

# **Ancient History**

Advanced GCE **A2 7809**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3809**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

**3809/7809/MS/R/07**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE Ancient History (7809)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Ancient History (3809)

### REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2450	Document Study 1: Greek History	3
2451	Document Study 1: Roman History	8
2452	Document Study 1: Roman World	16
2453	Source Based Study 1: Greek History	20
2454	Source Based Study 1: Roman History	26
2455	Source Based Study 1: Roman World	36
2456	Thematic Study 1: Greek History	40
2457	Thematic Study 1: Roman History	44
2458	Thematic Study 1: Roman World	50
2459	Document Study 2: Greek History	54
2460	Document Study 2: Roman History	58
2461	Document Study 2: Roman World	66
2462	Source Based Study 2: Greek History	70
2463	Source Based Study 2: Roman History	73
2464	Source Based Study 2: Roman World	79
2465	Thematic Study 2: Greek History	83
2466	Thematic Study 2: Roman History	86
2467	Thematic Study 2: Roman World	92
2468	Individual Study: Greek history	94
2469	Individual Study: Roman History	94
2470	Individual Study: Roman World	94
*	Grade Thresholds	96



## **Chief Examiner Report**

Yet again there has been an increase in the entry for the subject at both levels; the growing popularity of the subject is encouraging for future developments. The subject attracts a wide range of centres and students. The vast majority of candidates showed clearly that they have profited from the teaching they have received and have displayed an enthusiasm for the subject which is to the credit of everyone involved.

The candidates continue to improve in their application of source material at both AS and A2. It is not yet universal, but we are getting much more awareness of the need to develop their knowledge from what the sources tell us. There are still the factually based answers, which are often very sound and well-researched but lack reference to the sources. This damages the chances of good candidates gaining a high grade. Evaluation of the evidence is gaining ground, even if only in general terms. Candidates do need to relate their evaluation to the specific reference they are using for the highest grades.

This year, unlike in most previous years, at AS there was a noticeable rise in the number of candidates who failed to answer two questions in the Document Studies (2450, 2451, 2452). The rubric states plainly that two questions must be answered from the same section. This means the questions on two passages. Centres are also reminded that on these papers (a) and (b) questions **must be answered as separate questions** not amalgamated together as one answer.

Examiners do stress that those candidates who take time to identify the key words/phrases in the question and develop their answer accordingly are more likely to be successful. It means that the answer is focused on the issues and does not tend to lose track of the question. In Document study especially, it is a common failing that the answers to the (a) questions do not mention the extract printed on the examination paper. The answer provides background or a narrative instead of analysing in detail the passage given.

The Coursework moderator was again aware that some centres are allowing candidates to choose titles which make it difficult to achieve marks in the three objectives. Centres can seek the advice of the moderator if they are unsure. Centres should be aware that each candidate should provide a word-count and that failure to keep within the 3000 words will be penalised. It is also important to remain within the Source-based study content.

**Finally**, as always, the perennial plea for **assistant examiners**: this is not just a repeat message – it is a serious matter when we struggle to find qualified examiners. It is essential for the continuance of the subject that there is a sufficient supply of Ancient History teachers willing to examine it. Principal examiners need the support of those who are daily in contact with the subject and the students who enter for the examination to provide the most reliable assessment of their attainment.



## **2450 Greek History: Document Study 1**

### **General comments**

The examiners felt that this paper was handled more confidently this year by candidates, and responses made good use of the passages, while drawing on a wider range of information. As has been the case in previous years, the majority of candidates organised their time well, though there were a few whose work clearly fell away under pressure of time, resulting in a final response that was very brief. There were a number of rubric errors where the candidate answered only one question, but fewer on this paper than in previous years. Candidates should be made as fully aware of the structure of the paper as possible before the exam, as these mistakes recur under pressure each year.

The majority of candidates had been well prepared to answer the (a) question, though there are still some who deal more with the topic than the passage on the paper. Since only marks under AO3 are available for this question, and the question itself directs the candidate to the passage set, it is difficult to give credit even for very erudite answers which stray too far from what is requested. When dealing with (b) questions, there are still candidates who neglect to draw on the sources, thus making it hard to give them credit under AO3. Candidates should be encouraged to make use of the passage, even if this means repeating something they have commented on in answering the (a) question. However generalised paragraphs on sources are not generally helpful and can restrict the time available for a full answer to the question.

Some candidates struggled to place passages in context in the stress of exam conditions. They should be trained to use the passage on the paper and the question together, as the marking grids give credit for intelligent use of the passage. Some answers to Question 5 were clearly unsure what a *proxenos* was, but could still score effectively by using what they saw in the passage.

Relatively few candidates discussed the nature of the passage set. This is helpful in showing coverage of Band 1, but even for answers that are more limited, discussion of the nature of the source (e.g. from an historian such as Herodotus or Thucydides, from an inscription, from a comic play) can pull the mark up into a higher Band. However comments about authors should be made relevant to the question; prepared paragraphs are often unhelpful.

The best answers were well-organised, made clear reference to the sources and gave a focused answer to the question.

### **Quality of Written Communication**

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There remain some candidates whose writing proves problematic for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised to use English terms whenever possible, rather than struggling with Greek terms.

## Comments on individual questions

### Section A - Herodotus on Persia

There were fewer candidates taking this section this year.

- 1 (a) What does this passage (The Cyrus Cylinder 26-41) tell us about the benefits of Persian intervention in Babylon?  
(b) How well can we understand the impact of Cyrus' conquests from our available sources?  
In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question was less popular, perhaps because the Persian sources intimidate some candidates. In (b) candidates were able to relate this passage to other examples drawn from Herodotus.

- 2 (a) What does this passage (Herodotus 3.80) tell us about Herodotus' views of Persian kings? (b) How well does Herodotus understand the relationship between the Persian king and his people? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

Not all candidates were clear of the context of this speech. The (b) question was generally well answered.

- 3 (a) What does this passage (Herodotus 8.90) tell us about Xerxes as a commander? (b) How well does Herodotus explain the political and military roles of the Persian kings? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

Candidates used the passage to good effect in (a), though in (b) the answers did not always cover both political and military aspects of the king's role.

### Section B - The Athenian Empire 450- 410 BC

- 4 (a) What does this passage (Plutarch, *Perikles* 12.1-4) tell us about Athenian attitudes towards the rewards of empire? (b) To what extent did the Athenians benefit from empire more than their allies? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

Many candidates could correctly identify the issues raised in the passage, though some focused too much on the movement of the treasury from Delos to Athens, and not all identified the differing view of groups of Athenians presented here. Some answers to (b) were unbalanced, with limited discussion of the rewards gained by allies.

- 5 (a) What does this passage (ML 90) tell us about the relationship between the Athenians and Oiniades? (b) How effectively were the Athenians able to control their allies during this period? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This proved a challenging passage for some candidates who were unsure what exactly a *proxenos* was. However, those who went methodically through the passage could select a range of points to answer the question. Very few responses dealt with the type of evidence (inscription). In (b) candidates were in general well aware of the methods used, but did not always focus on the effectiveness of what Athens did. Although many mentioned cleruchies, few gave examples and there was some variation in spelling. Many candidates



mentioned the Megarian decrees, but few made it clear that they knew that Megara was not an ally at the times of the decrees; however the general point made was a sound one.

- 6** (a) What does this passage (Thucydides 5.84) tell us about the relationships between the Greek states mentioned in the passage at this time? (b) Do you agree that Athens' allies had reason to fear her in the period 421-10 BC? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This passage from relatively late in the period caused some confusion, but those who worked through the passage and focused on the Greek states mentioned scored well. A few candidates recognised Melos and focused more on the outcome than on the passage. In (b) many candidates ignored the dates specified, and gave examples from the Archidamian War. The best answers chose points in the period 421-410 and suggested different answers depending on the success Athens was enjoying at the time.

## Section C - The Trial of Socrates

This section was very popular this year.

- 7 (a) What does this passage (Plato, *Apology* 19a-d) tell us about the reasons for the charges brought against Socrates? (b) To what extent do you consider Aristophanes was responsible for the guilty verdict against Socrates? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This was a popular passage. (a) was dealt with well as a whole, and many candidates were able to show how the content of the passage related to the charges laid against Socrates. There were divergent views on the importance of Aristophanes, though some candidates seemed to imply that the play was put on just before the trial: others were very well informed about its date, success and content.

- 8 (a) What does this passage (Plato, *Apology* 22a-c) tell us about the nature of Socrates' philosophical inquiry? (b) In your opinion, why was Socrates condemned to death? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This was a less popular question, but there were some good answers which used the passage well. In (b) answers varied considerably, but the best drew on a range of sources, and pointed both to the impact of Socratic questioning on individuals in Athens, as well as to Socrates' association with unpopular groups, such as sophists and oligarchs.

- 9 (a) What does this passage (Plato, *Apology* 32a-c) tell us about the way Socrates conducted himself in public life? (b) In your opinion, was Socrates' defence at his trial designed more to justify his way of life than to secure his acquittal? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This was very popular, with most candidates approaching the (a) question confidently. They were able to assess Socrates' role at the assembly meeting and pick up on his priorities as expressed in the passage. The (b) question was more demanding, but most candidates were able to show how the defence speech they studied failed to provide a defence in an Athenian court.



## 2451 Roman History: Document Study 1

### General comments

The candidates showed good understanding when evaluating and drawing conclusions from the material. Clearly document study technique is an essential skill to be acquired during the year if they are to perform well on this module. Some have obviously practiced the skills and managed their time well. Others found some difficulty in completing the two questions. There also appeared to be a higher number attempting one question instead of two. This may be an issue of time-management in the examination which suggests that some practice in timed exercises may be useful.

Most candidates had a working knowledge of the documents, and some had knowledge of documents beyond the prescribed texts. Candidates varied in their understanding of the documents, but very few were unable to give a context or explain the material and use it as evidence, even if only superficially. We continue to have candidates who ignore the relatively straightforward wording of '*What does **this** passage tell us about...*' in order to give considerable information about the topic of the question. This approach loses considerable time for answering the actual question. There are some marks for information in the (b) sub-question but the (a) sub-question is marked on A03 entirely; while some information about the text and author and context is useful, it need not be very much especially given the limited time available. Good answers provided 2 or 3 detailed references on which to base their discussions rather than a generalised assessment of the author's works. Some answers from well-informed candidates suffered under objectives A02 and A03 through lack of detailed and specific material. Some knowledge of the authors' aims, agendas and context of writing often helps to inform answers, but not to the exclusion of dealing with the text itself. As always a careful use of the extract's information with comment as to why the word, phrase or sentence has been chosen in respect of the question, would ensure a good mark in the (a) questions. Bias is a word frequently used in these questions, and it is generally taken to mean that if an author is biased, it is inaccurate. In addition, some (b) answers did little more than draw more information from the extract, providing no additional material when higher marks require it.

In all questions there were some very good answers, as well as some answers which did not address the question. Some interpretation is needed in the (a) sub-question which shows an understanding of the text and its value as evidence. Candidates who quote small or large sections of the extract without explaining why these choices have been made, and without relevant interpretation, are not likely to score highly.

## Comments on individual questions

### Section A - The Catilinarian Conspiracy

All questions were answered in this section. The vast majority of candidates are familiar with the texts and events, although a good number still confuse the chronology of events. Most are aware of Sallust's aims and approach to history, and some use the information well. However, evaluation is not sufficient if it amounts to no more than a repeated sentence which tells us that Sallust is a moralising/dramatic/ melodramatic/ author unrelated to any specific reference or quotation where this might be a significant factor. The candidates need to evaluate the specific evidence they are using. As always some evaluation of the sources was necessary for the best answers.

- 1 (a) What does this passage (Cicero, *In Catilinam* IV 7-8) tell us about Caesar's proposal and Cicero's view on its effectiveness in the situation? (b) Discuss how successfully Cicero dealt with the political and legal difficulties raised in this debate. In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

On Caesar's proposal to imprison the conspirators, was in general answered well. The main problem in the (a) sub-questions was the failure to answer both parts of the question which involved Cicero's view on it – needing more interpretation than simple referencing the text. Most candidates displayed a competence at extracting information from the passage relating to the proposal, although odd details were missed, such as the confiscation of property.

Good answers identified the context of the speech. Weaker candidates proceeded to develop the answer with regard to the situation and execution of the conspirators. In the (b) sub-question, there was very good material which developed the information from the extract with material from other parts of the texts. These answers focused on the issue of legality, with reference to the laws on citizen rights to trial. Candidates who show a balanced approach to Cicero's evidence are more likely to score well rather than assuming everything is exaggerated and untrue. Some support from other evidence was needed, as always, in order to answer the question fully, especially concerning the political issues such as maintaining support across the factions, or ensuring his future against prosecution; again better candidates were aware of the problems in using Sallust since he is most likely to have used Cicero himself. A number of answers did not address 'successfully' clearly enough.

- 2 (a) What does this passage (Sallust, *Catiline* 39) tell us about Sallust's views on the problems of the Roman Republic at the time of the conspiracy? (b) How useful is Sallust's account for our understanding of the political situation in Rome at the time of the Catilinarian conspiracy? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question on the problems of the Republic was well-answered in (a) but less so in (b). In (a) candidates had to develop views from the information in the passage and interpret what was in the extract. Few candidates noted that Sallust's use of some of the detail in his assessment, which he presents in a generalised manner. Good answers used the extract carefully with detailed examples. Answers strayed from the information in the extract too easily. (b) Answers were sometimes excellent in their ideas about the political situation since candidates could provide a fair amount of information from the text and knew about optimates and populares, the Rabinus trial etc. However, the question of Sallust's usefulness escaped a number of candidates. Good information was used from other texts such as Plutarch, although not actually set at this level. Weaker answers provided a narrative of the year.

- 3 (a) What does this passage (Sallust, *Catiline* 31) tell us about Sallust's characterisation of Cicero and Catiline? (b) Discuss how far Catiline's problems were due to his own mistakes and ineffectiveness. In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question on Catiline's character and his effectiveness in the conspiracy produced variable answers. Some answers developed the question in terms of the contrast between Catiline (the villain) and Cicero (the hero) providing an answer which saw a good balance of material and discussion. Weaker answers simply gave a series of quotes from the passage with very little attempt to develop the characterisation as such. In (b) candidates generally had sufficient knowledge of the scope of the Conspiracy to develop good answers, although they tended to be one-sided, seeing Catiline as either unlucky to have Cicero opposing him, or simply incapable. Very good answers widened the scope of the answer by reference to others supposedly in the plot. Some answers focused entirely upon the extract when further detail is needed for higher marks. Again good answers used **precise** information about the events, especially the actions of Catiline. Very good answers continue to question the information we have. However, this must be related to the information extracted and not simply a blanket assessment that 'Cicero exaggerates' because he needs to persuade the listeners.

## Section B - Augustus and Augustan Propaganda

Candidates continue to find assessing poetry as historical evidence difficult, and tend to evaluate by some overall assessment that since it is poetry we cannot believe entirely what is written. They usually proceed to use the extracts as fact from that point on, without evaluating the precise evidence. A paragraph on the *Res Gestae* as Augustus' memoirs, and therefore untrustworthy, is not what is needed. An author's perspective on events does not make his or her account of them incorrect or inaccurate.

- 4 (a) What does this passage (Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 1-3) tell us about how Augustus wanted the early part of his career to be viewed? (b) Discuss how far the *Res Gestae* succeeds in answering criticisms of the ways Augustus acquired and maintained his power. In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question on the presentation of his career in his early period and the success of the *Res Gestae* in answering criticisms) was the very popular. The context of the extract and the information referred to were identified by most candidates. The sub-question (b) was attempted well with support from other source-material to provide some idea of the criticisms which Augustus may be answering. Some answers made no reference to criticisms and simply discussed the accuracy of the extract and/or the whole book without referring to how it answered criticisms. As in Section A some candidates provided additional material which they had come across in another module from Dio Cassius and Velleius Paterculus. In (a) there was a tendency to repeat the phrasing of the passage, when the question concerned not 'what' he tells us, but rather what he wants his readers to think about the content. A number of candidates failed to develop the elements of legality, generosity and piety involved, ignoring some aspects; weaker answers started to detail the events, without reference to the passage.

- 5 (a) What does this passage (Tacitus, *Annals* 1.8) tell us about views of Augustus at the time of his death. (b) To what extent were Augustus' actions and achievements supported by the different classes of Romans? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question asked about the views of Augustus and support for Augustus' actions and achievements. Answers identified the range of possibilities very well, although not always interpreting the Tacitus in context. As in Q. 4, some repetition of the extract was found to be the case in some answers. The best answers again recognised the ways in which Tacitus suggests some ambiguity about the reactions and the generalisations which the extract provided. The issue of support among the **different classes** was generally answered soundly (b). The only problem lay with those candidates who did not read the question carefully to note that it concerned a range of reactions not one group or a general view of Augustus. Some ignored the emphasis on 'achievements' and the focus for some was on Augustus himself. Despite good knowledge and understanding, candidates who did this did not answer the question and suffered accordingly. Those candidates who were aware of the plots against Augustus, the troubles he had with various members of the upper class (senators and/or equestrians) and the times when the lower classes reacted badly answered this question well. Some failed to use the passage as evidence for some views. The better answers employed their knowledge of the poetry of the age to suggest attitudes towards Augustus.

- 6 (a) What does this passage (Virgil Aeneid 6. 789-808) tell us about Virgil's attitude towards Augustus' achievements? (b) How true was it that Augustus did 'bring back again the age of gold to Latium' (lines 4-5)? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question asked candidates to consider the relevance and importance of poetry to the Augustan regime. The genre of the extract is important and not all candidates are able to establish the relevance of this. It was equally important to examine what is said and how the issues are presented through interpretation of the images and language. Very good answers knew precisely the context of the poem and were able to interpret the information in relation to events during the period. Most candidates recognised some aspects in the poem, even if only on a superficial level, although some were confused over the references to places and people. In (b) the answers focused often on the extract again with little reference to other documents. Good answers were able to contrast this extract with comments from other poets and writers. Candidates who evaluate the poems with a general assessment of their historical value, instead of looking at each precise and specific poem or part of a poem, did not answer this question well. Equally those with only a sketchy knowledge of the content and the style are unlikely to be able to support their judgements with precise and sound knowledge. A number simply provided generalisations about Augustus' regime without specific examples and so could not gain marks in A01 and A02 very easily. The very best focused on the word 'true' and discussed what could be extracted and what could not.



## **Section C - The Reign of Nero**

As in previous years, most candidates understood the difference between the two genres and agendas of the authors. They mostly applied it well to the tasks. Candidates had a good knowledge of the reign of Nero, and could apply the knowledge relevantly to the questions. Some candidates confuse the reference source – giving Suetonius credit where Tacitus deserves it and vice versa, although in most cases it did not affect the general point being made. Evaluation of the sources remains an issue where candidates insist on some general overview of Suetonius as sensationalist (on the lines of a tabloid newspaper) and Tacitus as the conservative reactionary who hates emperors and distorts the facts to suit his purpose. These generalisations do not help their cause in AO3.

- 7** (a) What does this passage (Tacitus Annals 14.12-13) tell us about reactions to Agrippina's death? (b) How successfully did Nero gain and maintain popularity among the ordinary people of Rome and the Empire? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

There were a number of excellent answers to Q. 7, on Agrippina's death and Nero's popularity. The candidates interpreted the extract for the reactions and attitudes. The good answers identified the variety of reactions among different groups and individuals. There were some, however, who developed a short essay on Agrippina. Better answers spotted that this was more about Nero than anyone else. Tacitus' bias was usually addressed but not generally well as if everything in the passage reflected badly upon Nero. In answering (b) on Nero's popularity there were many very good answers: very good candidates focused on the ordinary people as the question asked. The most common examples were Tacitus' account of the games, his chariot racing and his use of gifts and so on. Most answers included the main elements of his popularity among the lower classes but a number also discussed other groups. Good answers developed the attitude Tacitus displays towards Nero and Suetonius' view of his actions. Incidents which suggested that he was losing popularity were well-rewarded, providing a balanced discussion.

