

Examiners' report

A LEVEL

ANCIENT HISTORY

OCR Level 3 Advanced GCE in
Ancient History

H407

For first teaching in 2017

H407/22 Summer 2025 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 22 series overview	4
Section A overview	5
Question 1*	6
Question 2*	7
Question 3	9
Section B overview	13
Question 4	14
Question 5*	15
Question 6*	16
Copyright information	20

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 responses 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 [Teach Cambridge](#).

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 22 series overview

As in previous years, examiners have seen some excellent work across the unit with only a small number of responses showing a lack of the skills and knowledge to perform well.

Candidates, who performed well, developed a coherent analysis focused on the question by integrating the knowledge and evidence into an explanation. Better responses integrated knowledge and sources to form judgements. A good response sustains a series of judgements developed around the issues in the question. Statements or assertions unsupported by evidence and vaguely linked to the information do not provide convincing, well-supported judgements.

Very few responses did not deal with the issues; few seemed to be only vaguely aware of the prescribed sources. They were able to name an author or piece of evidence but little more.

There is still a tendency to provide generalised knowledge and assertions. Candidates do less well where assertion replaces argument. There should be an explanation of how and why the evidence is linked to the view and/or the issue in the question.

Better responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding of, at least, part of the period and the depth study. Errors were made and misconceptions arose given the constraints of an examination. Such errors are minor and do not affect the overall grading. Misattributions of evidence occur but do not generally damage the overall response. Most responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the response but not consistently.

There were a few responses which included little or no source evidence. The majority of marks for the essays are for the use of sources and evidence. In the interpretation, support is needed to develop a substantiated argument regarding how convincing it is. A basic aim should be to support the response with evidence.

The quality of the evaluation of the evidence varies; some provide a lengthy, usually unrelated, paragraph on an author at the start or end of a response. Better responses integrate their assessment of the evidence within the explanation and judgements. It is focused on the specific piece of evidence, rather than a general view of the reliability of the author. Comparison of sources is present in better responses, where possible.

There were very few candidates who omitted a question or did not complete a response due to the time constraints.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
• had a secure knowledge of the chronology of the periods in both the Period and Depth study • provided knowledge of the sources and their differing contexts • gave specific sources relevant to the terms of the question. • provided evaluation that dealt with the value of the specific information in the source • prioritised the analysis over a narrative of the period • gave a clearly organised structure leading to a well organised and well-supported conclusion.	• gave inaccurate chronology and showed confusion over the order of events • provided lack of clarity on the context and relevance of information or sources used. • gave generalised factual knowledge • used assertions instead of developed judgements based on evidence • generalised source evidence, e.g. 'according to Plutarch'. • lacked clear structure leading to unclear reasoning and unfocused narrative.

Section A overview

Question 2 was slightly more popular than Question 1. Question 1 asked candidates to consider the ways in which Tiberius' reign provided a template for the Julio-Claudians who followed. Most had good detail on all the reigns. Better responses focused on specific elements rather than narratives of reigns. This was also true of Question 2, where focus on specific women seemed to provide better responses than a narrative through all women.

Question 3 was more thematic in asking about the reactions of various groups to the Julio-Claudian period. The responses were often good to very good; some less successful responses focused on Augustus alone. Candidates are now much more willing to examine the analysis and meaning in some detail.

Question 1*

1* To what extent did the reign of Tiberius set a pattern for the future direction of the principate?

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

Most responses found areas with which they could compare Tiberius' reign with the reigns of the other emperors. These mostly, not exclusively, included the maiestas trials, the use of the Praetorians, specifically Sejanus, the lack of support socially and economically for the people of Rome, and the Imperial Cult. Better responses developed the idea of 'pattern' by dealing in detail with a few areas rather than the whole reign. Less successful responses focused on the general tenor of the reign in terms of cruelty and/or deviancy. Tiberius' retirement from Rome and, by implication, from dealing with administration featured in most responses. The relationships with the senate and ordinary people were generally linked to other aspects of his reign. Better responses examined the structure/role of the principate in relation to some of the above to determine how far Tiberius changed the principate for the future.

