identify the institutions and their functions. A number focused on the Senate; they answered as if this was a question on the weakness of the Senate in the face of challenges from politicians and other problems in the Republic. This is a partial answer to the question. The information on the Senate and its function was often good as was the assessment of its lack of functioning. This took the form of its failure to meet challenges, apart from the Catilinarian Conspiracy. Here it was said to function well.

Good responses dealt with some of the magistracies and the courts where there was evidence of abuse and corruption. Good responses made use of the Verres trial as the primary (and only example) of the state of the courts. The use of Cicero was precise and detailed in this respect. However, other examples of corruption and the failure of the courts eluded most; The *Bona Dea* trial, Milo's trial were possibilities given the sources available.

Bribery featured in some responses; Caesar's use of it in the election to the role of *Pontifex Maximus* for example, and again the *Bona Dea* trial. Connected to this was the disruption of the institutions by the use of violence such as Pompey's use of veterans in 59 BC or his threats to the Senate in 75 BC and 70 BC. Pompey's lack of qualifications for the magistracies he held was shown to indicate how they did not function as they should.

In general, knowledge of the institutions was superficial; assemblies, and particular magistracies, such as the tribunes or consuls, were not commonly featured; governorships did not feature.

Misconception



The statement that the Senate gifted Pompey his two commands in 67 BC and 66 BC is incorrect; they were the result of laws passed in the assembly by tribunes; in fact, the Senate (or some senators) resisted the *Lex Gabinia* and used a tribune to try to stop it until a riot occurred. These commands were voted by the people, not the Senate which could not pass laws.

Question 6*

6* How far were the actions of individual politicians responsible for 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 invited candidates to assess the contribution of a variety of politicians to the Breakdown of the Republic. However, some took this as an opportunity to develop theories about the reasons for its breakdown which only briefly dealt with individuals. 'How far' asks for an assessment and some analysis of the extent of their responsibility in the context of the events and issues of the period. This should be the focus of the response; the response should assess the role of an individual in what they did and said. Other factors might be introduced in the context of how far it removed responsibility from the individual for their actions. Some responses mentioned Pompey and/or Caesar briefly as a nod to the question before moving on to economic or social issues.

Good responses avoided a narrative of careers in favour of identifying key points which could be shown to have damaged the constitution seriously, even permanently. Sulla's actions – the march on Rome, the use of the army, the proscriptions, and the dictatorship – were argued to have left a legacy which damaged the Republic. His efforts to reform were seen as more damaging than helpful. The actions of Pompey, Caesar and Octavian were used as proof of how responsible Sulla was. Thoughtful analysis suggested it was difficult to blame Sulla for what happened in 31 BC; rather it was that others followed him due to their ambition and their choice.

Most responses detailed (with sources usually) the actions of a series of individuals, covering the period well. There was, therefore, a tendency to narrative rather than analysis. Less successful responses would narrate Pompey's actions: his demand for a triumph, his holding of *imperium* too young, his threat in 75 BC, his consulship in 70 BC unqualified and his role in the triumvirate. They would end with a brief statement that Pompey was responsible; however, the response has not linked his actions to any specific damage which he did; the laws he broke, the effects he had on the functioning of the institutions, the ways in which he ignored the checks and balances which allowed the Republic to function. This approach was often true when dealing with Caesar or Octavian.

A number of responses stopped at 60 BC; some dealt with only the events of the 60s and 50s. This effectively meant they dealt with Pompey and/or Caesar. Coverage of the period is not essential but responses need to reflect more than two-fifths of the period involved. Where coverage is limited, what is provided needs to be very detailed and developed thoroughly.

Good responses examined the failings of the system and focused on how individuals exploited those failings. The responses used the misuse of the tribunate by various politicians going back to Marius to circumvent the system; some argued that the Senate, or particular senators such as Cato, forced individuals into action by their obstructive and damaging actions. For example, Cato's obstruction to Pompey's requests in the late 60s BC forced him to work with Crassus and Caesar; the faction in the Senate who resisted the majority who wanted to take up Caesar's offer in 50 BC. Some saw the reaction to Catiline as a factor in the way the conspirators were treated and the possibility that Cicero had exaggerated the seriousness for his own ambitions.

There were a number of thoughtful responses which displayed a very good understanding and sound knowledge of the material; the majority made consistent efforts to support the analysis with evidence, mostly accurately.

There were paragraphs of general evaluation of Plutarch or Cicero which had little relationship to the line of reasoning; some quotes were used almost automatically; Cicero 'The Republic is finished' in a letter of 59 BC used without a sense of context or relevance, other than to show the triumvirate had broken the Republic (in Cicero's opinion).

Exemplar 3

		The next reason as to why the
		actions of individual politicians
		caused the breakdown of the
		Republic can be shown through
		Pompey. Pompey was an excellent
		commander who dominated
		many years of the Republic
		and was nicknamed the
		"teenage butcherer" by Sulla
		for his efficient military action
		in Sicily and Africa during the
		Social Wars. The military efficiency
		of Pompey helped cause the
		breakdown of the Republic
		primarily due to to his actions
		and powers that ^{forced the Senate to go} went against
		the constitution. For example,
		Pompey requested a triumph
		after the social wars that Sulla
		reluctantly accepted despite
		the fact that triumphs were
		usually reserved for a long,
		successful career. Pompey also
		received extraordinary powers
		such as the lex Crabina and
		Lex Manilia which allowed him to

take from the treasury and tax collectors to support his campaigns in the east. Pompey was also made co-consul with Crassus Crassus, who Plutarch states "they had a disliking for each other" despite the fact he ~~had no political~~ he was not a senator. Although, he did have a pro-consular imperium in Spain before hand. The power gained from the first Triumvirate with Caesar and Crassus also allowed these three individual politicians to have excessive control over the Senate and the Republic for their own personal gain. Thus, the ^{unusual} amount of powers and honours given to Pompey throughout his career demonstrated that it was possible for an individual to gain a strong influence over the Senate which eventually led to the breakdown of the Republic.

This section of the response to Question 6 deals with Pompey and his career. It asserts that he caused the breakdown and proceeds to explain how. It is claimed that he had military efficiency; a quote from Sulla describes him as a 'teenage butcher', although it is not explained how this supports the claim of efficiency. However, the response proceeds to assert that this caused the breakdown because it damaged the Senate and the constitution. The response does not explain precisely how this was the case. We do get an example of gaining a triumph at too early an age which Sulla granted rather than the Senate. The response moves from 80 BC to 67 BC and 66 BC and the *Leges Gabinia, Manilia*. These are not placed in context.

However, they allowed Pompey money to support his campaigns. It then moves back in time to the consulship of 70 BC not being a senator (again this is not explained in the context of the question although clearly relevant). The quote of disagreement between him and Crassus seems somewhat unrelated to the narrative and analysis. The response moves back to the 70s for Pompey's command in Spain which is meant to explain how he had a rank suitable to be a consul (possibly). The narrative finishes with the triumvirate and his excessive control gained from that arrangement. The conclusion is made that his powers and honours gave him influence over the Senate which led to the breakdown. The issue is that the assertions of his role are largely undeveloped judgments which are attached to a narrative which has some detail but no sources which are relevant. The candidate has sufficient information, although limited sources, to make a case for Pompey's responsibility by undermining the Senate. However, they do not develop how he damages the Republic. The candidate understands how Pompey breaks the law or bends the rules. They do not use that to show how, if at all, this leads to a breakdown. A more precise chronology would perhaps help clarify the role he played.

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.