

GCE

Ancient History

H407/13: Macedon and the Greek world

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2025

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

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

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2025

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor.
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the RM Assessor messaging system.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed-out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed-out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.
7. There is a NR (**No Response**) option. Award NR (No Response):
 - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- a. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page
Highlight	Factual error
	Omission
	Noted
	AO1
	AO2
	AO3
	AO4
	Irrelevant

12. Subject Specific Marking Instructions

The Assessment Objectives targeted by each question and the maximum marks available for each Assessment Objective are given at the top of each level's mark scheme for each question.

The weightings of the assessment objectives remain consistent throughout the levels. For example, if the maximum marks are 5 AO1, 10 AO2 and 15 AO3, then the AO1/AO2/AO3 ratio will be 1/2/3 throughout the levels.

When marking, you must therefore give greater priority to the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective when determining in which level and where within a level to place an answer.

Section A: Relations between Greek states and between Greek and non-Greek states, 492-404 BC

Question 1*	‘The Persians were consistent in their policy and actions towards the Greek states from 492 to 431 BC.’ To what extent do the sources support this statement? [30 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about: • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.
Additional guidance	The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. • Candidates should consider the policy of the Persians towards the Greeks and the actions they took against them, as evidenced by the sources. They should discuss the extent to which these were consistent. • They may also consider the extent to which the Persians treated the various Greek states in similar or different ways. • Candidates will be expected to cover the full time period within the question and consider continuity and change Answers are likely to include: • The various attacks on Greece of 492, 490 and 480-479

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 4	19–24	- Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.	- Persian policy after defeat in 479, including conflict up to and including Eurymedon and a possible peace - Further conflict in Egypt - Cimon's expedition to Cyprus - The Peace of Callias - Persian involvement in the revolt of Samos 440 - Evidence for the Persians' general policy towards other states - The reasons for each of the above and the extent to which they were the same or different - The nature of and reasons for any apparent changes in Persian policy and actions - The different natures of each of the three attempted invasions - Different policies towards Greek states which medized - The extent to which policy changed towards any Greek states, especially during the invasion of 480-79

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 3	13–18	- Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	Supporting source details may include: - Naqs-e Rostam inscriptions 1 and 2 (LACTOR 15 Nos 48 & 103) (evidence of expansion as a general motive) - Xerxes Inscription (LACTOR 15 No. 63) (Xerxes aligning himself with Darius and previous kings) - Herodotus: 6.42-3 (Persian measures to pacify states of Ionia) 6.43-44 (reasons for the 492 campaign) 6.48-49; 7.133 (Darius' request for earth and water; response of Aegina, Athens & Sparta) 6.94 (Darius' motivations of revenge and punishment of those who did not give earth and water) 6.95-96 (desire to take Naxos after previous failure) 6.97 (respect for the religious island of Delos) 6.99 (Datis' first target after Delos was Eretria – by way of Carystus)

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 2	7–12	- Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	6.102 (then sailed for Attica) 7.1 (Darius even more determined to punish Athens) 7.5-7 (Xerxes at first not invading Greece, persuaded by Mardonius, Aleuadae and Pisistratidae; preparations interrupted by Egyptian revolt) 7.8-10; 49-40 (arguments in favour of and against invasion of Greece) 7.138 ('nominal' and real purpose of Xerxes' expedition) 7.151-152 (friendship between Argos and Persia) 8.100-103 (Xerxes persuaded to leave Greece with Mardonius in charge) 8.143 (Athenian response to Mardonius' offer through Alexander) 9.3 (Mardonius' motivation for his renewed march on Athens) - Thucydides 1.89 (initial actions of Greeks after 479 victories) - Thucydides 1.93 (fortification of Piraeus a defence against Persians)