Responses showed good understanding of the accessions of the emperors and how they compared. Good responses tried to identify if Tiberius set a pattern in dealing with the difficult moment. Most recognised Tiberius was the first to succeed and was copying Augustus. They noted the role of the Praetorians; there was discussion of removing 'rivals' early in the case of Tiberius, Gaius and Nero. Usually, candidates assessed the relations with the senators in connection with the early days.

Better responses dealt sensibly with the evidence for a variety of issues, the maiestas trials, the level of administration, the issue of 'popularity', the provision of 'bread and circus', the financial 'miserliness', the retreat to Capri, and his view of the Imperial Cult. Most recognised the sources were not favourable to Tiberius and assessed the evidence accordingly. This varied from the short assessment that we had to be careful with the evidence, to a more detailed, specific, evaluation of the evidence. Some took Suetonius' assessment of the number of deaths or Seneca's view as fact; others were more cautious with Tacitus' assessment of the trials. There was good material on the Imperial Cult for both Tiberius and Claudius. The assessment of financial and social administration was more balanced in better responses. Some used Tacitus assessment of good administration in Annals 4.

Very good comparisons were made between emperors; better responses were specific in their examples, and they covered more than one reign. Excellent responses linked all the emperors in different areas providing a coherent series of judgements on the issue of 'pattern'. Less successful responses spent too long on Gaius leaving them time only to offer a sentence or two on Nero. These responses were often structured around a narrative of each reign. Gaius and Nero were limited at times to a single example, often the Fire of AD 64. Less successful responses focused only on Tiberius and Gaius.

The sources were at times confused, with Tacitus quoted for Gaius. Suetonius was frequently cited with the wrong emperor. There was a tendency with the sources to preface a narrative with 'According to Suetonius and Tacitus'. This would not work with Gaius and to some extent parts of the reigns are not covered by either Suetonius or Tacitus. More effective use included Cassius Dio, certainly on Claudius. There was also use of Pliny on aqueducts and Seneca on the trials. In general, sources were accurate and well-used in relation to the knowledge and understanding.

Misconception



Suetonius was not a senator; he was an equestrian; Suetonius and Seneca judgements on maiestas trials need evaluating concerning the extent and number of trials and executions. Tacitus does not quote 'Tiberius to the Tiber'; it is quoted by Suetonius in the prescribed material

Question 2*

2* 'The imperial women had very little influence during this period.'

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. [30]

Better responses dealt with both aspects of the question. The general view in the sources concerning women, and imperial women in particular, was developed as part of the assessment. Less successful responses simply took what the sources said as fact. Better responses evaluated what we are told of women when making their judgements. Less successful responses took the agreement of the sources to mean they are reliable. It did not help when the historical context of each source was either not known or incorrect. Cassius Dio was stated to be contemporary, along with Suetonius (who knew Nero). Tacitus was said to have written 'under the reign of Domitian'. He wrote after Domitian died.

The range of women discussed was quite wide, although most responses did not cover the full range. The common examples were Livia (variously named), Agrippina the Younger (a number of spellings), Messalina; others used less frequently were the Julias, Agrippina the Elder, Livilla, wife of Drusus, Poppaea and Octavia. Some mentioned Gaius' sisters, notably Drusilla. There was occasional use of Cleopatra who was not a member of the Imperial family and outside the period. The most common error was to confuse the names; some confusion with their husbands also occurred. However, there was a general accuracy and often very detailed material.

Better responses focused on the sources available, rather than on a narrative of alleged actions.

Livia's influence was developed through Tacitus for the most part; the issue of the murder of Augustus with figs is in Cassius Dio, although Tacitus hints at the idea briefly. Most responses focused on the succession and her role in Tiberius' reign. Better responses evaluated what is said about her role rather than accepting it as fact. Many responses used Seneca's account of Cinna, with some assessment of how accurate it could be. It is also in a longer version in Cassius Dio. Her role in the accession, and how she orchestrated the accession, with the death of Agrippa Postumus, was mostly treated well, using all the sources. Very good responses made an immediate parallel with Agrippina and Nero (including Tacitus' parallel death of a rival in the opening of Annals 13).

Most responses made good work of Agrippina the Younger and Nero using the sources and comparing accounts. They dealt with her arranging Nero as heir, the sidelining of Britannicus, and the orchestrating of the accession. Better responses were more detailed on her role during the reign. They developed the decline of her influence. Less successful responses simply assumed she was in control for 5 years and that she lost influence when killed, but this showed she was influential. The work on Messalina tended to believe the account in Cassius Dio (sometimes attributed to Suetonius) of her influence over Claudius and the administration. Better responses were more critical and identified that Claudius was more in charge than the sources suggested. All knew of her plot and death, although her husband had a variety of names.