- 8** (a) What does this passage (Suetonius 43) tell us about Nero's reactions to the news of the revolt and the reasons for his behaviour? (b) How credible is the portrayal in the sources of Nero in the latter part of his reign? In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

The question on the reaction of Nero to the revolt of Vindex and the portrayal in the sources was generally answered with clearly expressed conclusions from the extract for (a). Again there were those who used the question to narrate the final days of Nero's reign. Good answers dealt with all the aspects in the extract, weaker ones focused on some. Good answers interpreted the actions for reasons finding good points to make about his behaviour. Something of Suetonius' attitude was also developed by better answers in terms of his view of Nero's character. For (b) candidates did not always keep to the scope of the question despite it being limited to the later part of his reign. The majority of the final years are not covered by Tacitus and so candidates needed to use information from some years before the incident in the passage. 'Credible' was not always addressed despite answers using a good range of source material. Good answers made comparisons with Tacitus and other parts of Suetonius to consider how compatible they were. A small number of well chosen incidents was sufficient to develop a good answer.

- 9 What does this passage (Tacitus, *Annals* 15.65-67) tell us about the motives and aims of Piso's fellow-conspirators? Consider why this attempt by Piso and others to overthrow Nero failed. In your answer, you should refer to this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question focused on the plot by Piso and others and why it failed. The context is the deaths of Flavus and Rufus and the contrast between them both as conspirators and as victims. For the (a) sub-question the extract indicated Tacitus' attitudes as well as the motives of the plotters in his use of rumour and direct speech; good answers made good use of the material in terms of identifying different motives apart from getting rid of Nero. Specific information on the characters in the extract was lacking in the less effective answers, as was a focus on 'motives'. Some good answers made a point out of the use of direct speech in the final part of the extract. In (b) the answers were usually well-documented and well-argued. Some answers showed a wide range of knowledge and good use of evidence for the course of the plot. Some willingness to accept Tacitus' view of the plotters was noticeable; others managed to find reference in Suetonius (which was actually Tacitus); most were able to discuss the nature of the characters involved, especially Epicaris as a contrast with most others. Not all could identify specific events or the order of events or the names of the individuals (Milichus was frequently renamed and given a different status).

It has to be said again, that some candidates answer with barely a reference to the sources despite the fact that 60 of the 90 marks for the extracts are for A03. They are usually quite knowledgeable candidates who generally have sufficient sensible ideas to produce a good answer if they would only use the documents. Answers must always be supported by use of the documents and some evaluation of the source as evidence using precise examples where necessary. Without these elements answers cannot achieve the higher levels on the marking grids.



## **2452 Roman World: Document Study 1**

### **General comments**

The requirement to answer two questions on this paper (in contrast to 2455 and 2458) has once again raised its ugly head, as was the case last year. Some 10% of candidates committed this error in 2007, by no means all of them producing weaker answers (although with ample time to answer parts (a) and (b) of a single question, candidates had time to amass more marks on the one question, while penalising themselves by not answering the second). Once again it must be made clear that centres need to stress, even at the start of the examination itself, that **the requirement to answer two questions is not met by addressing (a) and (b)**. Time-management is clearly an issue in this examination, but in the (a) section, four well-developed points can be written in a side or less, and will enable the highest bands to be reached. This problem affected some centres much more than others, where the problem has been successfully addressed. Candidates must also be prepared for the requirements of the examination. Despite the aversion of many to 'teaching to the examination', candidates who are not adequately prepared to answer the questions as set are at a distinct disadvantage. Thus biographical information, even running to lengthy paragraphs, about authors such as Tacitus which is not relevant to the specific question is irrelevant and gains no marks. This is particularly the case with (a) questions, where at AS there are 20 marks awardable for AO3 only.

A further error which has begun to creep in is the writing of answers to (a) and (b) parts of the questions as a single essay. The examiners try to disentangle different parts and award marks accordingly where they can, but more often than not the answer is a mishmash of vaguely related/ relevant points, and thus has to be marked **either** as (a) **or** (more often) as (b) – leading to the loss of 40 or 50 marks from the outset. Again, this seems to affect less able candidates, who can ill afford to lose access to marks in this way. Centres must draw candidates' attention to the fact that the mark scheme does not permit the awarding of marks for (a) in (b) on this paper – unlike the three-part questions in 2455 and 2458.

Simple techniques need to be reiterated: many candidates fail to engage with the questions set, or misread them (see particularly on 2a, below). The result is that while they produce answers which are accurate, and even supported, they are often irrelevant. A session showing how the mark grids are applied would benefit students overall, as they would then be able to see how they are missing out on straightforward marks – providing they have some knowledge of the source material and the secondary sources. Support for assertions made must be included in the (b) question, where marks are awarded for all three attainment objectives, and the use of sources or reference to them will enable more marks to be awarded under both AO3 and AO2 (for supporting an argument, and avoiding plain unfounded assertion or reliance on narrative). Candidates would in many instances benefit from extensive practice in time-management and techniques; a good number, too many to be acceptable, wrote unnecessarily in the (a) parts and then found themselves short of time in the (b) parts.

On this point, the Examiners have noted a continued tendency to conflate original ancient sources with modern scholars, in this and other papers. While it is true that some authorities seem to have been with us almost since the beginning, candidates must be taught to distinguish clearly between them; it would help, in answering 2452 and all the accompanying papers, if candidates could be shown the technique of starting with evidence and moving to a conclusion, rather than making assertions and casting around for support. There has been a marked increase in speculation and supposition as a result ('they must have', 'they would have'). 2007 has also seen an appearance of slang on a remarkable scale for the first time; candidates wrote that Tacitus 'bigged up' Agricola, and Caesar's second expeditionary force was 'humongous'. Abbreviations were also noticed in greater numbers than before – 'info' 'intel' and 'recce' – the impact of war reports on the news? Most students used the word 'guerrilla' to describe British military tactics, but spelling it correctly is beyond many. Likewise, there seems to be very little emphasis on correct spelling, clear communication, or lucid expression. Common names such as Caesar or Britain/Briton are routinely confused to a point where the impression is given that these do not matter. As for 'bias' – do not ask the examiners to think any more on this .

### Comments on individual questions

- 1 (a) What does this passage (Caesar, *Gallic War* 4.32) tell us about the difficulties Caesar encountered during his first expedition to Britain? (b) To what extent were Caesar's two expeditions well planned? In your answer you should refer to both this passage and to other sources you have studied.

This question was easily the most popular, with about two-thirds of the candidates attempting it. On the whole it was better done than (2), and candidates found it more straightforward addressing (3).

(a) This was generally done well. Candidates as a rule found little difficulty in identifying 'difficulties' in the passage and commenting on them to a greater or lesser extent. There was a welcome number of answers scoring 16 marks and above. As remarked in the introduction, a number of candidates were misled into writing a general history of Caesar's expeditions here rather than in (b) where it would have earned some marks.

(b) The most able candidates were able to provide a wide range of detail about Caesar's two expeditions, and could contrast them well, with balanced and supported comments. Weaker answers gave imbalanced answers, or provided little or no information on one or the other. There was a tendency to repeat what Caesar said without making the source explicit; benefit of the doubt was applied in a number of instances where after a long narrative a statement such as 'all this is in Caesar' or 'Caesar tells us all this.' There were some desperate attempts to support judgements from non-existent archaeology or invented statements by Caesar.

- 2 (a) What does this passage (Tacitus *Annals* 12. 33-34) tell us about the reaction of some Britons to the Roman conquest under Claudius? (b) Discuss how far Caratacus posed a serious threat to the Roman hold on Britain. In your answer you should refer to both this passage and other sources you have studied.

This question and question three were equally popular. In (a) some candidates appear to have missed the significance of the phrase 'some Britons' and embarked on a general discussion of British opposition to the Romans. This would have been better placed in (b). The passage was generally handled well, with key phrases picked up and commented on. Comments on the reliability of the statements, put as they are into the mouth of a Briton by a Roman, were often perceptive; there is also a serious lack of understanding of rhetoric and the place of speeches in ancient histories generally, and some naive and simplistic comments were also to be found.

This question seems to have been more difficult; the temptation to write the 'story' and make no use of sources was a common seduction, as was the inability of many to spot what was required by 'how far' and note that despite his opposition here he lost this battle as he had lost battles before against the Romans, despite the passage. There seemed little appreciation of the speed of the conquest up to AD 47, or of the rapid pacification of the south.

- 3 (a) What does this passage (Tacitus, *Agricola* 21) tell us about Tacitus' views of the part played by Agricola in the Romanisation of Britain? (b) How accurate is Tacitus' account of Romanization under Agricola? In your answer you should refer to both this passage and other sources you have studied.

As popular as (2), this question was set with some trepidation by the examiners given the likelihood that candidates had all studied it in depth, it being such a versatile piece of the *Agricola*. This accounts for the slightly more complex approach demanded by the question, asking what the passage tells us about Tacitus' views of the part played by Agricola in Romanization. Here again, a lack of attention to the passage led many to launch into a general essay without any specific support on why Tacitus was 'biased/bias/biast'. There were also a number of very naive and simplistic responses which assumed that T. intended us to think of Agricola as a part-time teacher, going through *amo*, *amas*, *amat* with the tribal chiefs! There were other misunderstandings or instances of poor appreciation of the passage which indicated that all Britons, undifferentiated, were swanning around in togas. The best responses were able to pick out key points and evaluate them – supporting or countering the picture in the passage with archaeology and in some instances inscriptions, to produce good evaluation which was continued in (b).

(b) This was the question which caused the most difficulty on the whole paper, particularly for less-able candidates who were by now running out of steam and time, and who may not have spotted the word 'Romanization'; many answers only addressed Tacitus' presentation of Agricola in general terms, while others addressed his military exploits in some detail. Better responses used archaeology, inscriptions, and T. himself to counter the idea that Romanization really got under way under Agricola – or else they showed that this passage must really refer to Brigantian territory, in which case the evidence for temples, public squares, etc., is sparse in this period and in this location. The rebuilding following the Boudiccan revolt was the most common archaeological source used in support.

## **2453 Greek History: Source-based Study 1**

### **General comments**

Most candidates chose topics for which they felt well-prepared on this paper, though there remain a few (though much fewer than in earlier years) who make little or no reference to the sources, even in the (b) question which specifically directs them to the sources: this necessarily restricts the mark given for AO3. The best candidates were impressively able to attack the questions, select appropriate detail and sources and produce a well-structured argument for each of the three sub-questions. There were fewer examples of a prepared paragraph on particular sources, though for some candidates this would have been preferable as they did not address the sources at all. However a very few candidates adopted a strategy that was self-defeating: they included a set paragraph in each of the (a) (b) and (c) sections which was almost word-for-word identical (some candidates gave increasing detail at each repetition). This approach had the negative effect of restricting the time and space for covering the questions fully (some even failed to finish); because the material was repeated, it could be credited only once.

A number of candidates stated something as a fact, and then placed the name of a source in brackets after it. In many cases they did not choose well and some appeared to do this almost at random, which did not encourage the examiners to award significant credit. There are also candidates who write about 'the sources' without specifying who they mean. There are also those who rewrite quotations, sometimes rather inappropriately and inaccurately, and then attribute them to particular authors: again, this is not something that can receive high credit from examiners.

There were very many well-structured answers, the majority answering each question in turn; but there were also some effective continuous answers. There were fewer answers with over-long (a) answers, but (b) answers were varied, some candidates focusing on the issue, rather than drawing on the evidence they had studied, and a number omitting sources altogether. The (c) question is designed to give the candidates an opportunity to develop an argument but some wrote only a brief response, perhaps because of time pressures due to excessive length in (a).

### **Quality of Written Communication**

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There remain some candidates whose writing proves problematic for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised to use English terms whenever possible, rather than struggling with Greek terms. The examiners prefer candidates not to use abbreviations (e.g. Thuc.).



## **Comments on individual questions**

### **Section A - Herodotus and the Conflict of Greece and Persia 499-479 BC**

- 1 (a) What were the main strengths of the Persian Empire at the start of the Ionian revolt? (b) What can we learn from the sources about the weaknesses of the Ionian states? (c) Why do you think the states of mainland Greece did not support the Ionian revolt?

This proved popular with candidates. Most of those who attempted this could point to the strengths of the Persians and the weaknesses of the Ionians, but the weaker answers were very general. Some answers were very vague about what Herodotus says about the Ionian states.

- 2 (a) Outline the Persian campaign that led to the landing at Marathon. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the relations between the Greeks and the Persians before 490 BC? (c) What in your opinion did the Athenian success at Marathon achieve?

This question proved less popular. The best answers gave a very thorough answer to (a) and could point to a variety of encounters in (b). There were some judicious discussions of the importance of Marathon, though many focused just on Athens.

- 3 (a) What were the main strengths of the Greek forces in 480 BC? (b) What can we learn from the sources about the strengths and weaknesses of the Persian forces in 480-479 BC? (c) To what extent was the Greek victory in 480-479 BC due to Persian mistakes?

This proved very popular. (a) was generally well done, though not all candidates were able to discuss any other state than Athens and Sparta; (b) produced some good answers, but some candidates did not deal with both strengths and weaknesses.

- 4 (a) Outline the strategy pursued by the Persians in 480 BC. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the role of the Peloponnesian states in 480 BC? (c) Do you agree that the Persian defeat was inevitable after the Battle of Salamis in 480 BC?

This proved a less popular question.

- 5 (a) Outline Athens' role in the Greek preparations for the invasion of 480 BC. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the contribution of the Athenians to the campaign of 479 BC? (c) Do you agree that, without the Athenians, the Greeks would have been overwhelmed in the invasion of 480-79 BC?

This was a less popular question, and answers were either very good or very weak, with little in the middle ground. Even the better answers were less sure of the evidence in Herodotus for Athenian activity both against the Persians and within the Hellenic league, and not many were aware of Herodotus' explicit comment on the importance of the role played by the Athenians.

### **Section B - Greek History 446 – 413 BC**

This was the most popular section once again this year, with a good spread of centres. The best answers were conversant with a wide range of sources.

- 6 (a) Outline the policies pursued by Pericles in the period 446 – 429 BC. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the opposition to Pericles in the period 446-429 BC? (c) Do you agree that Pericles led Athens effectively during this period?

This was a very popular question. In (a) most candidates were able to discuss the war strategy of Pericles, but relatively few could discuss the whole period; some gave a potted account of all that Pericles did. The best were able to discuss Thucydides son of Melesias in (b), though only the very best answers were able to point to Plutarch's account of the attacks on Pericles' friends. There were some impressive answers to (c), where candidates showed a good understanding of what Pericles achieved. Some were able to raise interesting questions about the problems caused by his strategy for the war & make effective use of material from later in the Archidamian War to support their argument.

- 7 (a) Outline the main activities of Spartan kings in the period 446-421 BC. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the importance of the kings in the Spartan constitution? (c) How successful was the foreign policy of Spartan kings in the period 446-421 BC?

This proved a popular question, though there were perhaps fewer very good answers. (a) elicited some general discussion, but only the best candidates were able to give detailed examples of what kings actually did. In (b), candidates were able to give an account of the kings' importance, but struggled to support their argument with appropriate sources. Answers to (c) were interesting and showed a good understanding both of the importance of kings and of other individuals during this period.

- 8 (a) Outline the role of Sparta's allies in the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (431 BC)? (b) What can we learn from the sources about the relationship between Sparta and her allies in the period 446-431 BC? (c) To what extent was Sparta able to act independently of her allies during the Archidamian war (431-421 BC)?

This proved a far less popular question. Most candidates were able in (a) to outline the role of Corinth and some other allies in the outbreak of the war. In (b) answers were less focused on the sources and some were rather general. There were some different approaches to (c), though most were aware of the pressure Sparta faced from Corinth at the start of the war, and also of the impact of the disaster at Pylos on Sparta's approach to the war. Relatively few commented on the reaction of Sparta's allies to the Peace of Nicias.

- 9 (a) Outline how political leaders in Athens maintained their position. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the attitudes of Athenians towards their political leaders during the period 431-413 BC? (c) To what extent were Athenian political leaders able to pursue consistent policies in the period 431-413 BC?

This proved a popular question. In (a) most candidates were able to come up with a range of examples, though they often focused on Pericles and Thucydides son of Melesias, rather than figures later in the period. There was discussion of Thucydides and Aristophanes in (b), though there was less use of Plutarch. (c) provoked some excellent discussion, with some good use made of Thucydides' accounts of assembly meetings.

- 10 (a) What were the main reasons for sending the Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415 BC? (b) What can we learn from the sources about the situation in Athens before the expedition set sail? (c) Do you agree that sending the expedition to Sicily was a disastrous mistake?

This, as expected, proved a very popular question. (a) was generally well done, though there was some confusion over the relationship between states in Sicily; not all candidates were aware of the details of Thucydides' account of the assembly debate in Athens. Answers to (b) mentioned the mutilation of the hermae, and better answers included the various Athenian debates. Some candidates interpreted the question more widely, covering the period from the Peace of Nicias or sometimes even earlier, in some cases showing a very good knowledge of detail. (c) produced a range of response on both sides of the argument. Most discussed Thucydides' view, as alluded to in the question, and better answers contained some discussion of his possible bias. Some candidates included Persia in their discussion, but failed to recognise that this would not have been a factor for the Athenians at the time. Weaker answers tended to slip into a straightforward narrative of events with little discussion.

### Section C - The Culture of Athens 447-399 BC

- 11 (a) Outline what happened at Assembly meetings in Athens in this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the influence of political leaders at Assembly meetings? (c) Do you agree that political leaders were too weak to control decision making in Athens?

This was the most popular question in the section. In a) most candidates were aware of what happened in the Assembly and how votes were taken (though there was some confusion here with voting in the *dikasteria*); very few candidates were able to discuss the importance of the role of the *boule* in the functioning of the Assembly. Answers in b) were generally good with discussion mainly of Cleon, and some good discussion of the Mytilene and Pylos debates; Alcibiades and the Sicilian Expedition debates were not often referred to, nor was the influence of Pericles with examples from his speeches. The same material was generally used to answer c), but not many candidates acknowledged the importance of the *stratēgoi* and their role within the democracy.

- 12 (a) Describe briefly the main buildings in the Agora in this period. (b) What can we learn from the literary sources and other evidence about the importance of the Agora in the civic life of Athens? (c) Were the building programmes in Athens in this period designed solely to celebrate Athens' imperial power?

Too few answers to make meaningful comments.

- 13 (a) Outline the political ideas of Socrates. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the attitudes of Athenians towards philosophy? (c) Why were philosophers and sophists unpopular at the end of the fifth century BC?

This proved a less popular question. Candidates were able to point to some of Socrates' political views, as found in Plato. (b) was less well done, though candidates did show knowledge of Aristophanes. There were some interesting discussions of the impact of the oligarchic revolutions on Athenian interest in philosophy and rhetoric.

- 14 (a) Outline the main events of the Great Dionysia. (b) What can we learn from the sources about Athenian attitudes to state religion? (c) In your opinion, how important are religion and the gods in the plays you have studied? (You may limit yourself to **two** plays if you wish.)

Too few answers to make meaningful comments.

- 15** (a) Outline the role of the chorus in Greek Comedy. (You may limit yourself to two plays if you wish.) (b) What can we learn from Aristophanes about criticisms of the democratic system? (c) To what extent are Aristophanes' criticisms of the Athenian democratic system supported by other sources?