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 1	1–6	- Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) - The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) - The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	- Thucydides 1.94 (Pausanias' expeditions against Cyprus and Byzantium) - Thucydides 1.98 (early operations under Athenian leadership) - Thucydides 1.104, 109-110 (Athenian involvement in revolt of Inaros and Persian reaction to it) - Thucydides 1.115-6 (Persian involvement in revolt of Samos) - Plutarch <i>Cimon</i> 12.1-4 & 13.4-5, Thucydides 1.100 (Cimon's activities up to and including Eurymedon and effect it had on Persians) - Diodorus 12.2.1-2 (Persians forced to make peace) - Hapokration s.v. <i>Attikois grammasin</i> (discussion of Peace of Callias) - Diodorus 12.4.4-6, Thucydides 1.112 (Cimon's Cyprus victory and Persian reaction to it) Answers should address the policies and actions of the Persians towards Greek states in the stated period and come to a conclusion to the question of whether the sources support the view expressed in the statement. Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. Analysis of the sources might focus on: - The lack of Persian sources - The reliability of Herodotus - The reliability of the prescribed Persian inscriptions - The extent to which the views and actions described by Herodotus support, or contradict, the policies expressed in the prescribed Persian inscriptions
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
			• The reliability of Diodorus and Plutarch • The deficiencies of Thucydides' account of the pentacontaetia

Question 2*	How far would you agree that the Peace of Nicias of 421 BC was always the most likely outcome of the first ten years of the Peloponnesian War? [30 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about: • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements. AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	- Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of how far. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. - Candidates should consider the objectives of both sides at the start of the war and the likelihood of their being able to win. - They should consider the possible outcomes of win, lose, draw for each side and what they consider the most likely of these, and therefore whether a negotiated peace was the most likely outcome. Answers are likely to include: - The aims of the Spartans at the outbreak of the war, including Archidamus' and Sthenelaidas' speeches

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 4	19–24	• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.	• The aims of the Athenians, including Pericles' war policy and his assessment of Athenian resources • The major events of the Archidamian War, including initial strategy of both sides; Athenian loss at Delium • Changing political attitudes to the war in both Athens and Sparta • Financial measures taken in Athens • The events leading up to the Peace of Nicias after Pylos including Brasidas' Thracian expedition and the Athenians' response • The emergence of Nicias and Pleistoanax as leaders after the deaths of Cleon and Brasidas • The actual terms of the Peace of Nicias Some candidates may also include the events of the immediate aftermath of the Peace.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 3	13–18	- Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	- Supporting source details may include: - Aristophanes Peace 639-648 (role of Cleon against Brasidas); 619-622 (Athenian allies worried about tribute) - Thucydides 1.23 (effect of Plague on Athens) 1.120-121 (Corinthian analysis of how the Peloponnesians might win, economic possibilities; cf 4.50, Spartan overtures to Persia) 1.139 (Spartan final demand) 2.8 (attitudes of other Greeks at outbreak of war; Spartan claim to be liberators of Greece) 2.11 (Archidamus' speech; admission that Athenians might not march out to meet them – cf 2.13, Pericles' advice not to march out to meet Spartans) 2.13 (Pericles' assessment of Athens' financial situation; they should be confident of victory); cf Thoudippus Decree

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	• 2.63; 65 (Pericles speech and policy 430, what Athens was fighting for; assessment of Pericles' successors) • 4.19-20 (Spartan offer of peace after loss of Pylos, 425) • 4.40-41 (effect of surrender of Spartans at Sphacteria on rest of Greece; change in Athenian tactics) • 4.80-81 (effect of Athenian change of tactics on Spartans and Brasidas' Thracian expedition) • 4.108 (capture of Amphipolis and its effect – cf Aristophanes Peace 619-622; refusal of Spartans to send further support to Brasidas) • 4.117 (reasons for Sparta agreeing to an armistice 423) • 5.13-17 (reasons for both sides wanting peace; also reference to loss at Delium and that war had gone differently from Spartan expectations, and that Athens could have secured an earlier peace; refusal of major Peloponnesian allies to accept the Peace)