Arguments that women had little influence used the Julias (exiled), Agrippina the Elder (starved to death), and Octavia and Poppaea (both killed by Nero). Some very good responses knew more about these and could develop sound judgements on their influence. An example was Tacitus' view of Poppaea's role in the murder of Agrippina and death of Octavia.

Most candidates had good material, used in detail, to form coherent explanations, differing only in their assessments of the evidence.

Exemplar 1

^{Suetonius,}
~~Aditus~~ negative portrayal of imperial women carries over to Claudius, describing him as a servant to his wives and freedmen and completely influenced by them. This can be seen through Messalina's (third wife) portrayal as promiscuous and bigamous which supposedly was the reason for her execution and Agrippina the younger, who pushed Nero as heir, similar to Livia. This once again could be a case of the imperial women being described as having great influence over the princeps in order to paint them as weak as a way to criticise them.

So rather than the imperial women being particularly influential and ~~and~~ cunning, it's more of the Princeps being so weak that they let a woman manipulate them.

This paragraph, Exemplar 1, illustrates good practice and some underdevelopment of ideas.

It has a clear statement of Suetonius' view of Claudius' wives, largely correct even if paraphrased. It provides a good example but lacks some details of Messalina's 'plot' and death. The reference to Agrippina and comparison with Livia is succinct but apposite, leading to a sound judgement on possible influence. This introduces a key element in the question in terms of the trustworthiness of the evidence. This develops the idea that the sources are using the stories of women to characterise the emperors. This is answering the second part of the question. However, it needs developing further with a more detailed evaluation of what the sources say. The paragraph lacks precise source material on Messalina and Agrippina with which to frame the analysis. Therefore, it does not reach the higher level of source evaluation and convincing judgements.

Question 3

3 Read the interpretation below.

The people most bitter about imperial rule were the aristocrats, who had lost the political power that had always belonged to their ancestors. The average Roman had never held more than a token share of this power and could not, therefore, grieve too deeply when the monarchy of the emperor replaced the aristocracy of the Senate. In fact, many Romans welcomed this new system of government because it brought peace, stability, and therefore prosperity. In the republican period, the fate of the common man was frequently dependent on magistrates who changed every year and who were willing to sacrifice the welfare of other people to achieve their own political and financial ambitions. In the imperial period, affairs of state were conducted by bureaucrats, not politicians; by men who had served in one office for a long time and who had no illusions of securing for themselves supreme control over the Roman world.

5

10

J-A Shelton, *As the Romans Did* (adapted)

How convincing do you find Shelton's interpretation that the majority benefitted from the Julio-Claudian system of government because it brought 'peace, stability, and therefore prosperity'?

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

Candidates have become much more attuned to the requirements of this question. There are fewer generalised assessments of the extract and many more detailed examinations of the specific issues. In some responses, there are still passages that discuss at length the value of the sources. This may be relevant in assessing the specific information used to support the candidate's analysis. However, lines of generalised evaluation of an author are not rewarded in Question 3. There are marks for knowledge and understanding, and for evaluating the interpretation.

Most responses focused almost entirely on the phrase in the question, assessing the three issues. Very good responses introduced the other points in the interpretation within the overall assessment.

The issue of the reaction of the 'aristocrats' produced mixed responses, both agreement and disagreement. Some argued that, as Cassius Dio says, the senate willingly handed over power. They also pointed to the joy at Gaius' accession and, partially, at Nero's. Others argued the willingness was forced (again as Cassius Dio says) and the joy short-lived; the existence of plots also supported this view. However, there were well-supported, coherent assessments on both sides.

There were equally well-argued and well-supported evaluations of the reactions of the ordinary Romans. Some responses were underdeveloped in citing one unstable event in the period as evidence that there was little stability. The event was either the fire of AD 64 or Gaius' assassination, the latter a short-lived disruption at best. The various wars on the frontiers were cited as lack of peace, while others argued there was no Civil War until AD 69.