There were some sound responses to this question. Most were able to give details of the choruses of two plays, though this question proved quite searching. In b) there was good discussion of Aristophanes' descriptions and criticisms of the democratic system. c) produced a range of responses, with better answers able to make comparisons with other sources, and also to include some discussion of Aristophanes' potential bias, especially in relation to Cleon. Others pointed out that Aristophanes is a contemporary writer, and that the audience he was aiming to please was also the assembly, but also were aware of the type of satirical comedy he was writing and the effect this has on its accuracy.



## **2454 Roman History: Source-Based Study 1**

### **General comments**

The majority of candidates are now using sources in some form, although there is still a tendency to refer to the author generally (e.g. Plutarch tells us....). However, fewer candidates are simply offering 'the sources say' which is a step in the right direction. The more precise the reference and the greater the interpretation, the more likely it is that the answer will be placed in higher bands where marks are gained for the use of the sources to support the views expressed. Evaluation of the sources is difficult for candidates at this level, but there is a growing number who do more than make a passing reference to bias. There is also a good development of candidates comparing two sources (which is not always possible in this subject!). Showing some conflict between sources and/or problems with the sources is again a sign of the higher bands. All evaluation must be related to the specific reference not generally applied to all sources in the essay. Candidates need to know which authors are contemporary with the emperors. In addition, the genre of the writing is sometime useful when answering questions. Candidates should be encouraged to quote the whole phrase rather than a word or a phrase. Candidates should be wary too of attributions when uncertain of the author. It cannot be stressed enough to candidates that judgements need to be made by the candidates which supported by the evidence if they are to be considered well-organised and balanced – which itself gains marks. Detailed narrative is not often required, although candidates clearly feel they need to give this, to their own detriment since they then do not have time to develop a discussion sufficiently well.

All three sections were attempted and there were answers which ranged from excellent to weak, and no questions produced a majority of either very good or very weak answers.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A - Roman History 81-44 BC**

Questions 1 and 2 were the most popular questions. In this section there were some candidates who, despite the strictures in the question to keep within a defined time period, insisted on writing about the whole period and usually failing to be detailed on the period stipulated in the question.

- 1 (a) Describe the ways in which specific individuals and different groups opposed Sulla's reforms during the 70s BC. (b) How far do the sources help us to understand the reasons for the opposition of these individuals and groups? (c) How far do you think the actions of these individuals and groups affected the impact of Sulla's reforms?

This question concerned those who opposed Sulla's reforms, their reasons and their impact on politics. This was a popular choice. Clearly candidates still see the name Sulla and want to narrate his reforms and/or their ultimate failure. The pre-exam practice question (not quite the one set) turns up more often on this topic than elsewhere. Very good answers focused on a selection of opponents whose reasons they could identify and support from the sources; discussion of impact varied and good answers argued from the evidence. It was possible to extract information and make conclusions from the events which followed. There were quite a few useful sources available: Cicero on corruption and the control of the courts, Plutarch on the careers of some politicians, although this could decline into a narrative of a politician's career. A small number make use of Sallust's Histories and the Conspiracy of Catiline as well as extracts Appian and Livy. Very good answers indicated that a reform might be elicit more than one type of opposition for more than one reason, the sort of answer which looks at alternatives, avoiding the simplistic analysis.

- 2 (a) Outline the activities of Crassus during the 60s BC. (b) What can we learn from the sources about his aims during the 60s BC? (c) Do you think that Crassus was the most influential politician during the 60s BC?

The question on the career of Crassus (Q.2) was attempted by a few candidates. Answers did focus on Spartacus too much to the exclusion of the 60s. The (c) part allowed candidates to introduce other politicians which were used by some to deliver a narrative of Pompey. Most could not keep within the time-frame. Weaker candidates became confused over chronology. Better answers made use of the Sallust references from the *Catiline*. Good answers had precise information and avoided simply a catalogue of events in favour of analyzing his aims and influence. It is clear that Crassus is not thought of as an important figure by some.

- 3 (a) Outline the actions of those involved in the events leading to the outbreak of war in 49 BC. (b) How useful are the sources in helping us to assess who was responsible for the outbreak of war? (c) In your view, who was most responsible for the outbreak of the war?

This question on the outbreak of war in 49 BC was popular but some answers suffered from an inadequate idea of chronology. Despite the wealth of source material on this topic there was a number who failed in their use of source material to support judgments about blame. The letters of Cicero provide plenty of source material for the question, along with Plutarch, Caesar himself and others. Better answers had factual knowledge and some detail, but tended towards narrative. It was important in (a) to identify key actions which led to the outbreak, and not take the story back to before 60 BC, in an attempt to answer a question about the formation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Triumvirate (so-called).

- 4 (a) Outline the differences in status and role of senators and equestrians during this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the issues which united or divided them? (c) In your opinion, to what extent did the relations between senators and equestrians break down during this period?

The question on the senators and equestrians (Q.4) was not popular and few candidates can identify specific issues covering the two groups. Candidates also appear not to be clear about what constituted the two groups. Despite the information on Sulla's reforms, the issue of courts and the financial issues, to name but three, candidates did find it difficult to develop coherent accounts.

- 5 (a) Outline examples of the ways in which violent action in Rome affected the course of events during this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the reasons for the use of violence by individuals and groups? (c) Do you think the use of violence was an effective method for these politicians in achieving their aims?

This question on politics and violence was attempted by a number of candidates. There were some good answers where candidates had thought about the different types of violent actions. Those who related a list of violent occurrences were not answering most of the question. However, some candidates took the opportunity offered by this question to develop the material and make judgements from the information which they could support with the evidence. There was considerable leeway in terms of what constituted violent actions for candidates to argue about effectiveness but the question was concerned with what happened in Rome not the Empire.



## **Section B - The Age of Augustus 31 BC – AD 14**

Question 6 was the most popular question along with Q.7. The majority used sources sensibly, especially the *Res Gestae*. Some did answer the questions without use of source material.

- 6 (a) Outline the main aspects of Augustus' constitutional position in AD14. (b) To what extent did Augustus maintain republican precedents and tradition in creating this constitutional position? (c) To what extent do the sources agree with the view that Augustus restored the Republic?

This question on Augustus' attempts to use republican precedents and restore the Republic produced excellent detailed answers dealing with the main elements of his claims and their success and/or failure. As might have been expected the main weakness was the difficulty some candidates had in defining what was republican precedents. It was sometimes interpreted to mean restoring traditional values or rebuilding parts of Rome. This has a marginal relevance in places to his constitutional position which was the focus of (a). Few could identify a precedent of any sort. For example, the *tribunicia potestas* was frequently claimed to be a republican magistracy. Good answers argued that the institutions of the Republic remained while their importance and functions declined. Most were able to refer to the *Res Gestae*'s claims to have 'restored the Republic' and could develop an argument from there. There was some good work in comparing what different sources have to say. The candidates took the opportunity to show that they understood the problems with the evidence due to conflicting views – one of the criteria for the highest marks in 03. I

- 7 (a) Describe the ways in which Augustus used members of his family to support his regime. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the extent to which members of his family contributed to the achievements of the regime? (c) How important, in your opinion, were members of his family to the success of his regime?

This question on the contributions of the family members produced a small number of answers. Some introduced material between 44-31 BC which is technically outside the period of the module. Others were rather general in their use of sources, and typically uncritical of the poets especially. There is in this module a tendency to be much less specific about quotations from poets. The phrases are often taken out of context and become almost meaningless as historical evidence as a result. Very good answers showed understanding of the limitations of the source material. These answers also used a range of sources with an awareness of the dates at which they were written and the genre in which the authors were writing. Equally good answers recognized that the *Res Gestae* is not entirely without historical value. There was little trouble in providing examples of contributions; less successful was the assessment of the value of the contributions.

- 8 (a) Describe briefly the various administrative, judicial, legislative and financial tasks which senators undertook during this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the importance of these tasks to the successful government of Rome and the Empire? (c) How far did the Senate perform these tasks independently of Augustus?

This question on the functions of the senate and senators attracted a small number of candidates, generally less knowledgeable than in the previous questions. They answers did not detail a range of functions with any real precise examples, nor could they assess the extent of independence in specific areas. The majority were aware of the use of the senators by Augustus in certain roles (as governors, army commanders, commissioners as a court and so on) because of their expertise and his wish to conciliate them. Some used information from Tacitus about Augustus' increase in power at the expense of the senate, usually without any attempt to evaluate the generalisation. Others used Dio's claim of the

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

creation of a monarchy. Generally the answers failed to develop their views from specific examples.

- 9 (a) Describe briefly the measures Augustus took to improve the living conditions and amenities for the people of Rome. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the reasons for these measures? (c) Do you think the lives of the people of Rome were improved by these measures?

This question concerned the extent to which Augustus had improved the lives of the Roman people. This was reasonably popular and answered with some specific detail and sources by some. There is an assumption among candidates that Augustus improved the lives of ordinary Romans without any attempt to see if the evidence shows this. Better answers were more cautious and were aware of the lack of evidence from ordinary people as opposed to the propaganda claims made by the writers of the age. A number were well aware of the measures for improving policing, fire-fighting, corn supply, etc, but few could translate that into assessment of their success.

- 10 (a) Outline the problems Augustus faced in dealing with the army during this period. (b) How helpful are the sources in assessing the success of Augustus in solving these problems? (c) Would you agree that Augustus' rule depended entirely upon the army?

This question on the army under Augustus was answered by a fair number of candidates. Good answers detailed the range of problems and the measures by which Augustus approached sought to solve them. The issues of size and pay were upper most, but a lot of candidates did not have precise knowledge of the facts and figures. There was, an assumption that Augustus improved the state of affairs and that he was totally successful. This, of course, is what the majority of the contemporary sources say. However, some of his measures do not automatically work and there are signs at the end of his principate that the army was not completely content with his efforts. Answers were at their best discussing why he needed the support of the army, with good discussions of a wide range of issues. A range of sources were used, with some comparison of Tacitus and *Res Gestae*, with the occasional Suetonius added (although this seemed to refer to the early period of problems with the army). There were a few who used the Prima Porta statue to develop the question of Augustus' image as a general.

### **Section C - Roman History Ad 14-68**

This section was attempted a wide range of candidates with some producing answers of high quality; the majority of whom had a good knowledge of the period and some understanding of the issues. There was a fairly even spread across all the questions in this section.

- 11 (a) Describe the ways in which Tiberius tried to involve the senators in the government of Rome and the Empire. (b) According to the sources, how successful was Tiberius at involving the senators in the government? (c) In your view, was Tiberius serious in his efforts to involve the senators?

This question was on Tiberius and the involvement of the senators. FEW candidates failed to present some example of senatorial involvement even if it was only to debate his accession! The more adventurous answers included the use of the senate as a court (Piso' trial), individual senators as commissioners and governors, and even references to specific debates on issues. Better answers developed some view on how far Tiberius was serious, especially given the rather critical attitude of the source material. Weaker answers generalized about the use of the senate or claimed Tiberius took no notice of it at all; there was a disappointing lack of source material for (b) especially when there is a range of material available – Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, Velleius Paterculus and even inscriptions. A number of candidates assumed that Tiberius had not wish to involve the senators, and used the treason trials of evidence of his bad relationship with them ignoring the earlier efforts. The better answers had examples of senators employed on state business as well as good material on the difficulties Tiberius encountered which were not

of his own making. There were some answers which told the story of Sejanus as a way of explaining why there was such a problem.

- 12** (a) Describe examples of the involvement of Claudius' wives in decision-making during his reign. (b) According to the sources, to what extent did Claudius rely on his wives in making decisions? (c) Do you think his wives contributed significantly to the successes or failures of his reign?

This question on Claudius and his wives in decision-making was answered by a number of candidates. These suffered from unbalanced answers in that one or other of the wives were discussed but not both Messalina and Agrippina. A further problem was the unquestioning acceptance of the sources' view that Claudius was well and truly under the thumb of his wives (and freedmen). There were some excellent answers which did argue that the impression of the sources was incorrect (even to the extent of arguing that it was not his wives but his freedmen who controlled him!). Candidates simply do not know what the sources do tell us about the decisions, if any, they were a party to. There were some interesting answers to (c) for example, that Agrippina contributed to the failure of his reign by getting Nero appointed successor.

- 13 (a) Describe ways in which the equestrians were involved in the administration of Rome and the Empire. (b) What do we learn from the sources about the importance of the equestrians to the emperors during this period? (c) Do you think that the administration of the Rome and the Empire was improved by the involvement of the equestrians.

This question on the role of the equestrians was well-answered by a small number of candidates. Again precise reference to some of three or more aspects was sufficient for a good answer – for example their role in certain major offices of state, such as the Praetorian Guard (or Pratorian Gaurd in the case of a large number of candidates), the various commissions, the Governorship of Egypt, the increasing role of procurators etc; good answers showed an understanding of the increase in administration which needed the expertise of such men. As with all the answers in the paper, imprecise use of information and sources tended to spoil answers which are otherwise quite good. The question of improvement tended to be full of generalizations without much evidence to support the views. However there are some high-profile examples of good and bad equestrians from which to build an answer.

- 14 (a) Describe examples of the entertainments which emperors provided for the people of Rome. (You may confine yourself to **two** emperors if you wish.) (b) What can we learn from the sources about the reactions of the people of Rome to these entertainments? (c) To what extent was it important for emperors to provide entertainments for the people of Rome?

This question on the ways emperors sought the support of the People of Rome through entertainments was quite popular and very well done by some candidates, largely because they had precise examples of specific entertainments. This might include Claudius' opening event for the Fucine Lake, Nero's Neronia and Youth Games, Gaius' frequent shows. Most candidates recognized the need for emperors after Augustus to engage in this means of gaining support, although not all could develop this fully when it came to discussing the reasons. There was good material from some on reactions to Nero's attempts to entertain, the popularity of Claudius, and the reaction to some less successful efforts by others. Triumphs and spectacles were included with good effect using Gaius' bridge across the Bay of Naples and Nero's return to Rome from Greece. Discussion about how far these maintained support was usually well-informed, but the better answers were aware that it was different among different groups. Importance again was well-argued by most candidates, and the better answers were aware that its importance was not as great as some other factors. Some candidates appeared to choose this question while trying to use information from earlier periods.

- 15 (a) Outline the contributions made by specific individuals outside the imperial family to the reigns of **two** emperors. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the extent to which emperors relied on the contributions of these individuals? (c) In your opinion, did the Julio-Claudians survive for so long because of the successes of others?

This question on the involvement of individuals outside the imperial family was not a popular option, although it allowed candidates to choose from a variety of possibilities in terms of freedmen, senators, provincials, generals etc. Some answers included the Praetorian Guard and its commanders. There were some good attempts to deal with the factors involved in the survival of the Julio-Claudians although they were not successful when it amounted to some generalized discussion on the emperors. Good answers used figures such as Corbulo, Paulinus, Burrus, Seneca, Sejanus and freedmen such as Helius and Pallas. The more specific the answer was the better the discussion and judgement.

### *Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

Every candidate attempted a question in some form, although some found they had spent too long on one section. Some candidates provide very little or give an overview of the topic, either through necessity (lack of knowledge) or because they misunderstand what they should do. It is expected that they will give detailed accounts in (a) and follow these up in the next two sections.

The vast majority did have accurate information and some understanding of the issues involved in the questions. Some clearly misunderstood what the question was asking. However, the majority focused on the particular issue in some form. The tendency to generalize remains, especially about bias in the source-material. Specific detail of sources should be the basis of the discussions.

Legibility is becoming a more serious issue and needs to be addressed; in this age when a great deal of a student's work may be word-processed, perhaps the only time they write by hand is in the examination. Candidates need to be aware that their answers have to be understood to be marked.



## 2455 Roman World: Source-based Study 1

### General comments

This paper ought to cause few difficulties to candidates, given that credit for the whole essay is awarded across the three parts of the question, which are structured to allow for the gradual development of issues. Furthermore, candidates have an hour to complete the task – 15 minutes more than they will find for a comparable essay at A2. The repetition which ensues in many answers is not penalized – it is accepted that there will be recourse to the same sources or issues perhaps three times over.

The great majority of candidates now follow the threefold division suggested by the questions, and as a result address all the aspects of any question selected to the best of their ability on the day. Some of candidates still prefer to run the answers to (a) (b) and (c) together (or have been taught to), which caused some less careful candidates to omit part of the required material by not addressing one of the issues. Whether or not answers are divided up into three parts is a matter of preference for the Centre and the candidate, but even more competent and confident answers were weakened by not paying attention to all the aspects of the question on occasion. Candidates do after all have an hour to complete what is really a single, if extensive, essay. The term 'briefly' was not taken too literally this year, and answers to the (a) parts were given adequate treatment on the whole.

A continuing disappointment to the examiners is the failure of weaker answers to recognize that this is a **source-based study**, and that 30 of the 100 marks available are awarded according to the use-or not – of sources, whether literary or archaeological. As in previous years, some candidates demonstrated that *it is possible to compose a whole answer without mentioning a single specific source, whether literary or archaeological*. A significant number also responded to the specific sub-question about the use/ value of the sources by starting off 'according to the sources...' and then mentioning none specifically. In addition, (and this was also the case in previous years), there needs to be a better appreciation of the demands of answers at AS as opposed to GCSE-type responses, which tend to lift a word or two from the title but do not focus on the demands of the question set.

The range of questions on the paper seemed appropriate, and (as was the case in 2006) there was a fairly even spread between 1, 3, 4 and 5, (no Boudica again – see 2458 this year!) while Q. 2 on Claudius' invasion proved the most popular choice overall. There were no rubric errors.

On this point, the Examiners have noted an increasing tendency to conflate original ancient sources with modern scholars, in this and other papers. While it is true that some authorities seem to have been with us almost since the beginning, candidates must be taught to distinguish clearly between them; it would help, particularly in answering 2455, if candidates could be taught the technique of starting with evidence and moving to a conclusion, rather than making assertions and casting around for support. There has been a marked increase in speculation and supposition as a result ('they must have', 'they would have').

Simple techniques need to be reiterated: many candidates fail to engage with the questions set, or misread them. The result is that while they produce answers which are accurate, and even supported, they are often irrelevant. A session showing how the mark grids are applied would benefit students overall, as they would then be able to see how they are missing out on straightforward marks – providing that they are familiar with the source material and the secondary sources.

A final general point: there seems to be very little emphasis on correct spelling, clear communication, or lucid expression. Common names such as Caesar or Britain/Briton are routinely confused to a point where the impression is given that these do not matter.



## **Comments on individual questions**

- 1** (a) What evidence is there for political and economic links between British tribes and Romans before AD 43? (b) What can we learn from this evidence about how far Britons had come under Roman influence by AD 43? (c) To what extent did events in Britain before AD 43 influence Claudius' decision to invade?

Answers to this question were very varied in quality. Some found it hard to outline 'evidence' in (a), or focused entirely on literary sources (Caesar, Strabo – quite a few seem to think that Strabo was a source used by Caesar). Good responses used archaeology and literary sources and tended to move into issues intended to be covered in (b), producing some repetition which was not penalised. In (b) there was some good evaluation looking at what it meant to 'come under Roman influence' – liking Roman wine did not imply liking Roman military dominance on your doorstep! The examiners wondered whether any of the debate raised by David Mattingley's recent book had filtered down to aid/ shape candidates in this regard. (c) turned into a general discussion on Claudius' motives without focus on events in Britain, even omitting them completely, in some answers – and these candidates would have been better off answering Q. 2.

- 2** (a) Explain briefly Claudius' motives for invading Britain in AD 43. (b) To what extent did co-operation from Britons help the Romans in their conquest of Britain? (c) How useful are the literary sources and material evidence in explaining the opposition faced by the Romans up to AD 51?