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 1	1–6	- Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) - The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) - The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	5.18 (terms of Peace of Nicias) 5.25-26 (reaction of Corinth and other Peloponnesian states to the Peace; Thucydides' judgement of the effectiveness of the Peace) 7.18 (Spartan feelings of guilt for declaring war) 7.28 (Feelings in Greece that at outbreak Athens might be able to survive 1-3 years) Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. Analysis of the sources might focus on: - Our reliance on Thucydides as our only major source - Our lack of Spartan sources, despite Thucydides' claim to be able to see what was happening on the Peloponnesian side after his exile (5.26) - Thucydides at centre of Athenian military decisions before his exile - The unequivocal nature of decrees - The need to treat comedy with care, but that to be effective it needs to be based on actual events
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

Question 3	How convincing do you find Hornblower's interpretation of the Megarian decree and the reasons for the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War? [20 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO4 = 15 marks = Analyse and evaluate, in context, modern historians' interpretations of the historical events and topics studied. AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. Please note that interpretations can be evaluated in the context of the wider historical debate connected with the issue or of the historical context about which the historian was writing. There is no expectation that the interpretation will be evaluated in the context of the methods or approach used by the historian, or how the interpretation may have been affected by the time in which they were writing, though credit can be given for this approach to evaluation if done in a way which is relevant to the question. A learner's knowledge and understanding of the historical period, including the ancient sources may be credited, but only where it is presented in a way which is relevant and intrinsically linked to the analysis/evaluation/use of the interpretation, it should not be credited in isolation.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	17–20	- Response has a very thorough and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and fully substantiated evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) - The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with a conclusion either agreeing or disagreeing with the modern historians' interpretation, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of 'how convincing'. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. Answers should evaluate both the interpretation, locating it within the wider historical debate about the issue and using their own

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 4	13–16	- Response has a thorough and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and well supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) - The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)	knowledge of the ancient sources and events and periods to reach a judgement about how convincing they find the argument. In locating the interpretation within the wider historical debate, candidates might pick out the following points from the extract: - What the Megarian Decree actually said - The economic effects of the Megarian Decree - Athenian aggression against Corinth in the 460s - That war looked imminent for much of the 430s
Level 3	9–12	- Response has a good analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) - The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1)	In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this interpretation is not convincing, pointing towards the following information / ancient sources: The Megarian Decree was not intended as an economic measure but had religious justifications (Thucydides 1.139; Plutarch <i>Pericles</i> 30). Though clearly it would have had economic effects due to its terms (Thucydides 1.67, 139; Aristophanes <i>Acharnians</i> 535)
Level 2	5–8	- Response has some analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a partially supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) - The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1)	- There was always a hawkish party at Sparta who was more to blame as can be seen from her consistent actions throughout the period: - Spartan opposition to the Athens rebuilding her walls and her sense of aggrievement at seeing her wishes thwarted, 479-8 (Thucydides 1.90-92) - The debate at Sparta recorded in Diodorus (11.50)

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 1	1–4	- Response has a basic analysis of the interpretation, with parts of the answer just describing the interpretation. Response produces a very basic evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) - The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1)	- Sparta's secret promise to help Thasos revolt, foiled by the earthquake and helot revolt (Thucydides 1.101), c465 - Ongoing suspicion of Athens (Thucydides 1.102), c465-4 - Events leading to battle of Tanagra, 457 (Thucydides 1.108) - Athenian and Corinthian tensions from 460 onwards (Thucydides 1.103, 105-108) - Spartan invasion of 446 under Pleistoanax (Thucydides 1.114) - Spartan vote to attack Athens at time of revolt of Samos, 440, despite only 5 years after start of Thirty Years' Peace (Thucydides 1.40) - Spartan promise to attack Athens if Potidaea revolted (Thucydides 1.58) - Sparta refused Athenian offers of arbitration (Thucydides 1.140, 7.18) and later felt that they were at fault (Thucydides 7.18) In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this view is convincing, drawing on the following information / ancient sources: - The Decree was economic in form and intention (Thucydides 1.67, 139; Aristophanes <i>Acharnians</i> 535) - The religious justifications were just an excuse for a decree intended to harm Megara, partly as punishment for sending ships to help Corinth against Athens at Corcyra, or to force her back into Athenian alliance re-establishing the buffer state of c463-446 (Thucydides 1.103 & 113) - The Peloponnesian states did see the Decree as Athenian aggression (Thucydides 1.67; 139) - The other activities of the Athenians through the 430s (Corcyra and Potidaea), though not contrary to the terms of the Peace, were clearly aggressive (Thucydides 1.118) and could be regarded as intentionally so
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
			Thucydides' view on the significance of the growth of the Athenian power and the fear this caused in Sparta (1.23; 88) Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited.