The point about the merits of magistrates or bureaucrats in charge was successfully assessed. However, some candidates did not read the passage carefully; Shelton is referring to bureaucrats, when speaking of those who had no illusions of power not the emperors. Some argued that it was unconvincing because emperors did seek power. Other responses pointed to Sejanus as a counter argument. Some took issue with freedmen under Claudius. Most candidates agreed that the administration was better in the Imperial period. As always, there were generalisations on the improvement of lives, because of 'bread and circuses' without citing evidence that lives were better.

Misconception



The reference to Juvenal's 'bread and circuses' rarely includes the context: in Satire 10 Juvenal is complaining that the people, who have given up their votes, abdicated their duties and abilities to reward with honours and commands, now only want bread and circuses. It is a critique of the Imperial system and the ordinary people, just as Tacitus claims people were 'seduced' by Augustus.

Exemplar 2

Shelton's interpretation that the majority benefitted from the Julio-Claudian government is largely a convincing one. Indeed his claim that the "people most bitter about imperial rule were the aristocrats" is convincing as we are told by Suetonius and ^{Tacitus} Dio of the increasing discontent of the aristocracy. In Tacitus' *Annals* Tiberius' reign is characterised by the aristocracy's plight and discontent as the praetorian guard, and prefect Sejanus come to power, highlighting their discontent with the Julio-Claudian imperial system.

Moreover, it is important to note that our sources are overwhelmingly aristocratic and, whilst his works the details of the lives of the poor and marginalised groups hardly to be understood,

it does provide further evidence to back Shelton's claim. There is, in much of our extant literature a particular focus on the plight of the elite and the loss of power in the Senate. Indeed much of Tacitus' Annals holds a great deal of often thinly veiled bitterness towards the Julio-Claudian dynasty and the treatment of the elite, particularly the humiliation of Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, the abuse suffered in the maiestates trials and his loss of power, as the system of centralised power to the emperor.

However, Shelton's claim that their bitterness was due to a loss of power "political power which had belonged to their ancestors" ~~was~~ is perhaps less convincing. Whilst it is true that the Senate lost much of their legislative power, it is also true that with a new system of government, many did have the opportunity to grow their status.

Augustus himself in the Res Gestae notes his reforms to the Senate, but ~~states~~ ^{they were} ~~these~~ as reforms, not the ~~also~~ total destruction of the senatorial elite, a fact which Shelton perhaps fails to consider. Under Augustus many members of the Senate, and other elite ranks, particularly the equestrians, saw great rise in status. Augustus' building programme provi-

The paragraph in Exemplar 2 illustrates the focus of a precise element of the passage and a balance of argument for and against its view.

It begins by quoting accurately from the passage. There is evidence from the sources to support the statement, with a specific example of the reasons for aristocratic discontent. The issue of how accurate the evidence is for the view is introduced as part of the evaluation of the passage, not as added information on the source. The nature of the sources, it is argued, makes judgement on the reactions of various groups difficult to assess. The candidate develops the view that the sources create the impression of a bitterness, supporting it with a further precise example. Once this aspect is established, the response develops an alternative view. It argues that Shelton has overstated the bitterness. It suggests that loss of power was replaced by increased status and roles for the elite, using a reference to *Res Gestae* (which could be more detailed or specific). There could be more specific information, and it tends to generalise. However, there is coherent evaluation showing a very good understanding of the issues and the thrust of the extract.

Section B overview

Question 5 and Question 6 were of similar popularity to each other. Many responses displayed a knowledge of the three emperors and the sources for them. Most offered a balance between the emperors with very few focused on one to exclusion of the others. There was excellent knowledge of the Suetonius and Tacitus material. Cassius Dio was less well represented. The error of confusion between these three was the one most frequently met. It is sometimes difficult since they often say basically the same on some matters.

The majority of candidates dealt with the passage in Question 4 very well with a good range of supporting material in their evaluations. In Question 5 better responses identified 'changes'; less successful responses narrated the reigns with short judgements on an aspect of change. In Question 6, there was a focus on the Imperial Cult to the exclusion of other aspects of religion. This produced unbalanced responses, not covering the range required for higher levels.

Question 4

4 Read the passages below.

The text has been removed due to third party copyright restrictions.