As noted above, this was the most popular question overall. Responses ranged in quality from the extremely detailed to the vague and insecure in (a). A considerable number of responses had only vague ideas about who wrote what and what survives – too many credit Tacitus (or even Strabo!) as a source for the invasion itself. In (b), there was too often a simple narrative of conquest, and insufficient balance and/ or information to allow for a supported evaluation of 'to what extent?' In (c), the period 43 – 51 also proved problematic – some candidates going as far as Boudica. Better answers used both literature and archaeology to produce a balanced and thoughtful response with a clear evaluation, whether positive or not.

- 3** (a) Outline briefly the spread of urban settlements in Britain in the first century AD. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the effects of town life on British society up to c. AD 160? (c) For what reasons did the Romans promote urbanisation in Britain?

This was fairly popular, but as in previous years, good answers on towns were hard to find. Once again, far too many embarked on a theoretical outline of the kinds of towns that existed and did not mention a single example. The presence of Agricola 21 in the previous paper served as a reminder, and it was referred to with pleasing frequency. The better answers chose 3 or 4 examples (Chichester/ Exeter/ London/ Colchester, for example) and explained how and why each came into being. In (b), 'effects of town life on British society' again saw Agricola 21 brought into play, though many candidates found it hard to evaluate the said effects and there were frequent naive assumptions that the whole of Britain at every level adopted the toga, for example. In (c) there were some well-supported responses, but there were also some strange ideas to the effect that the Romans forced everyone out of the countryside, where they had been self-sufficient, into towns where they had to find alternative forms of work so they could buy food instead of growing it. As in 2458, concepts of economy and Romanization were imprecisely understood by many.

- 4 (a) Outline the opposition of British tribes in Wales to Roman rule. (b) What difficulties did the Romans have in conquering Wales, and why? (c) According to the sources, what effect did the campaigns in Wales have on Roman policy and military strategy in Britain?

There were more responses to the question on Wales than was expected, and than was the case the last time this topic appeared; perhaps its previous appearances has prompted more revision on it and/ or more time to this part of the topic in the classroom.

(a) was generally done quite well, though the opposition was often not securely grounded in terms of chronology or in reference to sources (which could easily be brought into play here). The best referred to both literature and archaeology, some very precise information about disposition of forts being found in (a) (b) and (c). In (b) the difficulties were generally well handled (see mark- scheme) but (c) proved too much for some candidates who could not cope with 'policy' as a term to discuss. There were a number of candidates who used (c) as an excuse to write a mini-essay on Boudica 'while Suetonius P. was off in Anglesey' but could not relate it to the question set.

- 5 (a) Outline the role played by Cartimandua in the extension of Roman control of Britain. (b) According to the sources, why did the Romans advance north while Agricola was governor? (c) How reliable are Tacitus' accounts of the attitudes and activities of British leaders?

Fewer candidates attempted this question than had been anticipated – perhaps because it demanded a diverse range of knowledge, rather than focusing on a single issue. Several who attempted it, attracted perhaps by the opportunity to present information on either Agricola or Tacitus, could not address (a) with any certainty at all – there was a lack of both factual knowledge (chronology, even names) and sources. Many answers limited themselves to C.'s early role as friend of Rome, handing over Caratacus – which assisted control, to be sure – but then omitted the later escapades which 'left us with a war to fight'. (b) follows on, inviting the idea that Roman troops had been brought into Brigantia before A. was governor, but as a question it proved a bridge too far for many, who contented themselves with narrative and could not/ did not link this to 'sources' or 'reasons why'. (c) proved a let-out for many, who were able to draw on sources describing Boudica, Calgacus, etc. and gain marks for specific use of sources in AO3, while remaining relatively naive in their discussion (AO2).



## **2456 Greek History: Thematic Study 1**

### **General comments**

The Thematic Paper often produces work of an excellent standard, where candidates have chosen detail from the period as a whole to answer the three sub-questions. They demonstrated this by selecting material from the beginning, the middle and end of the period, and showing understanding of appropriate sources. Weaker responses tend to reveal uneven knowledge of detail, focusing on one part of the period only and showing little understanding of change over time.

There is still a tendency for candidates to put sources to one side, though they are advised to the contrary on the paper. The distribution of marks ties the examiners' hands and can result in effective answers (in most respects) achieving a lower mark. As in 2453 this year, there were a very few candidates adopted a strategy that was self-defeating: they included a set paragraph in each of the (a) (b) and (c) sections which was almost word-for-word identical (some candidates gave increasing detail at each repetition). This approach had the negative effect of restricting the time and space for covering the questions fully (some even failed to finish); because the material was repeated, it could be credited only once.

### **Quality of Written Communication**

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There remain some candidates whose writing proves problematic for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised to use English terms whenever possible, rather than struggling with Greek terms.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A - The Culture of Tyranny in the Greek World c.600 – 479 BC**

This section proved much less popular this year, so there is limited feedback. Candidates should be able to discuss the evidence of Herodotus for particular tyrannies; where they can bring in additional material (from Aristotle, for example) to criticise Herodotus' account, they are likely to achieve higher marks under AO2 and AO3.

- 1 (a) Outline the main reasons why tyrants came to power. (b) What do the sources tell us about the different groups who supported tyrants at the start of their reign? (c) How important was it for a tyrant to keep the people on his side?

This question was generally answered well, though there are still too many vague answers that do not give specific examples. A number of answers focused almost exclusively on Peisistratus.

- 2 (a) Outline how tyrants maintained control over their states. (b) What can we learn from the sources about how successfully tyrants maintained their authority? (c) Do you agree that tyranny was always beneficial to a state?

This question was chosen by a number of candidates, with a range of examples and some good discussion in (c).

- 3 (a) Outline the changes made by tyrants to the government of their state. (b) What do the sources tell us about the domestic policy of the tyrants? (c) To what extent was the failure of domestic policies the main reason for the fall of tyrannies?

Too few answers to make meaningful comments.

- 4 (a) Describe briefly how Peisistratus made use of religion in Athens. (b) What do the sources tell us about the importance of religion to other tyrants? (c) Do you agree that other factors were more important than religion for the success of a tyranny?

Some answers showed a pleasing understanding of the use made of religion by Peisistratus, and the better answers also showed a good understanding of the evidence from archaeology.

## Section B - Sparta in the Greek World 520 – 400 BC

Relatively few candidates addressed the issue of the lack of Spartan sources and the difficulties facing other authors writing about Sparta.

- 5 (a) Outline the role of the Gerousia in Sparta. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the importance of the Assembly in Sparta? (c) Do you agree that during this period ordinary Spartans had no real influence on government in Sparta?

This proved a popular question. Answers generally covered a range of roles in (a), and there was some attempt to use the sources in (b), though relatively few referred to the meeting described by Thucydides in 432 BC. In (c) there were some interesting discussions of the role of the ephors and the impact of Pylos.

- 6 (a) Outline briefly the main phases of Spartan education. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the limitations of the Spartan education system? (c) In your opinion, was the Spartan education system responsible for Sparta's success during this period?

This proved a very popular as a question: many candidates were able to write with precision about the stage of the *agoge*, and the better answers also commented on the education of girls. In (b) there were too few references to sources. There was some lively discussion in (c), and the main events were interpreted in various ways to support a range of arguments.

- 7 (a) Outline the main problems with the surviving evidence from this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the internal government of Sparta throughout this period? (c) Do you agree that Sparta was well governed throughout this period?

In (a) the problems facing the historian of Sparta were discussed well, and in (b) the stronger candidates were able to make reference to sources. Answers to (c) that focused on 'throughout the period' were often of very high standard; some weaker answers looked only at isolated events.

- 8 (a) Outline Sparta's involvement with Persia during this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about Sparta's attitude to expeditions beyond the Peloponnese during this period? (c) Do you agree that Sparta pursued only her own interests throughout this period?

A popular question; the best answers were able to bring in a range of detail in (a) and to use sources to good effect in (b). There were some excellent discussions in (c), with a range of views, supported by well chosen examples.

## Section C - The Development of Athenian Democracy 508-399 BC

- 9 (a) Describe briefly the reforms introduced by Cleisthenes. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the reasons for the constitutional reforms introduced between 510 and 450 BC? (c) Do you agree that Athens had become a more fully democratic state by 399 BC?

This was a very popular answer. Most candidates dealt very well with (a), and in the main observed the injunction to be brief. The sources were not always well known for (b), particularly Aristotle. A number of answers discussed the change over the period, but surprisingly few made reference to the oligarchic coups towards the end of the period and the interpretation of what constitutes a fully democratic state.

- 10** (a) Outline the main ways in which a citizen could involve himself in the Athenian democracy. (b) What do the sources tell us about the political involvement of ordinary Athenians in this period? (c) How much influence do you think ordinary Athenians had on decision-making during this period?

Many decent answers to (a) discussed opportunities as a juror and member of the *boule* or assembly. Few candidates mentioned specific official posts or the involvement at *deme* level. Weaker responses to (b) failed to engage with the sources and tended to be very vague, but the better ones used Thucydides and other sources effectively. There were some imaginative answers to (c) which read well, particularly where candidates had a sound knowledge of the sources and could argue each side of the argument. Precise detail on individual leaders and specific decisions which were made scored well.

- 11** (a) Outline the ways in which the rich contributed to the running of the Athenian democracy. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the relationship between the rich and poor in Athens? (c) Do you agree that the Athenian democratic system was biased towards the poor?

Too few answers to make meaningful comments.

- 12** (a) Describe briefly the membership of the Council (*Boule*) and its role in the Athenian democratic system. (b) What can we learn from the sources about the changes affecting the Council (*Boule*) during this period? (c) In your opinion, was the Council or the Assembly more important in 399 BC?

In (a) candidates included plenty of accurate detail. However, only a few referred to the day-to-day business in the *tholos*, *dokimasia/euthune*, and the *boule*'s role in ensuring measures were carried out. Knowledge of factual content was encouraging in (b), but not the sources were less well known. The issue of pay in order to broaden participation was discussed only in the stronger answers. Inscriptions were seldom used by candidates in (c). Thucydides's accounts of assembly meetings were put to good use, and there were some excellent balanced discussions that looked at the evidence for what the two bodies actually did.

## **2457 Roman History: Thematic Study 1**

### **General comments**

The paper produced a reasonable spread of responses, both in terms of the sections addressed (and questions within them – with the exception of q. 12) and in the marks awarded. Most candidates are now offering sources, at least in general terms, though some still fail to do so, and many offer no evaluation. In the case of some large centres there was a very weak performance overall – whether from tiredness, this being the third of three papers, or from lack of knowledge, a significant number of candidates only answered one part of a question in a short paragraph and few marks could be rewarded as a result.

There is still a failure in all sections to cover the 100 years and the idea of change; candidates answering questions 1, 5, 7 and 9 may have been helped by the wording.

There were no rubric errors noted this year. There was no indication of a lack of time – some appeared to have too much! Some candidates failed to read questions with sufficient care, and consequently provided irrelevant discussion.



## **Comments on individual questions**

### **Section A - The Growth and Government of the Roman Empire, 133-30 BC**

There were good numbers of responses to all the questions in this section, with some preferences within centres for one or another.

- 1 (a) Outline Rome's dealings with Egypt and the rest of North Africa over this period. (b) What do the sources suggest about why some Romans favoured the expansion of the empire during this period? (c) Why do you think that expansion occurred slowly in North Africa early in this period, and what happened to change that?

'Egypt and North Africa' caused some candidates problems – they either concentrated on Caesar/ Anthony/ Cleopatra, or mentioned Jugurtha as an afterthought; few were able to go beyond Egypt, or bring any sources in for support in (a), though some detailed and thoughtful responses were also seen. Failure to address (a) in detail led to weak responses in (b) and (c), with some guesswork, speculation and desperation in evidence. There was some confusion between Cyrenaica and Cilicia.

- 2 (a) Give **four** examples of political conflict within Rome during this period over issues concerning the growth and government of the empire. (b) What do the sources suggest were the reasons that politicians came into conflict over issues concerning the empire? (c) To what extent were these conflicts caused by power struggles within Rome?

A significant number of candidates failed to read the question properly and ignored or did not identify the requirement for discussion '**over issues concerning the growth and government of the empire.**' Instead narrative about Spartacus and Catiline was often introduced, with no focus on the question, or ill-founded attempts to link it to the question (some succeeded with Catiline, showing ingenuity). Pompey was strangely absent in some, and the sole point of reference in others! Some mentioned Sulla, but without reference to his settlement of the East. Gracchan reforms were sometimes included, correctly; less reference was made to Octavian. NB 'within Rome' was taken broadly to allow for conflict outside the city – e.g. Sertorius.

- 3 (a) Outline the varying levels of independence enjoyed by the different categories of cities and communities within the empire during this period. (b) What can we learn from the sources about how much the Romans interfered in local affairs within the provinces? (c) How much real independence do you think was enjoyed by local communities throughout this period?

This was done quite well, with some good discussion in (a), but some responses then went off in strange directions in (b) and (c), ignoring urban centres and writing about slaves and women. Explicit conclusions in (c) were few and far between, with a lot of unsupported equivocation. Better responses tied the discussion down to specific examples – weaker ones offered generalities and abstract assertions.

- 4 (a) Outline the measures taken during this period to tackle corruption among Romans involved in the administration of the empire. (b) How much corruption do our sources suggest that there was in the administration of the empire during this period? (c) Do you think that the provincials suffered more from corrupt senators or corrupt equestrians throughout this period?

Of the responses to this, some were done very well – there was perhaps less scope for misunderstanding where the essay ought to go than in 2 or 3. There were some balanced discussions, with detailed outlines of measures in (a), which often saw specific laws mentioned, though there was less awareness of what each law was intended to do; some

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

answers missed the obvious sources, even Verres, in (b), and could not distinguish very easily between equestrian and senatorial corruption in (c). Few responses to this, and done either very well, with secure and accurate f.k., or very badly, without it. (b) lent itself to an exploration of Cicero (Verres/ Cilicia) but candidates found (c) difficult to evaluate.

## **Section B - The City of Rome, 33 BC – AD 117**

There were noticeably more responses to Qs. 5 and 8 than to 6 or 7 in this section.

- 5 (a) Give examples of buildings begun by others that were restored or completed by emperors during this period. (You may limit your answer to **three** emperors if you wish). (b) What images of themselves were the emperors trying to present by restoring or completing these buildings. (c) How important were their building projects to the popularity or unpopularity of emperors throughout this period?

This question produced patchy responses. The main difficulty was caused by the phrase 'restored or completed', which was often ignored and allowed discussion of e.g. the Colosseum (rarely spelled correctly) or Trajan's column. This was especially true of answers which chose examples from Augustus. (b) and (c) were better done and frequently allowed discussion of different buildings, treated as sources, which had been omitted in (a).

- 6 (a) Outline the measures taken during this period to ensure an adequate supply of water to the city of Rome. (b) Why was demand for water high in Rome during this period? (c) Do the literary sources and material evidence suggest that all classes of Romans benefited from the measures taken to supply Rome with water during this period?

This question caused difficulties for some who attempted it; (a) was sometimes done well, more often done very generally and without specific examples (does outline cause a problem?); reasons for demand for water included many less usual aspects, from water-towers to the need for water in construction (concrete mix). (c) was well done in many instances; sources ranged from Frontinus to Juvenal, though evaluation proved more difficult – there was a tendency for many to produce a one-sided discussion, or resort to assertion ('must have'); few used the archaeological remains as sources.

- 7 (a) Give examples of public disturbances in Rome during this period. (You may limit your answer to the reigns of **three** emperors if you wish). (b) What do the sources suggest were the reasons for these public disturbances? (c) How successful were different emperors in dealing with these public disturbances and their causes?

Not popular, and not well done by and large – the need to choose wisely to meet the demand for **three emperors** caused some difficulties, and disturbances outside Rome were sometimes used as part of the answer. In (b) not many candidates were critical of the sources, and simply re-told Tacitus and/ or Suetonius – or else blithely asserted they were 'untrustworthy'. Some responses made good use of less familiar sources and even noted Dio on famine and Macrobius on Julia – but these were exceptions to the general rule.

- 8 (a) Briefly describe **four** festivals of the religious year that took place in the city of Rome during this period? (b) What do the sources suggest about the importance of these festivals to the people of Rome? (c) Do you think that these festivals served to unite the people of Rome?

There were many responses to this question, though this was not common to all centres, some having no candidates who attempted it – is this issue always covered, one wonders? Candidates had few problems providing detail, sometimes very specific, to (a); there were some engaging descriptions of the Lupercalia. In some cases there were even additional specific sources, such as Juvenal on Cybele, Suetonius Tiberius 36 on cults, Nero 16 on Christians, Plutarch on Vestals, and Macrobius on the Saturnalia. Sadly, Ovid was rarely used as a source, and it has to be said that some candidates provided little more than a

general 'the sources say' before embarking on more description. Part (c) often used the Parentalia as support for 'uniting families' which was not the real focus of the question.

## **Section C - Emperors and Empire, AD 14 – 117**

Q. 9 was the most popular in this section, with a reasonable number of responses to 10 and 11, and markedly fewer to Q. 12.

- 9** (a) Outline the revolts that took place in the empire (not including army revolts) during this period. (You may limit your answer to **three** revolts if you wish). (b) What do the sources suggest were the causes of these revolts? (c) How effectively did the Romans deal with these revolts?

Despite it being the most popular question attempted in this section, it was the least well done overall. The Dacian wars (not in the empire) were frequently used as an example, as was Spartacus! Better responses examined Civilis, Florus/ Sacrovir, Tacfarinas; the Jewish revolt was often used as an example, and generally well handled. The sources were generally well handled in (b), amount and detail varying a great deal, though given the ample material available most candidates coped well; in (c) 'effectively' was often not well addressed.

- 10** (a) Outline the history of the Rhine-Danube frontier during this period. (b) According to our sources suggest about the extent to which senators were able to act independently of the emperor throughout this period? (c) Do you think that this frontier was stronger and more easily defended at the end of this period than at the beginning?

There were few responses to this question; those who attempted it had good factual knowledge and good secure knowledge of the sources; evaluation of (c) and success in dealing with frontier in (b) were less well handled.

- 11** (a) Outline the role of senators in the administration of the empire during this period. (b) What do the sources suggest about the extent to which senators were able to act independently of the emperor throughout this period? (c) How successful were senators in carrying out their responsibilities throughout this period?

This and 10 were equally popular; in Q. 11, weaker candidates embarked on a discussion of the role of the Senate in general, and missed the focus on 'administration of the empire', though some were able to use specific instances of senatorial involvement, and corrected the error in discussion in (b) or (c). 'Independently of the emperor' in (b) also caused problems. Sources tended to be sparse in this question, and were not adequately evaluated.

- 12** (a) Which goods were most commonly traded within the empire during this period, and from where did they originate? (b) Does the archaeological evidence suggest that the goods used were similar throughout the empire during this period? (c) How important do you think that trade was in Romanising and unifying the provinces during this period?

This was not well done; lack of knowledge of non-literary sources and lack of factual knowledge about the topic was evident in the vast majority of responses, which affected the levels of response to all three parts of the question.

## **2458 Roman World: Thematic Study 1**

### **General comments**

As has been the case in previous years, the challenge of sitting this third 1-hour paper in a session had a debilitating effect on many candidates, who simply ran out of steam – often soon after the paper was begun, to judge from some of the responses noted. There were notable and distinguished exceptions, where candidates successfully combined considerable amounts of accurate information with insightful relevant comment. However, for many, this paper resulted in bland, superficial assertions, lacking in any clear or precise knowledge and few references to sources if any.