Section B: The Rise of Macedon, c. 359–323 BC

Question 4	How useful is this passage for our understanding of Philip's ambition? [12 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. AO3 = 6 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 6	11–12	- The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) - Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach substantiated, well-developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either way as to the source's usefulness to understanding the issue in question providing the response has addressed the issue of usefulness. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. Candidates may discuss the following information in relation to contents of the source:

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	9–10	- The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) - Response uses a good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	- Whether Philip was really interested in ruling Greece or whether it was a means to an end, i.e. the invasion of Asia Minor and the glory that it would bring him. - His ‘kindly face’ does not always sit well with the ruthless and warlike Philip who had been securing and strengthening Macedonia. - The decision to invade Persia ‘on the Greeks’ behalf’ sounds like a popular plan to gain their support. - Election of Philip as General of Greece. The usefulness of this passage in comparison/contrast to other sources which make reference to Phillip’s ambitions e.g.: - In the aftermath of Chaeronea, Philip immediately puts forward the idea of a campaign in Asia Minor as ‘revenge for the Persian invasions’ of the early 5th century. - As soon as he is elected <i>autokrator</i> he starts organising a levy as though this was preplanned. - He organises supplies and returns to Macedon as though he can now focus on the coming campaign
Level 4	7–8	- The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) - Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	
Level 3	5–6	- The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1) - Response uses a reasonable range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 2	3–4	- The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1) - Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	Other sources discussing whether Philip's ambition was clear: - The Greek states were not wary enough of Philip and continued their internal wars leaving him to be the overall winner (Justin 8.1). - Philip's apparent treachery for his own ends, suggesting it was not easy to tell what his ultimate aim was (Justin 8.3).
Level 1	1–2	- The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1) - Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way but judgements about how the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question are either not present or are not linked to analysis and are merely assertions. (AO3)	- How Philip manipulated and outwitted his neighbours to build Macedon into a strong state which would be secure and powerful (Justin 8.5–6). - That a campaign against Persia was the clear aim of Philip after becoming <i>autokrator</i> (Justin 9.5).

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	- How Philip made promises to different groups and hoodwinked everyone by exploiting their ignorance of his intentions (Demosthenes 2. 6). - Alexander's speed in leaving for campaign after Philip's death might suggest that such a campaign was seen as reputation building? Candidates may also discuss the extent to which we cannot know for certain whether Philip's ambition was fully formed on his accession or whether it evolved at each successive victory.

*Question 5	'Philip's reorganisation of the Macedonian army upon his accession was the most important reason for his success.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? [36 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about: • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 6	31–36	- Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. Answers should aim to cover a variety of reasons for Philip's success in making Macedon a strong and successful military state, including: how Philip went about building a standing army, how he reformed their weaponry – the sarissa, hypaspists etc and tactics used including the phalanx. Answers are likely to include information on: The way Philip set about organising the Macedonian army when he took the throne, and how he built on