He established two new factions of charioteers, called Gold and Purple. He gave many gifts to spectators ..., and once he gave them a feast while they stayed in their seats, and supplied them with wine, which flowed in abundance all night everywhere. All this of course won him great popularity with the mob, but for the upper classes it spelt ruination. For he had no reserves of cash from which to fund his generosity, and so he murdered many of them.

5

Dio Cassius 67.4.4–4.5

How useful are these passages for our understanding of relations between Domitian and the different classes of Roman citizens?

[12]

Responses were generally sound; candidates identified the main points in each passage regarding the different classes. Very few did not mention the popularity of the Flavians with the army in assessing the reaction in Suetonius to Domitian's death. Better responses knew of the pay rise; some itemised the various military successes of the Flavians in general, rather than just Domitian. Better responses knew of the differing views of these in Cassius Dio and Tacitus, to question Suetonius' claims. A few explained that the army pressurised Nerva over Domitian's killers to support the passage's reliability. The issue of *damnatio memoriae* was universally commented on; some offered examples of inscriptions where his name was removed. The reaction of the senators was seen as reliable; examples of Domitian's treatment of them were used in support. At this point, the Cassius Dio extract was usually compared to show the general agreement on this aspect.

The Cassius Dio extract was equally well assessed by candidates; both aspects of the views of the people and elites were examined by the vast majority. The point about the 'reserves of cash' was linked to army pay and financial problems (Suetonius) in better responses. Some questioned 'so he murdered many of them' as unreliable.

Not all the responses indicated the two passages differed over the reaction of the 'mob' (general public). Some explained that the contexts were different, one at the end of his life, the other at some point in the reign. They suggested views on Domitian had changed. Others suggested Suetonius was showing that Domitian's 'cruelty and greed' had not affected the general public so were not bothered about his death.

Evaluation varied. Better responses noted that Suetonius was less specific than Cassius Dio in his description of reactions. Others were more general: Suetonius was contemporary, so more reliable. A few noted that the equestrians were not mentioned specifically; this was interesting since Suetonius was an equestrian.

Question 5*

- 5* To what extent and for what reasons did the Flavian emperors change the nature of the principate?

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

Better responses answered both 'extent' and 'reasons' in discussing change. These responses tended to deal with issues of change across the three emperors where relevant. Less successful ones listed what an emperor did with a judgement about whether there were changes. Some weighted the response to one emperor, either Vespasian or Domitian. Domitian was argued to be the one who changed most in terms of authoritarianism. Some concentrated on Vespasian, and argued he changed little in an effort to create stability.

The areas for discussion of change varied. Most assessed the role or power of the princeps in the light of the Lex de imperio. Very few provided details of what it says. Most pointed to the references to previous emperors (and the exclusion of some) as a sign that Vespasian was not changing the role. He was largely carrying on as the Julio-Claudians. Better responses noted the change in the more formal and legal position compared to Augustus. Several responses assessed the more authoritarian role with reference to Domitian's censorship and his use of his council. Titus' role as Praetorian Commander again was seen to be a change towards more control. These changes were supported by a wide range of sources. Tacitus *Agricola* supported Domitian's monarchical approach; Vespasian's comment on his sons as his heirs in Suetonius revealed his dynastic view of the principate. The overtly military aspect of the Flavians was also seen as a change in its more prominent role.

Other aspects were covered. Most looked at the increase of the role of the Imperial Cult; some responses saw this as change making the principate more dependent on religion, especially with Domitian. However, Vespasian's use of omens and miracles, his adherence to Eastern cults, and focus on traditional religion (four priesthoods coin) indicated a more obvious role of religion. Relationships with different groups were examined by most for change in the nature of the principate; responses mostly focused on the senate; the analysis generally argued for a change where the power of the princeps increased at the expense of the senate; some looked at how they dealt with challenges, for example, the Helvidius Priscus, Saturninus, Caecina plot.

In terms of reasons for change, responses highlighted Vespasian's origins as a non-aristocrat. His need to establish his role given his background was a reason to formalise his position and reform his relationship with the traditional elites. Some analysed the changes as due to character, especially with Domitian. Many responses cited the fact that there had been a civil war. The need to reestablish the principate, consolidate his position, restore the finances, rebuild Rome, and settle provinces (Judaea, Gaul, the Rhine and Danube frontiers), were all cited as reasons for changes in the principate after a time of crisis.

Question 6*

6* How far do the sources help us to understand the attitudes of the Flavians towards religion?