A particular cause for concern, noted for the first time in any quantity of responses last year, is the appearance of speculation (they would have . . . , they probably . . . ) or assertions with no support. Even when candidates do know the material quite well they appear to lack the skills to use it effectively in a discussion. There was little evidence of planning before the bulk of the answer was attempted.

In addition, Centres should continue to stress to candidates that Ancient History requires support from source material, even in this thematic paper; a discussion (for example) of the development of urban life ought to include at least one specific town by way of illustration; several answers omitted sources altogether, and relied on secondary material and a narrative approach which was singularly lacking in specific detail and often did not progress beyond a GCSE-type level, as marks awarded by the examiners show.

A further difficulty which will be commented on later under each question is the difficulty many candidates appear to have had in understanding what is meant by terms such as 'administration', 'economy', or 'Romanization'. This lack of awareness appears to have prevented many candidates from extending their discussion to areas which would have been quite legitimate to cover. See Q. 1 for an illustration of this. The terms are listed in the specification, and need to be explained very clearly so that they do not exist in candidates' minds merely as nebulous pieces of jargon.

The range of questions on the paper reflects the issues to be covered in the specification. In practice, about 40% answered question 3, on agriculture, with about equal numbers addressing Qs. 2 and 4, and only a few responses to Q. 1.

## **Comments on individual questions**

- 1 (a) Describe the roles played by local elites in administration in urban centres in Roman Britain. (b) According to the sources, in what ways were different parts of Britain administered up to c. AD100? (c) What evidence is there that the attitudes of local elites towards their involvement in administration changed in the period up to AD 415?

As noted above 'administration' proved a problem for many here – perhaps the concept needs to be fleshed out and explained. 'Local elites' and 'urban centres' also seem to have caused difficulties. The best answers to (a) discussed the responsibilities of *ordo* in *ciuitas* capitals, supported by inscriptions as well as own knowledge, and with specific examples (Silchester, for example). In (b), some candidates found it hard to go back and explain the different ways in which parts of Britain were administered in the first 70-odd years of Roman rule (client kings/ self-government as *ciuitas* capitals/ *municipium* at Verulamium/ direct military control), but it was not beyond the best responses, where some very good discussion was noted. (c) was addressed in patchy ways – the best responses noting the development of villas as centres for elites and linking this with the decline in the importance for them of towns.

Many candidates could not engage with the wording of the questions in (b) and (c) and embarked on a general discursive account of Romanization, blithely attributing everything in sight to the army (mosaics, pottery, villas, the lot).

- 2 (a) What impact did the Roman army have on the economy of Britain in the period up to c. AD 100? (b) What can we learn from the sources about the roles played by the Roman army in the administration of Roman Britain? (c) What part did the army play in the Romanisation of Britain up to AD 415?

This was a popular question, divided into three aspects which were intended to assist weaker candidates by getting them to address first the army vis-à-vis the economy, then the governance, and finally the more general issue of 'Romanization'. Candidates who chose to address the topic all in one go were prone to omit one at least of these and suffered as a result. The role of the army was sometimes carefully delineated, but more often weak and general, and in (a) the focus on 'economy' was either ignored or not spotted in the first place. The 'impact' on the economy was simply assumed to be great, without any geographical differentiation or support, and also assumed to be exploitative, not as a stimulus to economic growth. The switch to 'administration' in (b) caused problems, as noted above in the general discussion. There were on the other hand some good responses, with various administrative functions noted and supported (financial/ tax-gathering/ keeping law and order/ protection/ pacifying the natives/ promoting specific industries, specifically mining). Weaker answers discussed aspects of what the army got up to in (c) but did not evaluate levels of impact on native Britons (there were detailed discussions of religious practice but few asked whether this transferred to local populations). There was a lot of 'must have' speculation.

- 3 (a) What were the main features of British agriculture at the time of the Claudian invasion? (b) What changes in the economy of the countryside are indicated by the development of villa farms? (c) To what extent did techniques in farming in Roman Britain change during the period?

This was the most popular choice but it was often very poorly done. To begin with, there were some very general discussions about subsistence farming juxtaposed with Strabo's discussion of exports as support! These discussions were dotted with some very odd ideas which suggest that this topic needs much more careful attention to ensure that candidates – who are likely not to have much idea about agriculture in the first place can grasp what was going on. Recent publications in this field may be referred to in order to

supplant general discussion found elsewhere (Hilary Cool's new book *Eating and Drinking in Roman Britain* has good discussion of archaeology as well as literary sources and there is some good discussion in Peter Fowler, *Farming in the first millennium*. There was more assertion than supported argument in (b) on the development of villas – this was challenging but most managed to create a link between increased wealth and presumed growth/ changes in production; there were some good supported responses which examined the presence on some sites of outlying buildings as well as the better-known buildings with mosaics et.al., and a couple of references to the developments in theories about estate structures – with a central main location and outlying industrial complexes. Changes in techniques were quite well addressed, though not all addressed 'extent', which can be argued either way.

- 4 (a) Briefly outline the differences between British and Roman art in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD. (You should refer to at least **three** specific examples.) (b) To what extent did Roman forms of artistic expression replace British ones in the period up to AD 415? (c) How far do you consider that changes in artistic style support the view that Britain had become thoroughly Romanised by AD 415?

There were a range of answers to this question ranging from the very fine, with support for all aspects, to unsupported and unfocused assertion. Despite the wording of (a), some candidates clearly embarked on this question without the knowledge needed to answer it (or forgot to refer to three specific examples). There was a lot of generalized and unsupported discussion, and some cases of total confusion (e.g. British mosaics were black and white, Roman ones were coloured). (b) also required support from examples, so that an evaluation could be developed in (c). Where this was done, good marks could be awarded (refer to grids for differences in band definitions).





## **2459 Greek History: Document Study 2**

### **General comments**

There were some strong performances, but all too many good answers were marred by not making use of the passages in the papers. Some, for example, would open an answer on the reliability of a passage with a general discussion of the reliability of the historian, and then forget to analyse the passage itself. In general, section A attracted good answers, from candidates who seemed to have a considerable grasp of the material, whilst sections B and C were more evenly spread across the ability range. Candidates also need to make better use of their background knowledge to help them evaluate the sources. There were very few rubric errors on this paper, with most candidates answering the correct questions.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A – Herodotus and Persia**

- 1 (a) How far does this passage (Herodotus 3.38) help us understand Persian views about social customs? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, to what extent is Herodotus' account of Persian social customs affected by the fact that he was Greek?

Some candidates were able to take this passage further, and begin to look at the difference between Greek and Persia ideas on customs. The influence of Herodotus' Greekness on the ideas was not always understood.

- 2 (a) How far does this passage (The Cyrus Cylinder) help us understand the way that Cyrus presented himself to subjects? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, how consistent is Cyrus' self-presentation in this passage with the self-presentation of other Persian kings?

There were some excellent answers on the Cyrus Cylinder. However, some candidates failed to evaluate it as a source, and simply took it as 'fact'. The range of knowledge in response to (a) was impressive in some scripts. In (b) some candidates gave a detailed and thorough response using a range of sources both inscriptional and from Herodotus which were excellent.

- 3 (a) Account for the difference in Mardonius' advice to Xerxes in these two passages (Herodotus 7.5 and Herodotus 8.100). (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, how reliable is Herodotus' account of Persian decision-making?

Answers to this question were sometimes weaker than to 1 and 2. In some cases it appeared that candidates had 'run out of steam'. (a) required candidates to use their knowledge of the events to produce a considered response – this, unfortunately, was not always forthcoming. (b) was well answered by some, but too many candidates failed to evaluate Herodotus, and consider how he could have known about Persia decision-making. Some, however, were excellent, with detailed treatments of the various events surrounding key decisions, and an evaluation of his presentation. Candidates would be well advised to consider his narrative with a healthy rational scepticism where appropriate. Detail does not necessarily imply reliability.

## Section B – The Athenian Empire, 450-410BC

- 4 (a) How far does this passage (Thucydides 1.114-115.1) help us to understand the dangers Athens faced from revolting allies? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, to what extent was the Athenian Empire popular in the subject cities?

Many candidates gave a general evaluation of Thucydides as an Athenian general, but failed to apply this to the narrative on the paper. In (a) most candidates recognised the dangers of simultaneous revolts, and some produced an excellent discussion on this. Some, however, confused these events with others at the beginning of the later conflict. Question (b) proved more problematic. There were some excellent answers with a number using the rebellions as evidence for lack of popularity. Two clear difficulties emerged here – (i) the importance of using what evidence there is, and pointing out that there is very little evidence from non-Athenian sources and (ii) sticking to the question – a lot of candidates gave a potted history of the Delian League/Athenian Empire, but failed to address the question given. Much of what they said was relevant, but not well deployed in answer to this question.

- 5 (a) How useful is this passage (Thucydides 6.82.3 – 83.4) for our understanding of the Athenians' view of their own empire? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider the various reasons that allies were loyal to Athens during this period.

(a) was mainly well answered, although a number of candidates failed to make adequate use of the passage, and draw out the various elements given therein. Again, there was a considerable amount of general evaluation of Thucydides, which led almost nowhere. (b), like 4(b), elicited a number of general accounts of the Delian League/Athenian Empire. The question again required candidates to turn Athenian evidence around to look for an answer from the allies' perspective. Some produced excellent answers in this way, but candidates must be aware of the challenge, and apply what they know intelligently.

- 6 (a) How far do these two passages (Inscription 216A (LACTOR 1) and Plutarch, *Perikles* 11.5-6) help us to understand the extent of Athenian interference abroad? (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, consider the various and changing ways in which Athens sought to control her allies.

In general, this question was not that well handled. There were, of course, some excellent answers, but too many candidates thought that A was simply describing the Athenian constitution, whilst others ignored B. Candidates must make accurate and full use of both passages when answering. (a) some candidates accurately distinguished between the forms of interference given in the two passages, and produced excellent answers. (b) had a tendency to elicit general histories again, but in the main was not badly answered. Most answers tended to make some good use of Thucydides, and some use of the passages given.

## Section C – The Trial of Socrates

- 7 (a) How reliable is this passage (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.2) in its account of Socrates' relationship with the Thirty Tyrants? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, to what extent were the Athenians right to charge Socrates with corrupting the young?

Responses to this question varied, but a number were disappointing in their lack of focus on the questions asked. In (a) many candidates picked up on the first paragraph, but failed to detail with the analogy in the second. Some gave a profitable discussion of Xenophon's motives in writing this account. When this was well applied to the passage itself, it led to the highest marks. In (b) most answers focused profitably on Alcibiades and Critias, although some got rather confused on dates. There was a lack of focus in many answers on the question, although some produced excellent arguments suggesting that whilst the Athenians may not have been right, given the political circumstances the decision was understandable. A good knowledge of the contemporary political scene well applied was beneficial to good answers.

- 8 (a) How reliable is this passage (Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 628-647) in its depiction of Socrates' interests and ideas? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, how would you characterise the relationship between Socrates and the Sophists?

This answer produced a number of good responses. However, many state that Aristophanes, as a comic playwright, probably exaggerates things, and then fail to do anything with this. Some answers, however, traced the different ideas in the play back to different sophists, and used this to great effect in their evaluation of the passage. (a) was well answered by those who used the whole passage, and applied their knowledge of Socrates' activities to each area given. However, too many candidates appeared to have read the first couple of lines, and then ignored the rest of the passage and talked generally about the play. The question asks, 'How reliable is this passage..?' Candidates should be reminded of this. (b) led to some interesting answers. Most candidates attempted to answer, and included some evaluation of their sources. Answers suggest that there was some ambiguity in students' minds as to the meaning of the word 'relationship' – did it mean friendship between Socrates and the Sophists or a more professional relationship, along the lines of 'was Socrates a sophist?'. Both interpretations of the question were credited fully.

- 9 (a) How accurate and consistent are these two passages (Plato, *Apology* 37e-38b and Xenophon, *Socrates' Defence* 57) in their description of Socrates' conduct of his defence? (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, to what extent were Socrates' philosophical ideas responsible for the charges against him and his conviction?

This question was well answered by many candidates. Nevertheless, too many only read the first half of the *Apology* passage, or so it appeared. (a) most candidates focused on 'consistent', and used the idea of arrogance in B as a way of looking at A. Accurate was less well addressed in the main, although some candidates gave a good account of each source. (b) produced some excellent answers, which made very good use of a range of sources. However, only the best candidates distinguished between the different charges. This was an easy way to gain marks, but neglected by many candidates. Many candidates also failed to distinguish between the charges and the conviction. The passages given were an excellent help in doing this, but not many candidates made that much use of this route.



## **2460 Roman History: Document Study 2**

### **General comments**

Overall the candidates display a good standard of analysis and interpretation and more often than not, lower scores were due to a failure of technique in dealing with the requirements of the paper rather than lack of knowledge. Answers must show detailed use of the extract and other sources to score well. The candidates show good knowledge of the material, the authors and the political or social contexts. Most candidates understand that all answers must include source evidence for good marks. Chronology is not a strong area for a number of candidates and this can affect the coherence and cogency of a discussion.

Questions at A2 do focus on how useful the sources are for the historian and candidates need to think more about this aspect. Candidates are asked to use the extracts and their own knowledge to answer questions, and sometimes candidates develop their own knowledge without references to the sources to a degree which produces unbalanced marks. Candidates who do not develop their knowledge and understanding about the sources will be at disadvantage in terms of the allocation of marks. At the same time more needs to be offered than the name of the source (e.g. Tacitus tells us) since the task requires some comment or evaluation as evidence. A summary of what the extract or source tells us is insufficient for higher marks. Some knowledge of the context of a passage often helps to develop a good answer. The genre of the passage also is useful to include in answers where the issue is credibility- just as identifying an extract as dramatic writing, or factual reporting will influence the discussion. Tacitus' use of speeches (or reported comments) is something which is rarely mentioned.

There is less of a tendency to generalise about an author's views or bias, and a greater willingness to develop specific analysis of a quotation. Weaker answers are often characterised by tendency to narrate information about the topic rather than select the information needed for the question. Answers must keep to the specific focus of the question and the information in the documents. Some candidates with very good knowledge failed to gain marks in A03 because they simply did not refer to any source material in their answers. It is also true, that while questions are document-based, candidates must be aware that they need to support their ideas with some factual knowledge for which there are 10 marks out of 45 on each passage. Some candidates ran out of time because they spent far too long on narratives in (b) sub-questions. Not all candidates answered two questions, and a few failed to answer the compulsory question in their section.

In general attention to the wording of a question was something which affected marks: reference to a particular period, or group of people, or terms such as accuracy and consistency, or specific events all require that the answer focus in that direction.

The three sections A, B, and C, were all attempted, and candidates performed creditably in all three and showed understanding of all the prescribed texts.

## Comments on individual questions

### Section A - The Catilinarian Conspiracy

All three questions were attempted.

- 1 (a) Do you think Cicero's listeners would have found this description (Cicero *In Catilinam* II.19-20) of some of Catiline's supporters credible? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider the extent to which Cicero exaggerated the threat from Catiline to enhance his consulship.

Question (a) requested candidates to consider the credibility of Cicero's claims in terms of his listeners. Quite a number identified these as senators when the speech is delivered to the people. This clearly affected the language and accuracy of his claims but candidates were unable to place it as such. There was a good use of the text which was evaluated in most cases by the candidates, using Sallust. However, answers did provide some reasonable discussions of the language used by Cicero. In (b) answers were generally sound, although there was some lack of balance, as if Cicero had engineered the whole plot. Good reasons were offered why Cicero might exaggerate, but even in answers with a good understanding there was a failure to point to specific instances of exaggeration even in the extract on the paper. Weaker answers generalised about Cicero's aims without providing a specific examples of his speeches. There was good detail about Cicero's character, background and ambitions.

- 2 (a) How believable is this account (Sallust, *Catiline* 20) of Catiline's speech to his fellow conspirators? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, assess the accuracy of Sallust's account of Catiline's words and actions during the period 65-62 BC.

This question was less popular, and less well done. In (a) which concerned the reliability of Sallust's version of the speech, there were some good discussions of the text and its content. The better answers showed an attention to the detail of the speech and of the use of speeches in general. Obvious points were made about the recording of speeches, the fact that Sallust was not present at the time and so on. In (b), the question concerned how accurate Sallust's account is. Some answers were very precise and informative especially in dealing with examples of inaccuracy and/or accuracy of fact; others developed views concerning Sallust's aims in writing the book. Weaker answers did not have the detail to support their views (which tended to state that Sallust was too melodramatic to be accurate). They tended to be unbalanced in their discussion and have little understanding of the genre and sources used by Sallust. The commonest problem with the question was for candidates who placed the speech at the end before the battle.

- 3 (a) How consistent and accurate are these views of political activity in Rome at this time? (Sallust, *Catiline* 38 & 52) (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, consider whether the Catilinarian conspiracy was purely a symptom of serious underlying problems for the Republic.

This question produced some good answers comparing the material and evaluating the sources in general. A number produced very detailed answers in (a) on accuracy or consistency but not both. A few recognised that Sallust is speaking in the first and it is Cato's speech in the second passage. Weaker answers, as always, failed to focus on the **two** passages. Weaker answers also did not realise the nature of the second passage; even good answers did not mention the use of speeches by historians as an issue. Simple comparing and contrasting of statements from each is part of the answer but not the whole answer where some analysis and explanation is needed. For (b) the knowledge of the period and situation is important, and some better answers had a wide knowledge of the

context with specific material to support their analysis, avoiding the weaker generalisation of a breakdown of society. The issue of the viewpoint of the sources was raised with varying success, and usually expressed as 'bias', although here the speakers/authors are entitled to their view of the state of Rome from their own perspective. Placing Catiline's activities in this context proved less straightforward, although most candidates made sound arguments concerning the likelihood of such a plot in the context of Roman politics.



## Section B - Augustus and Augustan Propaganda

The vast majority of candidates chose Q. 4 over Q. 5.

- 4 How accurate is this account (Res Gestae 25-26) of Augustus' military achievements? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider why military achievements were regarded as important by writers both during and after Augustus' lifetime.

Candidates answered Q.4 (an assessment of Augustus' military achievements and the view taken of them by writers) showing good knowledge. In (a) candidates were able to develop ideas about the accuracy with the use of some detail both of the events and other accounts which differed or agreed with the extract. Good answers focused on the extract and what it tells us without falling into a narrative of events. Some pointed out that it made no reference to other, less acceptable events and actions. Others produced long descriptions of the various 'achievements' which were not military, or were not strictly Augustus'. Some could do not more than mention Actium and Sextus Pompeius. Good answers also noted information about the Res Gestae and what it was for. In (b) the question focused on the way his achievements were presented, although some candidates took this to mean a discussion of authors' agendas rather than what they have to say. Potentially good answers were damaged by the lack of focus on the extract. Some were unable to refer to a single reference in specific terms and so could not really answer the question. All realised that military success was important, and could provide general reasons for it, but relating this to Augustus' situation was less well done. Too often poets were said to be paid to write what Augustus wanted and the Res Gestae dismissed as simply propaganda. However, it is rarely as simple as this, and candidates did not develop their answers into his regime, clearly thinking military success was no longer necessary after Actium.

- 5 (a) How useful is this account (Tacitus *Annals* 1.3) for our understanding of the importance of Augustus' family to his regime? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how consistent and fair the sources are in their assessment of the contribution of Augustus' family to his time?