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	- Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.	and improved, or discarded, the methods etc of his predecessors. Supporting source details may include: - Philip's time in Thebes with Epaminondas – observing the army and tactics (Diodorus 16.2). - Philip's reorganisation of the army on his return from Thebes alongside creating assemblies, equipping the army properly etc. (Diodorus 16.3) - the licentiousness and unruliness of Philip's court (Demosthenes, 2.18). Plutarch 11 also presents the Macedonian court as full of feuding factions. - Cleitus' comments on Philip's achievements (Arrian, 4.8ff).
Level 4	19–24	- Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)	- Alexander explains to his army at Opis how Philip had built up the army from nothing but left little in the treasury for his son (Arrian, 7.9). - Philip's success not only due to his army but to his tactics and diplomacy (Justin, 8.1-6). - Philip owes his success to having a standing army always at the ready and being first to take the field, and also to having a plan (Demosthenes, 8.11). - Philip's actions were not entirely focused on organising the army.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
		There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	- Philip secured the boundaries of Macedon and exploited the wealth of natural resources including the people (Diodorus 16.3). - Philip takes control of the gold mines at Crenides (Philippi) (Diodorus 16.8). - neighbouring kings concerned at Philip's actions early in his reign (Diodorus 16 22.3). - Philip's actions in dealing with the northern Aegean cities – looking to secure resources such as timber? (Diodorus 53-55). - Philip's deceitful behaviour towards allies; his marriages (Justin 8.6). - Philip only acts in his own interests (Demosthenes 9.7).
Level 3	13–18	- Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. Analysis of the sources might focus on: - What Philip had learnt from his time in Thebes as a hostage, - the situation left to him by his predecessors, - the dangers to Macedon from surrounding city-states, - the need to exploit the natural resources of Macedon.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	• the reliability of the literary and epigraphic evidence available.
Level 1	1–6	• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
		Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

*Question 6	How far do you agree that up to and including the Battle of Gaugamela (331 BC), Alexander's successes were based on his skill as a general? [36 marks]
Assessment Objectives	AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about: - historical events and historical periods studied - how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied. Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 6	31–36	- Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)	No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of 'how far'. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors. Answers are likely to include information on: - Alexander's training in his youth. - His participation in the battle at Chaeronea. - The way he enthused and led his troops during the campaign against the Persians. - His justifications for why his army should be loyal to him. - Alexander's grasp of battle tactics - The battles of Granicus, Issus and Gaugamela - His pre-battle speeches - The way he put himself in the front rank as an example.

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
		There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.	• His 'inheritance' of competent generals from his father (e.g. Parmenio). Such things as Alexander's stirring speeches to his men before Issus and Gaugamela. • Mention of the siege of Tyre and the building of a causeway and possibly the siege of Gaza. • Alexander's complete faith in himself and his ability to win and his understanding of his enemy. • Mistakes made by his opponents. Supporting source details may include: • Alexander's part in the victory at Chaeronea (Diodorus 16.86).

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	- Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.	- Darius' generals gather at river Granicus; Parmenio's advice ignored by Alexander who leads his army across the river late in the day; Alexander's life is saved by Cleitus (Plutarch 16/Arrian 1.13). - Darius badly advised and moves his forces to a position which does not favour his army, so Alexander also helped by his enemy's bad decision. As with Granicus, Alexander leads a charge across the stream dividing the armies (Arrian 2.6-7). - Alexander again ignoring Parmenio's advice, and Arrian notes that Alexander often took risks in battle. Alexander's careful placement of his forces, and the letting of Darius' scythe-chariots through the main force to be cut down by the Royal Guard (Arrian 3.9 & 13-15). - Alexander putting himself in danger by being conspicuous to his troops (Plutarch 16). - The siege of Halicarnassus where a raiding party was frightened off by Alexander's appearance on the scene and Alexander realises the need for a navy (Arrian 1.20-23). Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. Analysis of the sources might focus on: - The siege of Halicarnassus - Details of events at the battle of Granicus - Darius' decision to move the battleground at Issus - Alexander's tactics at Gaugamela
Level 4	19–24	- Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
		There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	The reliability of the evidence
Level 3	13–18	- Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) - The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) - The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	
Level 1	1–6	• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)	

Level	Marks	Level descriptors	Indicative content
		Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

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



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

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 2025 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](#).

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.