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

It was important that responses focused on the range and quality of the sources in answering this question. Less successful responses provided good detail of religion but little support from sources. They generally ended with no reference to 'how far the sources help...'. It was also important to consider 'attitudes' which had to be inferred, sometimes from actions. Better responses avoided the list of religious actions and focused on what we can tell of attitudes. Most responses looked at the Imperial Cult, traditional religion, eastern cults, and treatment of other religions rather than dealing with each emperor in turn. This approach allowed for more focused analysis and avoided narrative.

Most responses examined the attitude towards traditional Roman religion through the specific roles and actions taken. Some good sources were employed – the four priesthood coins, the role of Pontifex Maximus, rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter (twice), various festivals discussed in the sources, Domitian's attachment to Minerva (Cassius Dio 67.1), Saecular Games (Tac. *Ann.* 11.11), temple to Claudius, and numerous coins. Many referred to Domitian's traditional use of the punishment of Vestals as a sign of his commitment. Interpretation of the evidence varied; some saw it as mostly propaganda rather than genuine interest; the priesthood coin was a link to Augustus rather than a desire to be religious. Domitian, however, was seen as more sincere especially over Minerva (his dream before his death in Suetonius).

The Imperial Cult was generally very well sourced, even with non-prescribed material. References were made to the Moesia inscription to Titus, the dedication in Ephesus to Domitian, and so on. Naturally, Domitian's 'Dominus et Deus' was included. Better responses evaluated and interpreted it sensibly. A number used Martial's poem and retraction to again suggest it was propaganda rather than genuine. The various temples to the Flavians and coins of deified family members were useful, but always accurate, examples of the Cult.

There was some good work on the foreign cults, although candidates were confused over Isis and Serapis. The attitude towards Jews and Christians was less well documented, apart from the Fiscus Iudaicus. The Suetonius incident was often used to show the Flavians' anti-Jewish views. Better responses knew of the treatment of Clemens and Domitilla as possible Christians.

Many detailed the omens and prophecies; some noted Tacitus' cynical comment in *Histories* 1.10. The interpretation of these focused on their usefulness as propaganda at the start of Vespasian's reign. This was often linked with Vespasian's comment on his deification. Responses interpreted this as evidence of Vespasian's cynical attitude to religion.

Responses provided a wide range of analyses supported by good, detailed evidence as the question demanded.

Misconception



Suetonius and Cassius Dio refer to 'dominus et deus'; Tacitus does not.

Exemplar 3

Another key aspect of Roman religion under the emperors was the Imperial cult, a way of promoting ones own genius, name or self as a god or godlike to improve your reputation or influence. Vespasian clearly made use of this, especially in the provinces, with an inscription in Tarraco that highlights he had a high priest dedicated to him. There is also a statue base of Titus in moesia that presents him as Divi, a clear attempt from the flavians to utilise the imperial cult. These sources are clearly likely commissioned by the flavians and are therefore very useful in portraying their use of the imperial cult. Suetonius presents in his biographical source 'life of Vespasian' a story

in which Vespasian Jones on his deathbed that he is becoming a god. A source that may not have known exact dialogue but that does present Vespasian's knowledge that utilising the imperial cult was vital to a stable reign, as Augustus had done. Domitian was the biggest utiliser of the imperial cult, with both Cassius Dio and Suetonius mentioning that he constructed 3 temples to his own deified family members. Both his brother Titus and his father ~~to~~ Vespasian. ^{Cassius Dio} ~~Suetonius~~ also highlights that he deified his sister Domitilla who was worshipped in the third temple. Dio clearly aims to make Domitian here, portraying him very negatively, but it does highlight Domitian's clear acceptance of the imperial crown. He even minted coins during his reign presenting the deified Vespasian, very useful physical evidence of Domitian's attitudes. Sources such as Suetonius and Tacitus highlight Domitian's almost pharaonic style of worship to himself, with one story being presented by ^{Suetonius} ~~Tacitus~~ in which he lets a condemned man off with no punishments as he referred to Domitian as 'Dominus et Deus' (Master and God). What may be a hyperbolic story, it does still highlight Domitian's overt use of the imperial cult.

The Exemplar 3 paragraph focuses on the Imperial Cult. It sets out a reason for the use of the Cult at the start.