Question 5 was not often attempted, and generally the answers lacked a close use of the text and language used by Tacitus which needed an assessment to answer the issue of usefulness well. Details of the family were not well known. In (a) candidates needed to consider what the passage suggested about the role of the family and to explore how Augustus treated them and why. Good answers developed the issue through the use of other information, and contributions from family members. Some repeated what the passage said without much interpretation. For (b), where the issue was the attitude of the sources candidates did not overall have the information about much apart from the Res Gestae to answer well. As in other questions it was rare for both consistent and fair to be included. Clearly the contrast between Augustus' recognition of their contribution and what we are told in other works would have been a good answer if candidates had some precise knowledge about these. The roles that various members of the family played were known in some form but not what was said in the sources (except in very general terms).

- 6 (a) How would you account for the varying and changing attitudes in these passages (Tacitus, *Annals* 1.2 & Horace *Odes* 4.5) towards Augustus? (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how far the opinions represented in these extracts are typical of the ways Romans viewed Augustus.

The answers to Q. 6 varied because candidates did not use both passages sufficiently carefully or in a balanced way. Q. (a) asked how one might account for the differing attitudes, and candidates generally found some aspect to discuss regarding the context of the writers or their agendas. Although most knew that the two authors were approximately 100 years apart, not all examined the language of the passages in the light of this. The fact that Tacitus claims to be reporting the views of others about the time of Augustus' death was infrequently used. In that sense what is said by both authors is roughly contemporary. Good answers qualified their analysis with the understanding that the genres are different. As in other answers, the simplistic idea of Horace as paid propagandist prevailed. Good answers in (b) could set what the passages said against further material in the sources, both in Tacitus and Suetonius and other authors. There was, in weaker answers, an assumption that the poets were all in favour of Augustus, and the prose writers against him. Better answers could use Paterculus or Ovid, and Tacitus *Annals* 1.9 in support of their ideas on how typical these extracts are. Some included evidence concerning other groups than educated writers. Most candidates realised that they had to focus on the views of sources and not what Augustus did. Very good answers questioned the objectivity of the writers without simplifying the issues.

### Section C - The Reign of Nero

- 7 (a) How believable are the motives and actions attributed to Agrippina in this passage (Tacitus, *Annals* 14.10-11)? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, discuss the extent to which women of the imperial family played a significant role in Nero's regime.

This saw a range of answers. In (a) candidates produced good material related to the issue of Agrippina's motives and actions. A few tended to use little of the extract and discuss her life and actions. Better answers focused on the passage and discussed its credibility in terms of what was likely from Agrippina's behaviour at other points in the reign. The passage is largely a report by Tacitus of what Nero claimed, and this was an important aspect of the evaluation of the material. Q. (b) required candidates to consider the significance of the imperial women. Again close attention to what is reported in the sources would have produced very good marks. Answers which covered 2 or 3 figures but barely included the sources could not gain high marks. There was an inevitable concentration on Agrippina, although better answers did develop views on Octavia and Poppaea. Their actions were well covered, not so the significance. Very good discussions occurred around the notion of the difficulty of knowing exactly what role they played and how far they influenced what happened, despite Suetonius and Tacitus, especially given the secrecy among the imperial household.

- 8 (a) How typical of the sources are the attitudes expressed in this passage (Cassius Dio 63. 10-11) towards Nero's activities? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how far the views of the sources towards Nero's artistic ambitions reflect those of his contemporaries.

The answers to the Q.8 passage (on the attitude of Dio towards Nero's activities, especially in the theatre) showed good understanding the passage and good knowledge of the activity involved. Candidates generally were able to offer some assessment of the fairness of the passage, and better ones examined the value-loading of the words as evidence of the author's attitude. Some weaker answers discussed the nature of his acting and the reaction among the upper classes, or how it affected his popularity without addressing the

question directly. Weaker answers also appeared to have little knowledge of Dio's style or approach to the writing of history. Comments were made that he agrees with Suetonius or Tacitus without making the point that he is probably using them as his source. Dio's rhetorical approach is certainly less easy to analyse than Suetonius' style. In (b) candidates were more successful in addressing the views of the sources with useful examples from other authors. However 'contemporaries' was not clearly understood by some, who thought it meant other authors, not those who lived during Nero's reign. Better answers discussed the perceived upper class bias against Nero and the popularity among other groups, such as the army, equestrians, freedmen etc. Some balanced answers noted that some parts of the sources are not entirely critical of Nero. The impression we have of the way Nero's theatrical activities were received comes from the sources so some skill is needed to identify what his contemporaries thought.

- 9 (a) How accurate and consistent do you find these accounts (Suetonius *Nero* 36-7 and Tacitus *Annals* 14.22)? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how effectively Nero dealt with rivals during his reign.

This question looked at accounts of Nero's reactions to rivals and opposition. In (a) the question concerned how far the passages were consistent as much as accurate, and there is an issue concerning what candidates understood by this. Equally accurate with ancient sources is somewhat relative, and good answers presented a qualified assessment using other material where possible. Very good answers identified parts of each passage which could be compared or contrasted. More good analysis came from examining the detail in terms of the stereotyping of Nero as tyrant using what the authors claim he intended to do. Some accurate chronology would have helped some answers, especially to distinguish the dates of the two events. Q.(b) asked candidates to consider how well Nero dealt with rivals, and weaker answers assumed the two passages were describing the same event. 'Rivals' was sometimes stretched to include Agrippina, who is to some extent an opponent, if not actually a rival to the throne. Rivals in poetry competitions was perhaps less acceptable. Some could examine the reign as a whole but most had little to offer than the Britannicus and/or Piso. Answers suffered from a lack of breadth of information. Good answers knew about Thrasea Paetus, and, of course, Vindex and Galba. Some also made the point that it was at times some one else who dealt with his rivals. Narratives of Nero's actions did not deal with the 'effectively' part of the questions, and again it has to be emphasised how important at A2 is the need for analytical approach to the material.

Finally, but by no means least, it is a concern whether candidates are aware of how important the A01b mark is to their overall grade. The failure to spell names even when printed on the paper (Cataline, Ceasar, Seutonium, Mycenae, Horis), the lack of punctuation, and sentence structure can all contribute to unclear expressions and arguments. While some write with clarity and conciseness, a good number fail to do so. Illegibility is just as serious and would appear to be getting worse with the probability that for some the examination is the only time they write by hand.



## **2461 Roman World: Document Study 2**

### **General comments**

In the view of the examiners, the paper was of comparable difficulty to that set in 2006 and 2005, and the overall standard of responses was about the same as in previous years. There was much evidence of skilled interpretation and informed judgement, as well as a fair amount of unsupported assertion and a shaky grasp of evidence, which many candidates failed to recall with accuracy or did not deploy effectively. There was only one rubric error noted, one candidate omitting Q. 3(a), possibly through pressure of time.

As was the case last year, a difficulty which the paper still appears to pose in terms of technique is the need to make use of the passage set, in detail, in the (a) questions. This year the phenomenon was particularly apparent in Q. 3, where otherwise competent and thorough responses failed to make any significant use of the passages in any detail at all.

As is the case with the AS counterpart module 2452, the overall performance of Centres would improve with more attention to this point. A large proportion of candidates who in other respects are quite competent, secure in their factual knowledge, and well-informed, still fail to score good marks in the (a) question by embarking on a related discursive essay which however fails to make little use of the passage. If candidates were taught to start from the passage and then make comments on points drawn from it the overall standard would improve, but more importantly, it would be appropriate to award weaker answers more marks in AO3, as well as in AO1 and AO2 (see grids for information).

Similarly, support for assertions made must be included in the (b) question, and the use of sources or reference to them will enable more marks to be awarded under both AO3 and AO2 (for supporting an argument, and avoiding plain unfounded assertion or reliance on narrative). As a general point, in the (b) answers there was often an imbalance in responses – for example, where 1 (b) asked for a consideration of the British economy, there was frequently a fair discussion of the points raised in the passage but little or no support from archaeology in order for this discussion to be fully supported. It was also noticeable that a significant number of candidates failed to provide any really secure background information for the discussion in 3(b), though there were many thoughtful and incisive answers to it.

On the topic of sources, the Examiners were pleased to note that the tendency to conflate original ancient sources with modern scholars, in this and other papers, was much less obvious than in previous years, and there seems to be a much clearer appreciation of what is meant by 'sources' in Ancient History.

A final general point: many candidates have problems providing correct spelling, clear communication, or lucid expression. Common names such as Caesar or Britain/Briton are routinely confused to a point where the impression is given that these do not matter.

## Comments on individual questions

- 1 (a) How useful is this passage (Strabo 4.5.2) in informing us about Roman views of the economy and inhabitants of Britain before the Claudian invasion? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how far we can rely on what Strabo tells us about economic activity in Roman Britain.

This question was easily the most popular of the two optional ones, with about three-quarters of the candidates attempting it. Answers to (a) were generally quite well done, since the question was fairly straightforward, though a number of candidates did not make full use of the passage and omitted detail on both **economy** and **inhabitants**. A number failed to spot some key details and assumed Strabo had taken everything from Caesar. There was also a tendency to begin the discussion needed in (b) in this part, although it clearly asked for usefulness in telling us about **Roman views**, not a general discussion. Better answers were able to find four or five key points in the passage, explain the importance of the citations, and compare and contrast them with other sources, Tacitus, Caesar, Dio and Herodian.

(b) posed no problems for some candidates, who were able to mine both literary and archaeological sources for an evaluation of the British economy as it actually was. Surprisingly few credited Strabo with the use of his own eyes in places ('I myself have seen') or, having placed him in context and noted the four crossing-points, credited him with repeating what may have been common knowledge within the empire about British exports by the time he wrote. There was a failure to place 'they know nothing of planting crops or farming in general' in the context of some of them and to assume that Strabo simply hadn't realised how stupid he was contradicting himself! At the lower end of responses there was also difficulty in grasping what could or could not be included by 'economic activity'.

- 2 (a) How accurate do you consider Tacitus' presentation of Caratacus in this passage (Tacitus, *Annals* 12.36-37)? (b) On the basis of this passage and your own knowledge and understanding, to what extent is this presentation typical of the ways in which Greek and Roman writers sought to portray British leaders?

This attracted fewer takers, but was generally well done, with some good use of the passage and some thoughtful attempts to address Tacitus' likely accuracy in (a). In some answers there was an assumption that we had another source to draw on, with assertions such as 'we can't be sure about the speech . . . but we know C. was released by Claudius' without appreciating the limited source material about this episode. (b) with its request for an examination of 'typical of the ways . . . sought to portray British leaders' proved a fine opportunity for discussion of the usual suspects, with source references in support, and at the higher end some perceptive comment about the attitudes different writers evince.

- 3 (a) Account for the differences in these two passages (Caesar *Gallic War* 5.9 and Dio, 62.12.1-3) in their presentation of battles between Romans and Britons. (b) On the basis of these passages and your own knowledge and understanding, consider how reliable are the accounts of battles between Romans and Britons recorded by classical writers.

As was the case last year, the compulsory question is evidently difficult for many candidates, and as noted above, there was a tendency for irrelevant material to be introduced here. The passages were long, and the questions were specific – in (a), note differences in presentation and explain how they come to be there; in (b), assess the reliability of accounts of battles.

There were some very focused, detailed and thoughtful responses to these two questions, but by and large what the examiners found was this:

- in (a) a general comparison between the two passages – often with a focus on similarities, not differences – and a poor use of the passages, with a general unfocused discussion of the styles (supported by detailed information or not) of Caesar and Dio, with recourse to Boudica's speech for example;
- in (b), marked absence of reliable knowledge about the authorship/ the likely audiences and what they would know about military activity themselves/ the place of historiography as part of rhetoric in any detail. For example, there were sweeping statements such as 'ancient historians write rhetoric so you can't trust what they write'; or worse, 'Tacitus was Agricola's son-in-law so he must be biased/bias/ biast . . .' The ideas that an audience would spot any military gaffe straightaway, or recognise detail of military tactics when they came across it, were largely absent, as did the point (made cogently in one response, we were glad to note) that Tacitus' family contact might work in the opposite direction, i.e. give him an inside account of what happened. There were also a number of sweeping claims to the effect that the sites of Mons Graupius and/ or Boudica's defeat have been clearly identified. Candidates must be advised not to make information up – it does not help their cause .
- There was also a lack of focus on what the questions actually require – so routine answers about the reliability of speeches were trotted out ad nauseam in (b) and no attempt made to link them to 'accounts of battles'. The old advice holds true – candidates must read the question.





## **2462 Greek History: Source-Based Study 2**

### **General comments**

The standard of answers in this paper was similar to that last year. In general, candidates are making good use of sources, but there are still those who fail to make any use of sources or only refer indirectly to them. The result is that some answers which are otherwise competent, gain very few marks under AO3, and fall down a considerable way.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A - Herodotus and the Conflict of Greece and Persia 499-479 BC**

- 1 How balanced is Herodotus' account of the consequences of the Ionian Revolt?
- 2 Assess the consequences for both Greeks and Persians of the outcome of the Battle of Marathon.
- 3 To what extent can we trust Herodotus' account of the Battle of Thermopylae?
- 4 How far can we trust Herodotus' view of the Athenian contribution to Greek victory in the Persian Wars (480 – 479 BC)?
- 5 How important was the liberation of the Greek cities of Asia Minor to the mainland Greek cities?

This section attracted very few candidates.

#### **Section B - Greek History, 446-413 BC**

This seemed to be the most popular section, with a number of good answers. Questions 6 and 7 were the most popular. In questions where an author is not cited – e.g. 6-8, 10 – candidates must take care to ensure that they deal with the relevant sources.

- 6 How fair is it to blame the Athenians for the outbreak of the Archidamian War?

Many of the responses were workmanlike, and showed a good knowledge of the background and causes of the war. However, not all candidates remained focused on the question of 'blame' for the outbreak of the war. A number also failed to evaluate or even acknowledge Thucydides as a source.

- 7 In what ways and for what reasons did Athenian strategy in the Archidamian War change?

Many candidates were reasonably clear on Pericles' strategy, but then fell to pieces after this. Some candidates effectively discussed the role of Cleon and Nicias after the death of Pericles, and produced intelligent answers. All too many looked at 'in what ways' but failed to deal with 'for what reasons'.

- 8 To what extent was the Peace of Nicias a failure for Sparta?

Candidates did not seem that familiar with the details of the Peace of Nicias. There were a number who produced excellent answers, and looked at the detail of Spartan strategy before and after to elucidate their answers.

- 9 How fair is Thucydides in his account of the failure of the Sicilian expedition?

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

Some candidates took this as an opportunity to write a narrative of the failure of the expedition. Only a few looked at it from beginning to end, dealing with both the political debate before the expedition and the failures of strategy during the expedition. Some excellent answers also considered the influence of tragedy on the shaping of Thucydides' narrative.

- 10** Assess the view that in Athens during this period religion and politics should **not** be seen as distinct activities.

Very few candidates answered this question.

## **Section C - The Culture of Athens, 447-399 BC**

- 11** To what extent during this period was the Assembly the main institution for ordinary citizens to participate in the political process?

This question led to a number of general accounts of the organs of government in Athens. Some candidates applied this well, and looked at the importance of the courts in the political process. Nevertheless, all too many failed to consider the importance of the assembly for ordinary citizens. In this context, many failed to deal with the role of rhetoric and the power of leading individuals. Evaluation of sources also proved to be a problem, as this tended to be very general rather than focussed on the particular issues.

- 12** In what ways do the dramatists, in the plays you have studied, represent the relationship between the individual and the state? (You may limit yourself to discussing **two** plays.)

This question led to a number of basic responses which dealt with a couple of plays. These were generally well handled, with adequate detail. Nevertheless, some read more as an account of the background to the play than a detailed treatment of parts of the play relevant to the question. Some answers twisted parts of the play to make them relevant to a degree that was a little far fetched.

- 13** What do the sculptures on the Parthenon, together with relevant literary sources, tell us about the purposes of the Periclean building programme?

This question was well handled, with a good standard of knowledge about the sculptures and literary sources. Thucydides' silence on this matter was forgotten by all but the best candidates, whilst some seemed to confuse Thucydides and Plutarch. Precision in describing the sculptures is essential, as is some degree of hesitation in stating 'what they mean'.

- 14** Discuss the importance of state religious festivals to the political and cultural life of Athens. (You may limit yourself to discussing **two** festivals.)

This question received some answers which tended to be of a general nature. There were some good treatments of the Panathenaia and the Dionysia. Answers tended not to focus on the 'political and cultural' element of the question, but looked more generally at the importance of festivals, and so were not always successful.

- 15** How fair are the sources in their depiction of the Sophists' ethical and political ideas?

This question proved a real challenge for those who chose it. Some had an excellent knowledge of the sophists, but difficulty in relating this to specific sources, whilst others were able to talk generally about Plato's 'bias', but then failed to apply this intelligently to specific areas.

## **2463 Roman History: Source-Based Study 2**

### **General comments**

There appeared to be a good range of knowledge and understanding from the candidates and a good use of source material from most. The main issue was that judgements were not always argued through supporting material, whether factual or from the sources. There are still a fair number of candidates who make little or no references to the sources. Some do little more than state that 'so and so tells us' some information. There is sometimes no attempt to be specific and develop an evaluation of the material. Alternatively candidates provide a generic evaluation of, for example, Plutarch writes 200 years later and therefore cannot be trusted. There is little attempt to isolate what can be trusted.

Some candidates produced answers which did not quite fit the question set, and candidates should beware of presenting a pre-prepared answer since examiners do not always write the question which fits their answers.

However, there are many candidates who develop their answers from the source material as a starting point. This is always going to be the most sensible way develop ideas and understanding in dealing with any topic in this subject. In the end it will produce the better answers. Establishing the context of the source, its genre, the author's agenda are all likely to produce a more successful answer.

In a growing number of answers, the candidates' quality of expression and communication seriously affects their work; the use of appropriate terminology is part of the assessment, as is clarity of communication.

All sections were attempted by the candidates with Section B being the most popular. While all questions were attempted, the most popular in each section were Qs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15. Q. 4, Q. 11 and Q 13 were rarely answered. There were some very weak answers but the vast majority produced accurate material and sound judgements of some sort. The commonest failing, as already indicated, was the lack of sources which dragged down the marks.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A - Roman History 81-44 BC**

- 1 How far were the political difficulties of the period 81-64 BC a result of Sulla's failure to solve the underlying problems of the Roman State?

This concerned the failure of Sulla's attempts to deal with the problems in the period 81-64 BC. It had a time period which a number of candidates clearly ignored. Information from outside the time-scale was unlikely to gain marks and would clearly waste the candidates' time. The chronology of the period was not well-known. Answers generally avoided a narration of Sulla's reforms. Good answers identified individual instances of problems and/or political difficulties (e.g. Verres, Lepidus, Pompey, Crassus,) or groups (e.g. the optimates and their rivalries). Good answers were also specific with factual information as well as identifying the issues with precise information. Good answers indicated that the underlying problems were more widespread than Sulla himself or his reforms. Some focused on one or two issues to exclusion of other threats to some effect. Also some answers tend to be unbalanced, in that the narrative focused too much on Sulla and the failure of his reforms. There was a general use of sources especially Plutarch Lives. However, others also used Sallust, Cicero, Appian, and others. Some made references on the lines of 'we learn about this from Plutarch'. Others treated the sources as information without any attempt to comment on them.

**2** To what extent was political activity in the 60s BC dominated by Pompey?

The question on the Pompey's domination of the 60s (Q.2) was competently answered but many candidates could not keep within the 60s or compare other politicians with Pompey in order to develop the extent of his dominance. Good answers identified specific examples of Pompey's success. 'Dominated' requires some careful interpretation of the evidence, and there was a need to discuss actions and reports of individuals' motivations with some care in order to draw conclusions. Weaker answers narrated the career of Pompey or others without really discussing the issue. Better answers developed detailed comparisons and argued for the change in Pompey's status as the decade progressed. These answers placed Pompey's career in the context of the politics of the period, where dominance was more clearly related to political activity. Some answers simply added sources to the end of the essay without making them part of the discussion.

