**H407/12 Summer 2019 series Athens and the Greek World**

**General**

* The overall message is the assessment objectives are heavily weighted towards using, analysing and evaluating ancient source material. Answers which give a broad narrative or offer unsubstantiated statements such as ‘the sources show that…’ are unlikely to achieve marks in AO3 beyond the lower two bands.

**Section A Questions 1&2**

* To repeat the advice from the previous specification: evaluation of the sources must be specific to the point being made. There was still far too much generic evaluation bolted on at the end of an essay, which, quite reasonably, received very little credit.
* The vast majority of responses dealt only with Athens post 478 and too many answers were restricted to only 478–431. Candidates should be reminded that questions without a specific date range refer to the whole period.
* The various treaties of the period are important, and their details should be known to candidates precisely.

**Section A Question 3**

* There is no expected answer and candidates are free to agree or disagree with all or part of the modern interpretation.
* There is no need for candidates to look to try to support their judgements with the ideas of other modern interpretations as some responses looked to contrast the views by Meiggs with other authors.
* Choice of evidence to support or challenge the interpretation has to come from within the timeframe of the key debate e.g. not after 431

**Section B Question 4**

* “There were actually few examples of Level 6 answers for Question 4 with a large number of candidates treating the question as ‘what does this passage tell us…’ rather than ‘how useful…’. It is important that the passage(s)/source(s) are mined for relevant information but that there is also some analysis of source utility.”
* Response consisting of a general evaluation of the passages without reference to the text in detail is “limited”,
* Arguing that the passage is useful or not because the author is reliable or not is partial at best.
* Long quotes from the text followed by a re-stating of what it means for the implication of the use of rhetoric is acceptable up to a point but needs supporting knowledge to develop the usefulness,

**Section B Questions 5&6**

* There was surprisingly a lack of information on the career of Pericles

**H407/23 Summer 2019 series Emperors and Empire**

**General**

* “For successful responses candidates need to display a secure knowledge of the ancient sources and the historical periods studied, displayed in precise and accurate examples;”
* “The prescribed sources needed to be carefully evaluated in the context showing how the context, genre and preconceptions of the author impacted on the reliability of the evidence.”
* “Less successful responses were characterised by limited sources, generalised factual knowledge, inaccurate chronology, general source references (‘Suetonius tells us’, ‘According to Tacitus’ or simply Dio in brackets after the information), confusion between emperors and simple inaccuracies.”
* “Candidates who were less successful offered a paragraph on the author or genre (sometimes), or the background and supposed bias. For example, ‘Tacitus was a senator and was biased towards emperors’ with little attempt to relate the evaluation to the evidence being used. Sometimes the paragraph which followed concluded that we could not trust the author but the candidate did not seem to see that this negated the argument just presented in the response. On the other hand, many made attempts to deal with specific evidence, notably with material examples such as coins as propaganda. The Depth study contains a good number of inscriptions and coins”

**Section A Questions 1&2**

* “Very good responses took the approach of not narrating each emperor. They identified the key ways in which improvement could be made and dealt with what a selection of emperors did in each of these ways - similarly with ‘reasons’, grouping actions under headings and identifying how the actions of emperors related to these. This is more analytical and less a run through events with a brief added note on a reason.”
* “Good responses displayed a good range of knowledge of the sources, often detailed, with accurate quotes.”
* “A perfectly relevant reference to evidence might be affected by a misattribution leading to an erroneous conclusion or a misunderstanding of the context again leading to an unconvincing analysis. Minor errors of dates or events are to be expected to some extent in a timed examination and do not seriously affect the performance unless they lead to misunderstanding or an unsubstantiated judgement.”
* “Assessing the reliability of written or material sources is achieved only by using specific examples. General evaluations (that Suetonius always relies on gossip, or that Tacitus is completely negative towards Tiberius) do not allow the response to deal with the context and its impact on the issue convincingly. An example of undeveloped evaluation was to mention Augustus and Agrippa’s aqueducts or the Cloaca Maxima, while claiming Suetonius is not to be trusted always because he writes as a moralist. It is not explained why the account of aqueducts is no longer credible in this case.”

**Section A Question 3**

* “It is important in this question to read the extract carefully and deal with the phraseology of the extract, and not rephrase it in some minor or major way.”

**Section B Question 4**

*Content specific feedback*

**Section B Questions 5&6**

*Content specific feedback*