It uses two examples from Tarraco and Moesia, neither of which are prescribed. There is sufficient detail of each for the analysis. The candidate claims these are examples of the Flavians utilising the Cult. However, in both instances the dedications were put up by locals. The claim they are commissioned by the emperors needs to be expanded given the evidence of the inscriptions. It is also not explained how these two examples show the Flavians using the cult and what the aim was. The analysis needs some development.

The Suetonius example is evaluated sensibly and plausible inferences about attitudes are drawn. The response refers to Cassius Dio and Suetonius as sources for the next item. It does distinguish between them. Suetonius *Dom.* 5 refers to the Temple of the Flavians, not 3 temples; he mentions Domitian making his birthplace into the Temple in *Dom.* 1 (and briefly in 15). It is not clear what part of Cassius Dio is being referenced. We do have the Temple of Vespasian and Titus which is partially referenced. The response goes on with the deification of Domitilla, again with an unclear reference to Cassius Dio; it is suggested this is a negative portrayal by Cassius Dio but we do have the details. This is also the case with the reference to coins; the 'attitudes' are claimed but not explained. As before, two sources are treated as one on the issue of Domitian's attitude towards worship. It finishes with a story from Suetonius as an example of how Domitian developed the Cult.

The paragraph illustrates the use of the Cult; it asserts that Domitian was keener on its use; it implies an attitude but does not focus on this aspect. It has sources and uses them but is not always secure in knowledge; this affects the extent to which the argument is convincing and the judgements plausible. The candidate deals with the issues in the question; they make efforts to base the analysis on sources; the effort, however, is undermined by some imprecise material and some underdeveloped judgements.

Copyright information

Question 3, Page 235, As the Romans Did 2nd ed. 1998, Jo-Ann Shelton, 9780195089745. © As the Romans Did A Sourcebook in Roman Social. History, Jo-ann. Shelton. Reproduced with permission of The Licensor through PLSclear.

Question 4, Page 310, Suetonius Life of Domitian ch. 23, Suetonius The Twelve Caesars translated by R. Graves, 1957, revised by J. B. Rives 2007, 9780140455168

Question 4, Page 83 Cassius Dio Roman History Book 67. 4.4-4.5, Lactor 20 The Flaviansed. M. G. L. Cooley 2015, 9780903625388. ©

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 the exam paper builder platform for a range of our qualifications. [Find out more](#).

Free for all OCR centres with an Interchange account, it allows unlimited users per centre. We require an [Interchange](#) username to verify your centre's users for ExamBuilder.

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

Once you have an Interchange username, use the form on [this page](#) to sign up for ExamBuilder, or ask an existing user at your centre to create an ExamBuilder account for you.

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](#).

Tell us what you think

Your feedback plays an important role in how we develop, market, support and resource qualifications now and into the future. We want you and your students to enjoy and get the best out of our qualifications and resources, but to do that we need your honest opinions to tell us whether we're on the right track or not.

You can email your thoughts to resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk or visit our [feedback page](#) to learn more about how you can help us improve our resources.



Designing and testing in [collaboration with you](#) and your students



Helping young people develop an [ethical view of the world](#)



Equality, diversity, inclusion and belonging (EDIB) are [part of everything we do](#)

Contact the team at:

☎ 01223 553998

🖥 ocr.org.uk

To stay up to date with all the relevant news about our qualifications, register for email updates at ocr.org.uk/updates

Visit our Online Support Centre at support.ocr.org.uk



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

OCR is a Company Limited by Guarantee and an exempt charity. Registered in England. Registered office: The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number: 3484466.

We operate academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers.

We are committed to providing a fully accessible experience across all our products, platforms, and websites. Find out more about our [accessibility standards](#).

© OCR 2025. All rights reserved. We retain the copyright on all our publications. However, our registered centres are permitted to copy and distribute our material for their own internal use, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the publication. Find out more about our [copyright policies](#).

We update our publications regularly so please check you have the most up-to-date version.

We cannot be held responsible for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and do not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

When we update our specifications, you'll see a new version number and a summary of the changes. While we do our best to reflect these changes in all associated resources on [Teach Cambridge](#), if you notice any discrepancies, please refer to the latest specification on our website and [let us know](#).

Our resources do not represent any teaching method we expect you to use. We cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in our resources.