**3** 'The formation of the so-called First Triumvirate marked the end of the Republic.' How far would you agree with this view?

This question on the effect of the First Triumvirate on the Republic allowed the candidates who attempted this question to develop their assessment of the major politicians and the events of the 50s. Good answers provided some good arguments based upon the idea of the breakdown of normal political activity, and how far this was due to the triumvirate or other factors. Weaker answers again lapsed into narrative of the 50s or (worse still) into an account of the Civil War, often with little regard for basic chronology. Crassus was often left out the equation and it became a struggle between Caesar and Pompey. Better answers approached the question from a wider viewpoint in terms of who were involved in the activities around 60 and the consequences of what they did. Evidence from Cicero's letters was used by some (although some confuse his letters and speeches).

**4** Assess the value of Cicero's speeches and letters as historical evidence for the events of the 50s and 40s BC.

This question, on the value of Cicero's speeches and letters as historical evidence, was attempted by a few candidates. There were considerable differences in the quality of answers; those with a good knowledge of the period could cite a number of incidents from which to develop an answer; candidates with a limited (and chronologically vague) knowledge struggled to assess his evidence meaningfully. Catiline was included but was outside the period stipulated; his governorship of Cilicia was omitted by some despite the fact that they must have been aware of it from another of the modules. Very good answers, naturally, contrasted the reality with the ways in which Cicero presented himself and events by comparison with other sources. Answers which showed a good understanding of the range of evidence were sound and often very good when supported by source material.

**5** To what extent did the demands of the urban poor influence the actions of politicians during this period?

A few candidates attempted this question but they tended to focus on the way in which politicians manipulated the poor through the assembly or via the tribune and often the focus was Caesar or Pompey. As a result answers focused on the use of the tribune by powerful politicians to gain their ends, rather than how far the poor influenced what they did. This was generally less successfully answered than other questions, since candidates did not consider what constituted the urban poor.

## **Section B - The Age of Augustus 31 BC – AD 14**

### **6 Why was there so little effective opposition to Augustus' regime?**

This question produced some excellently detailed answers. They used a range of examples from Caepio to the riots of the plebs over Augustus' apparent refusal to become dictator. Some answers were rather vague and general, as well as some which produced source references of a rather inexact nature. Some answers focused on the opposition to his social laws. Others discussed the extent of opposition before he became emperor despite the period being clearly indicated as 31 BC to AD 14. The question of why it was ineffective was less well answered. There were some who focused on how Augustus had developed the means to create support so that opposition found little opportunity to develop. This was well-done but lacked examples of opposition to provide a balanced discussion. Most were inclined to suggest it was because there were few of the noble families left and/or because Augustus used bribery and seduction (with Tacitus' support) to gain massive support. A wide range of sources was needed; some good answers made use of edicts as well as the normal *Res Gestae* and Tacitus. Hardly any candidate seems unaware of when the sources were written even if they do not make the most of the information of the text.

### **7 Did Augustus ever intend to extend the empire beyond the Rhine?**

This question on the extension of the empire beyond the Rhine was very popular. A number had some very detailed material with which to develop an answer. Very good answers did focus on the policy rather than a narrative of campaigns. Clearly the Varus disaster in AD 9 was an important point for all answers, although not all knew the details. There was a tendency in weaker answers to focus on this event to the exclusion of the activity in the earlier years of the reign. This question required a wide coverage of the reign as a whole not a restricted part of it. Candidates had some good knowledge of arrangements Augustus made and the attempts to extend the frontier, although there was some confusion over the actual area of the frontier. There is information of the activities on the frontier in Suetonius and Velleius Paterculus, as well as the *Res Gestae* and Dio Cassius. Chronology was also a difficulty for some. The aims varied from conquest to stabilising the frontier, and those who were aware of the events could show how the aims changed in reaction to what happened.

### **8 The sources are too limited for us to assess the effect of Augustus' social and moral legislation accurately.' Would you agree with this view?**

This question on the sources for the social and moral legislation was very popular, although only moderately well answered. This was largely because candidates knew the legislation very well but had little understanding of the effect it had and how far we can judge any effect from the evidence we have. A number discussed why the law was introduced not what impact it had. Some mentioned only the marriage laws and not the slave and freedmen legislation. Candidates generally had reference to various contemporary sources, although the claim that the laws are mentioned in detail in the *Res Gestae* appeared to be common. Horace was used as was Ovid (negatively); few made mention of other sources such as Tacitus' claim that they had not worked. The question asked the candidates to consider if there was evidence that we could assess the effect, and a reasonable number of candidate argued that there was not enough to produce a viable assessment.

- 9 'I excelled all in authority, but I had no more power than others who were my colleagues in each magistracy' (*Res Gestae* 34). Can Augustus' claim be defended?

This asked candidates to consider if Augustus' claims to equal power with other magistrates was credible and could be defended. The answers were largely well-informed both with the claim he makes and with alternative evidence from other sources, either in agreement or disagreement. The focus was whether or not the claim could be defended rather than how powerful Augustus was, and some candidates ignored the question and presented a standard argument about his power, with virtually no discussion of his *auctoritas*, and sometimes a confused idea of the settlements. The question of the Augustan constitution is a major focus but candidates should beware of offering a version of the monarchy/diarchy/republic answer to any question set in the examination. Good answers focus the information on the issue highlighted in the question – the mention of Augustan power does not automatically mean it is asking if he was all powerful. There were some very fine answers where candidates did show a balance between the two aspects in the quotation. Some quite rightly pointed out that the forms of the Republic continued to exist and to be used and that Augustus did not over-step the boundaries of the power of the offices as such.

- 10 To what extent and for what reasons did Augustus resist the creation of an imperial cult during his lifetime?

This question on the reasons for Augustus resisting the imperial cult produced a good number of answers. Weaker answers were unaware of the variations in the worship of the emperor, for example in the East and West, and the provinces and Italy itself; not all mentioned the creation of the worship of the Genius and the institution of the *seviri*. There was a great deal about religious reforms and temple building which was not always relevant to this question. The propaganda element was well-employed; good answers referred to poets as well as prose evidence. The very good answers discussed the historical value of the poetry. This was a question about the extent and the reasons for worship so it was important to provide a range of examples for a good answer. Augustus' religious views and/or the idea of emperor worship in general were the focus of weaker answers. The sources are varied from literature to inscriptions and buildings, which some answers employed but many did not. In addition candidates need to be careful with archaeological evidence since the dating of it is problematical – not all the evidence adduced for Augustan worship can actually be dated to his reign



## **Section C - Roman History AD 14-68**

- 11** 'Tacitus fails to live up to his own claim to have written without indignation and partisanship in his account of Tiberius' reign.' How far would you agree with this view?

A few candidates opted for Q. 11 (the extent to which Tacitus is fair and unbiased in his account of Tiberius). Answers in general discussed the elements of secrecy, maiestas trials, military control via the praetorian Guard, the servility of the senate, control of provinces and other topics on relation to the account in Tacitus and tried to discuss the accuracy of Tacitus' version. The best answers were able to provide specific material from the sources, to compare with Tacitus. Good answers made use of Tacitus to indicate that the author praises Tiberius for his administration up to a certain point (AD 23) and then develops a darker portrayal. There was a good knowledge of this author by many candidates, and it would appear that the study of his reign was based upon the study of source material in a lot of cases. Balanced judgements could not be made by the candidates who could not be precise about Tacitus nor find views by other authors. Answers could have used various extracts from Suetonius or Dio Cassius to support their views but few did.

- 12** To what extent and for what reasons did Claudius rely on non-senators in governing the empire?

This question on the reasons for Claudius' reliance on non-senators was very popular. There was a tendency to narrate the events of the reign of Claudius in weaker answers. Better answers used specific examples such as Pallas among the freedmen, or Felix, or client kings or equestrians and even his wives. The latter, however, was not entirely related to governing the empire as the question asked. There was a great deal of very specific material used in support of their judgements about the extent. The reasons often ended up as speculation. Weaker answers would focus on freedmen often again without any specific detail with which to support the argument. However, there were good judgements which showed balance when identifying the extent, with examples of the use of senators as well as non-senators. The explanations of the reasons for the use of both did tend towards simplistic idea that he had no friends in the senate because of his past and his accession. Better answers could point to a variety of reasons, such as more efficient administration, a lack of expertise in the senate for some tasks, the expertise of freedmen and equestrians, a desire for centralisation by Claudius and so on.

- 13** How much historical value is there in Suetonius' accounts of the emperors of this period? (You may limit yourself to discussing **two** emperors if you wish.)

This produced very few answers and some quite weak because the answers displayed little information which was taken from the Lives. There was general discussion of Suetonius (or Seutonium as he was often called) and his desire for the salacious rumour. It was clear that the candidates did not have a good knowledge of the accounts in some cases; on the other hand occasional answers were well-informed, detailed and well-argued.

- 14** 'The Senate was unable or unwilling to mount any serious opposition to the emperors.' Is this a fair assessment of the Senate during this period?

The question on the Senate's opposition to the emperors (Q.14) was answered by a few candidates and was reasonably well-attempted, because they had some precise information on the opposition to the emperor in the case of Tiberius and Nero. Good answers knew about Piso and Vindex, and usually others such as Plautus, Thrasea for Nero; Tiberius was well-served with Piso, and a variety of treason trials, to suggest that opposition was dealt with effectively by agents such as Sejanus. They also had precise

material from the sources, usually Suetonius and Tacitus. However, while they could narrate the examples of opposition, the discussion of the Senate's involvement or lack of it was less successful. There were, however, some very good answers which dealt with both 'unwilling' and 'unable' by looking at the factors which made opposition both difficult and unnecessary at various times. Weaker answers focused on one or two examples and provided only superficial explanations, such as the fact opposition was dealt with by killing them off. Better answers developed explanations about the weakness of the senate in the empire and the popularity of the empire even among some of the upper class. A good answer made use of Tacitus' criticisms of Piso and company, where some evaluated these criticisms.

- 15** Why was it important for the emperors to maintain good relations with the army and how far did they achieve this during this period?

This question on the importance of the army was attempted by some candidates. There were answers which developed the role of the army within the empire and its relationship with the emperor. Answers were generally good and some were very good. Most were aware of the general importance of the army; however, they did not relate this to specific factual knowledge. There was exact knowledge of the ways in which emperors tried to maintain good relations with the army from the provision of pay and retirement benefits to occasional gifts and conquests. Good answers also identified two or more emperors and compared them. The extent to which good relations were achieved tended to be largely speculative, with a lack of evidence for or against. Good answers could point to the mutiny in AD 14, the Praetorian Guard's role at the times of end and the beginnings of reigns, the importance of military victory for both the army and the general public's view of an emperor. The best showed that they did not always achieve good relations with the army according to the evidence. There were some answers which developed in general terms and some what speculatively as to the role of the army and its commanders. It is important that candidates realise that even where the question is wide and covers the period, they still need evidence to support their claims.

There were answers across all sections in which the candidates seemed to feel that an expression of an opinion was sufficient, and there was no need to support their views with anything other than some speculation as to how the individual or group might have reacted. The frequent use of the words 'would have' to indicate what was felt to be a logical way in which the people of Rome or the senators or others behaved or reacted to an event or incident is to be avoided. Equally the addition of probably as a way of justifying a conclusion should be considered. Such speculation may have its place but essentially candidates need to justify their views with evidence or indicate that the evidence is limited or may not exist.

## **2464 Roman World: Source-Based Study 2**

### **General comments**

The paper in 2007 was considered by the Examiners to offer a wide range of questions at the same level of difficulty as in 2006. The paper attracted a wide range of combinations of answers, with significant numbers of responses to all the questions set; questions 1, 3, and 5 were favoured more than 2 and 4, question 4 attracting the fewest attempts. There were a pleasing number of well-argued and supported responses where candidates had prepared well for the paper and were able to deploy securely-based factual knowledge and source material in a relevant and appropriate way to develop well-argued essays. There were in the impression of the examiners markedly fewer candidates whose answers only gained marks at the lower end of the scale than was the case in 2006.

The general standard of spelling seems to have gone down again at the lower end, with some responses paying little attention to the correct ways of writing names, technical terms, and so on. As is the case with other papers, there are more instances of speculation and unfounded assertion than in previous years. Of continuing concern is the re-appearance of the habit of mingling or conflating ancient sources with modern scholars – thus phraseology such as ‘Tacitus and Henig’ or ‘Dio and Sheppard Frere say’ has been in evidence again. The effort taken to memorise quotes from modern authors is of itself commendable, but candidates must be aware that in this source-based paper, these authors do not count as sources, and gain marks only under AO1, not AO3. There was also a greater tendency in this year’s cohort to offer pre-prepared answers – thus for example several responses to Qs. 3 and 4 were far too general, and did not focus on the terms of the questions set; in Q. 4 in particular, some responses did not mention Cartimandua. Similarly in Q. 5 there were a significant number of responses which only included the start and end of the period, whether from lack of secure knowledge or failure to appreciate the demands of the task in front of the candidate. The old advice needs to be repeated as much as ever – do not topic spot, revise thoroughly and read the question.

## **Comments on individual questions**

### **1 How credible are the reasons offered in the sources for Claudius' invasion of Britain?**

This question attracted some very good responses, with wide-ranging reasons and good support from the sources. There was a tendency in some answers to focus purely on the 'Roman' end of the question and to leave out the background of what may have been going on in Britain, or to mention the appeal of Verica/ Berikos. There were some whose knowledge of the sources could have been stronger, and what appeared to be guesswork in attributing authors to statements.

### **2 What factors best explain the rapid Roman conquest of lowland Britain up to AD 51?**

Not as popular as some others (see the general introduction). There were some well-argued responses which kept to the chronology set and argued in a variety of ways for military superiority vs. local co-operation; the issue is by no means settled, to judge from responses seen, and allowed for some good discussion. Some less secure answers went well beyond AD 51 and it was disappointing to see Boudicca brought in here.

### **3 How consistent were the policies of the Roman governors of Britain prior to the revolt of Boudica?**

This question, and the one which follows, caused difficulties for a number of weaker candidates who either did not read the question carefully enough or who insisted on offering pre-prepared answers on the causes of the Boudiccan rebellion. Answers like this were found with both Q. 3 and Q. 4 written in front of them.

The main difficulty seems to have been caused by 'consistent policies' and 'prior to'; discussion of Roman policies which caused the rebellion gained some marks under AO1, and under AO3 where sources (usually included) were mentioned in support, but little under AO2; very often there was no attempt to address the question at all.

### **4 To what extent were changes in Roman policy in Britain brought about by the crises caused by Boudica and Cartimandua?**

As noted in Q. 3 this question caused problems for candidates who saw 'Boudica' and did not read the question carefully enough. There were a small number of answers where the focus was so much on the causes of the rebellion of B. with no mention of C. where the answer was marked as Q. 3 as it gained marginally more marks. The focus here clearly has to be after AD 60-61, and better responses did well, handling the period up to the start of Agricola's governorship in a competent and thoughtful way, with changes noted as a result of both crises; answers tended to follow a broad pattern of 'being nice to the Britons' in AD 60-61, and then 'more military expansion' in the 70s AD. There were a few very well-informed answers which used the Agricola in a critical way, showing that some actions attributed to A. by Tacitus were already being done, supported by archaeology (dendrochronology, specifically).

- 5** Assess the possible reasons for the fluctuation in the position of the northern frontier in Britain between c. AD 80 and AD 122.

This was popular, but probably the least well-done of all the questions on this paper. Some candidates may have been expecting a piece on the two walls, not the period before, and gave us half of that; there was a large number of responses which leapt from Mons Graupius to The Hadrianic frontier with little or no material in between.

It was no all doom and gloom, however, and substantial numbers of answers were well documented and supported and assessed and evaluated possible reasons for the shifting position of the frontier with confidence.



## **2465 Greek History: Thematic Study 2**

### **General comments**

Over all the standard of work was good. There were few scripts which failed to use sources. There are still some candidates dealing in generalities, without looking at specific issues and using factual knowledge and sources to justify their answers. In general most candidates seem more able to reproduce facts rather than interpret them. Candidates must apply themselves fully to the question asked, and ensure that they use the material at their disposal to address the relevant issues.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Section A - The Culture of Tyranny in the Greek World, c. 600-479 BC**

- 1 Discuss the different ways in which tyrants gained power during this period.
- 2 What impact did tyrants have on the economic life of the cities they ruled, and how important was the economy to the success of their rule?
- 3 How convincing are Herodotus' accounts of how tyrants affected the religious and cultural life of their cities?
- 4 Assess the view that it is Herodotus' interest in morality rather than factual accuracy that determines his account of the ways tyrants exercised power.

There were only a few centres which answered this section. The standard was generally good. However, question 3 caused some candidates difficulty in that whilst they had a good knowledge of various aspects of the tyrants, they found it difficult to trace these back clearly to specific sections of Herodotus.

#### **Section B – Sparta in the Greek World, 520-400BC**

This section attracted some good answers.

- 5 Discuss the consistency and success of Spartan foreign policy during this period.

Many candidates did not seem clear on the meaning of 'foreign policy'. Candidates knew what the Spartans did, but failed to look at policy – for example at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. In general the idea was there, but not followed through into the detail of the answer.

- 6 To what extent was the success of the Spartan armed forces dependent on the Spartan education system?

Candidates knew quite a lot about the education system, but failed to apply this to the question. Many candidates also failed to use obvious examples from the military history – e.g. Thermopylae – or construct and answer.

- 7 How useful is Herodotus in helping us to understand the workings of the Spartan constitution during this period?

The details of Herodotus' text were not well known. Also many candidates did not note the lack of sources in this area. Factual knowledge on this was not bad, but needed to be focused on the question. There were some good answers.

- 8** How far do Herodotus and Thucydides help us to understand Sparta's view of other states during this period?

Most candidates were able to give a good account in general terms of Thucydides and Herodotus and their bias. They also produced general accounts of what these authors say, but they found some difficulty in shaping this to answer the question, which requires careful interpretation to reflect Sparta's views of other states.



## Section C - The development of Athenian Democracy, 508-399 BC

- 9 Assess the various types of political leadership in Athens during this period.

Many candidates took this question as an opportunity to write a potted history of Athenian democracy. Only some applied this effectively to the question. There was also a tendency to focus on the earlier part of the period, starting with Cleisthenes and then writing about Pericles, but not moving on to deal with Cleon and later political leadership. The better answers covered something of the whole period, and attempted to look at the types of political leadership, rather than just named characters.

- 10 What impact did the acquisition of empire have on Athenian democracy and its institutions during this period?

Some candidates made good attempts at this question, and considered the impact on the various organs of government in Athens. A number of candidates failed to focus directly on this, and talked more about the impact generally on Athens without thinking through the detail. There was little evaluation of the word 'impact'.

- 11 The 'Old Oligarch' argues that the navy was essential to the success of Athenian democracy. How accurate and convincing is this view?

This question produced some good responses, with candidates looking carefully at different aspects of Athenian naval power. It is still important here that candidates use a full range of sources, and relate the issues raised to the development of democracy, not just the power of Athens.

- 12 Compare the criticisms of democracy found in Thucydides and Aristophanes' *Knights*. How justified are those criticisms?

Answers on this question tended to suffer when candidates were not familiar enough with the texts. Some had a rough idea of both, whilst others knew one or the other. Clarity on the basic issues led competent students to give effective answers. Despite these comments, there were some excellent answers, with a thorough knowledge of Aristophanes. The knowledge of Thucydides was generally weaker. The main focus of most answers was Cleon, with less focus on the issues raised by the question which asks candidates to look at 'criticisms of democracy'.

## 2466 Roman History: Thematic Study 2

### General comments

The candidates this year performed creditably in all sections with some outstanding answers displaying a wide range of sources. However, there still remain a few candidates who fail to provide any sources in Questions 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10. In addition a number of candidates do not refer to any source other than the prescribed ones, making it difficult to assess Pliny, Horace, Juvenal or Cicero without some external evidence. There are a number of candidates who appear not to realise that there are marks for the use of sources which they are not gaining. Candidates produced answers with little or no source material in their first question, and then showed detailed knowledge of source material in their second. Even on the prescribed source candidates do not use them with reference to specific examples and/or quotations.

There were very few candidates who did not answer 2 questions although some had to curtail their second answer due to lack of time. The balance of answers on scripts was variable with some producing very good answers from the prescribed material and much weaker ones on the period as a whole. There were clear examples of candidates who had a minimal knowledge of the prescribed material as well as those who found it difficult to cover only part of the period.

Many candidates can write in great detail on some aspects but do find maintaining that level of detail difficult. In *The City of Rome* for example, there remains a great emphasis on Augustus and little effort to develop their knowledge of other emperors for comparison: emperors appear to have stopped around Nero and in the *Growth and Government of the Roman Empire* there appears to be no advance after 50 BC.

### Section A - The Growth and Government of the Roman Empire

All 4 questions were answered.

- 1 To what extent did the changes to the composition of the extortion court juries tackle corruption in the provinces?

This produced some very good detailed answers with precise information of the major changes from the Gracchi to 50s BC and Caesar. The evidence to some extent on Verres and Cicero, but there was good use of other examples such as Catiline and Appius Claudius. Some could point to scandals no matter who constituted the juries. The answers also developed ideas about central government inadequacy and corruption. A number of references were used ranging from Appian to Sallust (where occasionally the candidate pointed out that Sallust was as corrupt as the best of them). There were good contrasts made using the examples of Appius and Cicero in Cilicia. Weaker answers did not identify specific facts about individual governors; not all candidates identified specific examples of corruption as an issue.

- 2 To what extent were Caesar's campaigns in Gaul a turning point in the history of the expansion of the empire?

This was not as popular as Q. 1. Candidates did not make comparisons with other campaigns nor identify the ways in which Caesar's conquest of Gaul was significant – the movement north away from the Mediterranean, and the expansion of the Empire into a different political and social culture, use of conquest for political gain, the fierce loyalty of the troops to Caesar, Caesar's virtual independence from Rome etc. Comparison with other campaigns was also infrequent such as Pompey's against Mithridates, or Octavian's possession of Egypt. The use of source material was also weak in places considering what we have for this subject.

- 3 What can we learn from the *Cilician Letters* about Cicero's view of his own success in carrying out his responsibilities in comparison with other governors during this period?

There were a number of very good answers which displayed a very precise knowledge of the letters and information about other governors for comparison with Cicero. The general line taken was that Cicero was not typical of governors when compared to Verres or Appius or even Caesar. Most answers could refer to some specific information from the Letters and identify the range of tasks and his success. Evaluation tended to be a general comment that we cannot trust Cicero on himself, given his wish to enhance his own achievements. Having said that, however, the candidates usually went on to trust him implicitly. Better answers dealt with specific examples where it might be argued he was exaggerating or was being factually accurate. Better answers also indicated that in some ways he was both successful and unsuccessful, and that he performed the same duties as other governors, although not with the same intentions. Some answers used the reactions of the locals to Cicero (as he reported them) as a way of testing whether he was typical; for example, that they were amazed when he was not behaving as Appius had done. There was in weaker answers a focus on Cicero alone which was really only part of the answer. Equally, a small number failed to make any specific use of the prescribed text.

- 4 How much can we learn from Cicero's *Cilician Letters* about the ways in which provincials could suffer from the actions of Romans throughout this period?

This question was less popular and answers suffered from a failure to take into account the question 'how much'. While answers included examples of corruption, they did not assess the information as evidence, other than in general terms. This, as in Q.3, did not include specific use of the texts. There is information in the letters and material from other sources to develop an answer concerning the sorts of problems faced by the provincials from war to tax collectors, high rates of interest and corrupt staff members. Verres was a frequent balance to Cicero, and evidence of the trials during the period could have been used to indicate the range of suffering.

## Section B - The City of Rome

All questions were answered in this section with more opting for 6 than 5.

- 5 How, and for what reasons, did the people of Rome express their discontent throughout this period, and with what results?

This produced some very knowledgeable answers, at least about riots at games. Candidates do tend to confuse emperors so that the incident where Claudius is pelted with bread becomes an event in Gaius' reign. Every candidate had a good understanding of the ways Augustus dealt with the discontent, although some declared that Augustus never had any complaints. Good answers made use of the information on Suetonius and Tacitus on Nero and the removal of Octavia, or Tiberius and the reaction to Germanicus' funeral. Some candidates referred to graffiti as well as riots. Most mentioned the reactions to shortages, some referred to political uncertainties or unemployment as causes. Not many realised, it appears, that ordinary people no longer voted or attended Assemblies and so had few other ways to voice their feelings. Some made it clear they felt that they had a lot to complain about, despite the pre-emptive measures by Augustus in terms of gifts and shows and Claudius with his arrangements to improve the corn supply. Answers, especially weaker ones, tended to discuss one or other of the parts of the question, having some problems in identifying the impact on the emperors and their subsequent actions. Another issue was the discussion of how successful the measures were, where some candidates thought that the answer was 'we cannot tell.' Answers did concentrate on the earlier part of the period with the large amount of information one can find in the *Res Gestae*.

- 6 How, and for what reasons, did the emperors try to influence the religious life of the city throughout this period?

There was considerable detail in responses to Q. 6 (concerning the influence emperors had on religion) although sometimes this focused on foreign cults. There was more insecure factual knowledge with attributions to emperors of acts they did not commit. Tiberius does not build a temple to Isis – in fact she and the Jews are banned in AD19. There was a great deal on the state religion in some answers, with reference to the status of the emperor as Pontifex Maximus and the need for festivals. Augustus' building programme, the all too often Secular Games, Gaius' developing emperor worship and Domitian's interest in Isis all were mentioned. A good number focused on Augustus. Better answers had good detail on specific ways in which emperors affected religious practice either directly or indirectly for example the creation of the *seviri*. Candidates invariably referred to popularity as a reason enough for emperors to influence religious life. Better answers suggested that emperors wanted to appear to have divine approval, and in some cases be related to a god. They were after all the chief priest and needed to keep up appearances. As some answers noted, traditional religious life was very much a part of some emperors' policies for boosting Roman morale. A discussion of differences between emperors is always useful in these questions. Only the better answers examined how matters changed, which is an important aspect of the Thematic Study.

- 7 To what extent does Juvenal in *Satires* 3 prove that the measures taken by emperors throughout this period to improve living conditions in Rome were half-hearted or unsuccessful?

Q.7 was more frequently answered than Q. 8. Juvenal was generally well known and there was normally some detail from other sources of information which either supported Juvenal's assertions or suggested otherwise. Answers connected up the information on fires in Rome with the factual knowledge of Nero's fire in AD 64 or the attempt by Rufus to create a fire-brigade. The claims in Juvenal on the dangerous nature of flats or house were supported by reference to archaeological material or information from other towns. Juvenal's complaints about crowded and dangerous streets were compared with information from Horace in part and from information which can be inferred from remains. Some answers stretched the meaning of 'danger' to include almost everything Juvenal mentions in the satire. Good answers did attempt to evaluate the material in terms of genre, use the fact that it is spoken by Umbricius, and discuss how far Juvenal deals in stereotypes and typical rather than real situations. Too often the attempt may be limited to a general idea that satire is exaggerated for fun and therefore cannot be treated as fact or a discussion of Juvenal's background and possible influences. However, candidates did proceed to treat it as fact without considering each reference in turn. Some answers did discuss how far Juvenal's picture of Rome is affected by his own prejudices. However, they were not very clear about what his own slant on the picture is meant to be. It was important for good answers to show a detailed knowledge of the text and to be able to refer to specific aspects in the text.

- 8 How well do Juvenal in *Satires* 3 and Horace in *Satires* 2.6 illustrate how difficult it was for the people to express their views to those in power during this period?

There was much the same problem with Q. 8 (on the texts and how far the people of Rome could express their views to those in power) where answers found difficulty in relating the text to the issues. Very few candidates attempted this question. The relationship between patron and client was not well explored. Information concerning how they expressed their views and the restrictions on this was generally lacking in specific examples.

## Section C - Empire and Emperors

It was pleasing that the majority of candidates tried to avoid the narrative of events in favour of selective discussion of key points; also they generally covered the period as whole, avoiding a concentration on Trajan, especially in Q.9 and Q.10. There was a common use of Tacitus' *Agricola*, as well as Pliny's Letters, which again was pleasing to see. Other sources were used sparingly but nonetheless effectively by some.

- 9 How successful were governors of this period both in being effective military commanders and in winning over provincials to Roman rule?

The discussion of the role of governors was largely confined to the campaigning aspect, and there was a focus on *Agricola* and Pliny. A small number attempted discussions of how roles changed in different provinces, and this invariably added to the quality of the answer. It would be useful if more candidates focused on changes rather than comparing governors. The change in role from simply conquering army, to much more of Romanising force was an issue highlighted in the question. It was important to attempt some comparison between parts of the period in order to answer the 'how successful' aspect of the question. There were opportunities to use different types of evidence about the governors including inscriptions, but this was rarely taken up. However some candidates used Josephus in discussing the Judaeian situation and early parts of the *Annals* and Dio for Tiberius' and Claudius' periods. Better answers showed knowledge of specific examples of both governors (Plautius, Corbulo, Paulinus) and the effects their attempts to Romanise.

- 10 How different were the ways in which the emperor was viewed in the various provinces throughout this period?

Good answers showed an understanding of the images which emperors had in various provinces, and also, in very good answers, how the institution of the principate was viewed. Some noted that the emperor was viewed as a god in the East and as a rather harsh master in the west. Better answers also indicated when provinces changed their view of a particular emperor for various reasons. Candidates discussed changes in the perception of the emperor in better answers. Good answers also indicated how far the emperor's image was affected by the behaviour of governors. Weaker answers conflated the two and assumed that the mistakes of governors were blamed on the emperor. The better answers were precise with their examples and instances, and used the support from the sources, especially Pliny. It was not clear to some candidates what the special status of his province was. Not all could distinguish accurately between the imperial and senatorial provinces. Some introduced the procurator into the discussions, but did not make sufficient distinction between them and governors. Apart from Pliny's Letters, Tacitus' *Agricola* was used for support, and some Suetonius or Tacitus on Britain, with Josephus on Judaea. Candidates often took the chance to review a number of revolts as an indication of how the emperor was viewed. As with other questions throughout the paper candidates found some difficulty in providing material from the period as whole and tended to describe one or two reigns.

- 11** How far can we use the letters between Pliny and Trajan to assess the success with which local communities preserved their own distinctive cultures and administered their own affairs during this period?

This produced some good answers with highly detailed material from the Letters, which were appropriate and accurately recounted. Weaker answers paraphrased sometimes incorrectly and failed to provide an accurate record of Trajan's view. Generally answers were reasonably well-argued on the issue of administration. Some compared Pliny with Agricola both on the issue of administration and the extent of local independence. As evaluation, the view was often taken that Pliny embellished/polished his letters for publication and that therefore they are unlikely to be an accurate record. Book 10 was published after his death, and they may have been edited but not by Pliny. All candidates made the point that they were a record of one province, and that a special case any way. However, some candidates had little factual knowledge when attempting a comparison with other situations, for example in Judaea. Some answers had great detail of the Letters and the replies by Trajan but did not address the question on the local communities, preferring to deal with how well Pliny coped. Good answers provided examples of the procurator, although even these had some difficulty with either the names or the exact chronology of events, for example Classicianus in Britain. As in other questions the issue of balance was important and some answers argued that the local communities did virtually nothing for themselves. It was also noticeable that candidates seemed to think that theatre was a Roman invention imposed on the Greeks, indicative in some answers that knowledge of local cultures was limited.

- 12** How far can we use the letters between Pliny and Trajan to assess what the emperors considered to be their own responsibilities in provincial administration during this period?

Answers to this question suffered from much the same weaknesses as those to Q. 11. Answers did not always address the issue of usefulness, despite having a range of examples to discuss. Equally they did not keep a focus on what the emperor thought he should be doing. Good answers had precise examples of where Trajan made a point of changing Pliny's decision and/or pointing out what mattered. Comparisons were made, as far as possible: Britain was the most obvious choice given the information from Tacitus, but this was not used well, either through lack of specific material or simply a lack of exact knowledge of the information about Britain. Other provinces used included Judaea, Gaul and Egypt. Good answers could point to the issue of the imperial cult under Tiberius and Trajan, the role of Nero and Classicianus in Britain, and the differences between emperors and their involvement in provinces. Most saw the Letters as useful since they were free of Tacitean rhetoric and/or bias or were official and therefore much more likely to represent the true state of affairs.

In general candidates had good knowledge and some skills in analysing and organising information. It needs to be reiterated that candidates must try to compare different parts of the period as much as possible within the scope of the question if they are to score highly. The Thematic Paper is concerned with change over time; even where there is little change over the majority of the period it is important to discuss it in the context of the question.



## **2467 Roman World: Thematic Study 2**

### **General comments**

This paper was judged to be on a par with those set in previous years in terms of difficulty and range of topics offered, though the Examiners remain aware that it is the most challenging task which candidates at A2 have to attempt, and that the abilities of some candidates are sorely tried by some aspects of it, particularly the requirement to recall information about inscriptions in Qs. 3 or 4. That said, there were a good number of very thoughtful answers to the questions set which made adequate use of source material and factual knowledge, while recognizing the inherently speculative nature of some of the conclusions they reached. Many weaker candidates found it straightforward to discuss either Q. 1 or Q. 2, but failed to use sources in any detail to support their answers, despite the obvious wealth of material available to them. Sweeping statements, speculation and unsupported assertions were very much to the fore. There was little evidence of planning before embarking on the essay itself; where planning had been carried out, the level of focus on the questions was much better.

There were slightly more responses to Q. 1 than to Q. 2; in the second part of the paper twice as many candidates attempted Q. 4 (army) than Q. 3 (occupations and economic activity). Only one rubric error was noted, with a candidate answering questions 1 and 2.

### **Comments on individual questions**

- 1** Examine the reasons for the development and change in functions of towns in Roman Britain during this period.

This elicited a wide range of responses; there was much use made of evidence from specific towns, and both issues were addressed thoughtfully at the upper end of the scale; weaker responses coped with 'development' but did not engage with, or forgot, 'change in function'. Some very detailed knowledge was noted, as well as a few instances of local knowledge, which is good to see.

- 2** To what extent does a study of **either** art **or** architecture in Roman Britain during this period support the view that Britain became fully 'Romanised'?

The examiners thought that this was a straightforward question, but in practice it caused problems for some candidates who could not get to grips with/ ignored 'fully Romanised'. There was much basic discussion of specimens without placing them in their proper context, or addressing the issue of how many Britons actually enjoyed mosaics (for example). That said there were some very thoughtful and balanced responses which explored what it meant to be 'Roman' and whether the evidence of cultural change can be linked to other aspects of 'Romanization'.

- 3** How much can we learn from inscriptions about the occupations and economic activity of the inhabitants of Roman Britain?

Responses to this question were often well-supported by a variety of inscriptional material, including tombstones, the Vindolanda letters, and archaeology. Many candidates evaluated the epigraphic material well and passed comments on 'how much we can learn' from it in a thoughtful way, stressing the limited/ fragmentary nature of what survives and its association with people who were literate and could afford to leave evidence of their lives behind! Several candidates mentioned agriculture as an example of this – the Vindolanda letters and villas apart, precious little survives to illuminate the lives of the vast majority who were engaged in food production and processing in Britain.



- 4 How much can be learned from inscriptions about the varying functions performed by the Roman army in Roman Britain during this period?

A good two-thirds of candidates addressed this question. There was some good discussion of 'varying functions' ranging from conquest and peace-keeping to more mundane roles such as building and maintenance of roads, frontier systems, and towns. These allowed reference to inscriptions at a variety of levels, and starting with the functions rather than the material for once opened up opportunities for candidates of all abilities to mention something relevant. Among the best responses were fine detailed discussions of inscriptions and some very thoughtful evaluation. The benefits of using the sources as an integral part of the teaching material (i.e. providing five or six inscriptions for students and using them as the basis for an introduction to a thematic topic) was apparent in some well-founded and argued essays which reached the top of the top bands.

**2468 Greek History: Individual Study**  
**2469 Roman History: Individual Study**  
**2470 Roman World: Individual study**

As last year, the general standard of coursework submitted was good and some was outstanding, but a few pieces showed a lack of planning and analysis. In one or two cases the lack of analysis was due to the title. Yet again, some titles did not give candidates the scope to use, evaluate and analyse the original sources. There are still some centres also where ancient and modern sources seem to be interchangeable, both being used for information with no consideration of interpretation and so marks on AO3 are necessarily low.

A rather disturbing occurrence this year was the increase in the number of centres where several, or all, of the students used the same title and there was little evidence of individual research and response. Some answers seemed based on a template, and although this does not mean that good candidates do not do well, it can show up more clearly the faults of the weaker ones. The standardised evaluation of source material was also evident, often dealt with in one paragraph rather than incorporated throughout the essay. This is something not to be encouraged.

Most candidates confined themselves to the word count, but some were overlong. It is not acceptable to increase the length by long footnotes. This should be penalised in AO1b. **There are still some centres which are not giving the word count which has been a requirement for several years.**

If an essay is concerned with 'visual arts', then illustrations to clarify the argument are a good idea. These should obviously be referenced, as should all sources. Specific references rather than the vague 'Thucydides says', should be given e.g. Thuc, II 65, or Suetonius, Tib.27. Tacitus may present a problem but it should be possible to give the original book.

Bibliographies should include all books used and quoted from. Web sites must also be listed.

Annotation of essays is still missing in some centres. It makes it very difficult to see where marks have been awarded and to give advice if things have gone wrong.

Having said all this, the vast majority of work is well presented and researched and marked within tolerance.



**Advanced GCE (Ancient History) (3809 and 7809)  
June 2007 Assessment Series**

**AS Unit Threshold Marks**

<i>Unit</i>		<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>u</b>
<b>2450</b>	Raw	100	76	66	56	46	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2451</b>	Raw	100	77	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2452</b>	Raw	100	78	69	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2453</b>	Raw	100	80	70	61	52	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2454</b>	Raw	100	78	68	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2455</b>	Raw	100	83	74	66	58	50	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2456</b>	Raw	100	76	66	57	48	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2457</b>	Raw	100	81	71	62	53	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2458</b>	Raw	100	74	65	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**A2 Unit Threshold Marks**

<i>Unit</i>		<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>u</b>
<b>2459</b>	Raw	100	77	68	59	50	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2460</b>	Raw	100	79	69	59	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2461</b>	Raw	100	79	69	59	50	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2462</b>	Raw	100	78	69	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2463</b>	Raw	100	78	68	58	48	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2464</b>	Raw	100	82	72	63	54	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2465</b>	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2466</b>	Raw	100	84	74	64	54	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2467</b>	Raw	100	81	70	60	50	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2468</b>	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2469</b>	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>2470</b>	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

### Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>3809</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>7809</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total Number of Candidates</b>
<b>3809</b>	15.8	36.4	59.9	78.8	92.1	100	994
<b>7809</b>	22.0	48.7	76.3	92.1	98.5	100	575

1569 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam\\_system/understand\\_ums.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998  
Facsimile: 01223 552627  
Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored



**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**